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

August 27, 2013

Patricia Follette, Superintendent
Whitney Point Central School District
10 Keibel Road
Whitney Point, NY 13862

Dear Superintendent Follette:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR) meets the criteria outlined in Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Commissioner's Regulations and has been approved for the 2012-2013 school year. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,

John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Allen D. Buyck

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Monday, July 15, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department reserves the right to request further information from the school district or BOCES, as necessary, as part of its review.

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 031401060000

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

031401060000

1.2) School District Name: WHITNEY POINT CSD

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

WHITNEY POINT CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 13, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

State assessments (or Regents or Regent equivalents), *required if one exists*
If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Kindergarten ELA Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed First-Grade ELA Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Second-Grade ELA Assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

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	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Kindergarten Math Assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed First-Grade Math Assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Second-Grade Math Assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be

	determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

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	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Six Science Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Seven Science Assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations:

	Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

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	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Six Social Studies Assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Whitney Point District Developed Grade Seven Social Studies Assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Whitney Point District Developed Grade Eight Social Studies Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

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	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Global 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test.

	2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2

	weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

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	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Nine ELA Assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed Grade Ten ELA Assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	New York State English 11 Regents Exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of

	the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

	Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
	All other courses not listed above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed and Whitney Point District Developed Assessments in the appropriate grade and content

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. •Full-year Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course

	o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks of the course •All Other Courses: o Pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 2 weeks of course o Post-tests will be administered generally within the last 2 weeks of the course Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting 1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula. (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs. Post-test/ Determining Growth 1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test. 2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average) Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Teachers who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Teachers who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

and upload that file here.

assets/survey-uploads/5364/131784-TXEtxx9bQW/Growth with Material Change.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

No controls.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Tuesday, August 27, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.3 for material change.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload

Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness.

	The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.3 for material change.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.3 upload

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/131785-rhJdBgDruP/Local Measure with Material Change 5.docx

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

	See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across

	the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

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

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science

	and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachement)

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.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be

	expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

	The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

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 not listed above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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	Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model). All teachers in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation. The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness. The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See attached 3.13 for material change.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Task 3.13 upload

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/131785-y92vNseFa4/Local Measure with Material Change 5.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

No Controls.

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.

Not applicable.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

Not applicable

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	45
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	15

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Evaluators conducting observations will evaluate and score teachers in a holistic manner using jointly developed forms based on the four domains of the rubric.

1. Relative Value of Each Domain will be equal
Domains a., b., and c. will be used to score 45 points through the observation process
Domain d. will be used to score 15 points through the structured review of lessons plans, student portfolios, and other teacher artifacts
a. Planning and Preparation 25%
b. Classroom Environment 25%
c. Instruction 25%

d. Professional Responsibilities 25%

2. Relative Value of Each Component
a. Planning and Preparation
•Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy 17%
•Knowledge of Students 17%
•Setting Instructional Outcomes 17%
•Knowledge of Resources 15%
•Designing Coherent Instruction 17%
•Designing Student Assessments 17%

b. Classroom Environment
• Respect and Rapport 20%
• Culture for Learning 20%
• Managing Classroom Procedures 20%
• Managing Student Behavior 20%
• Organizing Physical Spaces 20%

c. Instruction
• Communicating with Students 20%
• Questioning/Prompts and Discussion 20%
• Engaging Students in Learning 20%
• Using Assessment and Instruction 20%
• Using Flexibility and Responsiveness 20%

d. Professional Responsibilities
• Reflecting on Teaching 17%
• Maintaining Accurate Records 17%
• Communicating with Families 15%
• Participating in a Professional Community 17%
• Growing and Developing Professionally 17%
• Showing Professionalism 17%

3. Each Component is Rated from 1 to 4
(4= HE, 3= E, 2= D, 1=I)

4. Determine Weighted Component Scores
(Rating X Relative Value = Weighted Component Score)

5. For Each Domain, Determine the Total Domain Score
(Sum of Each Weighted Component Score)

6. Determine Weighted Total Of Each Domain
(Sum of the Weighted Component Score X Relative Value of the Domain)

7. Total Weighted Domain Scores = Evaluation Score
(Sum of the Weighted Domain Scores)

8. Use the Evaluation Score to Determine the Measure of Effectiveness Score Using the Negotiated Scale (see chart below)

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/5091/131786-eka9yMJ855/Other Measures_1.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.	Measure Effectiveness Score of 3.3 to 4.0 equals 59-60 HEDI Points
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Measure Effectiveness Score of 2.5 to 3.2 equals 57-58 HEDI Points
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Measure Effectiveness Score of 1.5 to 2.4 equals 50-56 HEDI Points
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Measure Effectiveness Score of 1 to 1.4 equals 0-49 HEDI Points

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

- Both

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

- Both

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?

- Both

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

- Both

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Wednesday, October 03, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 20, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/131789-Df0w3Xx5v6/WP TIP plan.doc

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

ARTICLE VII
PROCEDURES FOR APPEALING AN ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL
PERFORMANCE REVIEW

7.1 The following procedures are the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals

related to a tenured teacher's annual professional performance review. The procedures contained herein are not available to probationary teachers.

7.2 The grievance and/or arbitration procedures in any negotiated agreement shall not be used to appeal or review a tenured teacher's annual professional performance review. To the extent that a conflict exists between a negotiated agreement and this procedure, the terms and conditions of this procedure shall prevail and be applied.

7.3 This procedure shall be in effect unless changed by the parties or until the requirement to have such a procedure under Education Law §3012-c is repealed by law, regulation or a valid ruling by a court or administrative agency with jurisdiction.

(1) A tenured teacher who receives a composite rating of "ineffective" may appeal his or her performance review. Ratings of "highly effective", "effective" or "developing" cannot be appealed.

(2) A tenured teacher may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review, the school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the annual professional performance review plan.

(3) Under this appeal process the tenured teacher has the burden of proving a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he/she seeks relief. The burden of proof shall be by the preponderance of the credible evidence.

(4) A tenured teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same composite performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular composite performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

(5) A tenured teacher may have an association representative present at any time during the appeal process.

(6) It is the desired objective of the parties to encourage the prompt and informal resolution of potential appeals. Therefore, before any formal appeal is initiated, the tenured teacher and Evaluator should attempt to address and resolve any disputes. This conversation should be initiated no later than five (5) work days after the date when the teacher receives his/her composite performance review and be conducted and completed within 5 day of initiation.

(7) If a resolution is not achieved through the informal meeting of the tenured teacher and Evaluator, he/she will have five (5) work days from the date of this informal meeting to notify the Superintendent of the intent to file a formal appeal. The teacher shall then have ten (10) work days from the date of notification of the intent to appeal to submit the APPR Appeal Form and documentation, except for special circumstances or as agreed upon by the educator and the Superintendent. Failure to submit the APPR Appeal Form with documentation within the required/agreed upon time frame shall result in a waiver of the teacher's right to appeal that performance review.

Formal appeals must include a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over the teacher's performance review on the APPR Appeal Form, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that he/she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

The formal appeal process is intended to span no more than thirty (30) days, with the Superintendent issuing a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than ten (10) calendar days from the date the appeal hearing ends. If the Superintendent sustains the appeal he/she shall issue an appropriate remedy.

(8) If the tenured teacher chooses to appeal the written decision of the Superintendent, a final step would be to appeal to a three-member Board of Education Panel within five (5) work days of the Superintendent's decision. The panel will be comprised of three Board members chosen by the following: Teachers' Association (1), Superintendent (1), and Evaluator (1). The three-member Board of Education Panel will determine the final/binding resolution. If the Board of Education Panel sustains the appeal, they will issue an appropriate remedy. If they dismiss or deny the appeal, the teacher's score and evaluation shall remain unchanged and the appeal process shall end. The panel will meet and issue a final decision within thirty (30) work days of the request of the tenured teacher.
In no case will this appeal process not be timely and expeditious.

6.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

ARTICLE V
EVALUATOR TRAINING

5.1 The Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The district will utilize BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. 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.

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in ongoing training and are re-certified on an annual basis to ensure inter-rater reliability over time. The BOCES Network Team and on-line instruction through Teachscape© will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

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 Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Thursday, June 13, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

4-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

	School or Program Type	SLO with Assessment Option	Name of the Assessment
	Elementary School K-3	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	Broome-Tioga BOCES Regionally Developed K-2 ELA and Math Post Assessments
	Elementary School K-3	State assessment	3rd Grade New York State ELA and Math Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The K-3 Principal's HEDI score will be determined using a school-wide (K-3) SLO gap-closing measure. The SLO process will use a school-wide weighted average of all K-3 ELA and Math pre-tests administered at the beginning of the year compared to a school-wide weighted average of all of K-3 ELA and Math post-tests administered at the end of the year, including the NYS ELA and Math 3rd grade Assessment. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this. K-3 ELA and Math pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course. K-2 ELA and Math post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks and the NYS 3rd Grade ELA and Math Assessments will be administered according to the state-determined schedule. Gap Closing Calculations: Pre-test/Goal Setting: 1. After the pre-tests are administered and scored, a school-wide K-3 ELA and Math pre-test weighted average will be calculated. The pre-test weighted average will be calculated by using the following calculation: Pre-test Weighted Average=Total of All K-3 ELA and Math Pre-test Scores divided by the Total number of students taking the K-3 ELA and Math Pre-Tests. 2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen

	Percent (17%) Gap-Closing Formula. Gap Closing Goal = (100 – pre-test weighted school average) x 17% 3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating the Principal's SLO. Post-test/ Determining Growth: 1. After the post-tests are administered and scored, a school-wide K-3 ELA and Math post-test weighted average will be calculated using those on the course rosters who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. Post-test Weighted Average =Total of All K-3 ELA and Math Post-Test Scores divided by the Total number of students taking the K-3 ELA and Math Post-Tests. 2. Once the school-wide weighted average on the ELA and Math post-tests are determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for K-3 ELA and Math shall be determined as follows: % Gap Closed = (PostTest Weighted Average) – (Pre Test Weighted Average) divided by (100 - PreTest Weighted Average) X 100 Principals who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points. Principals who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Principals who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points. Principals who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points. Principals who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points. Material Change: See attachment for conversion of scaled scores used for post-tests.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Principals who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Principals who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Principals who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Principals who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Principals who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5365/131791-lha0DogRNw/Principal SLO With Material Change .docx

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

No Controls

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Tuesday, August 27, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.
Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
	4-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)
	9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

	See upload for material change.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/131792-qBFVOWF7fC/Local Measure with Material Change 5.docx

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

In the table below, list all of the grade configurations used in your district or BOCES (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a local measure from the menu.
Note: Districts and BOCES may select one or more types of growth or achievement measures for each grade configuration. If you are using more than one type of local measure for the evaluation of principals in a given grade configuration, list that grade configuration multiple times. If more space is needed, duplicate this portion of the form and upload additional pages (below) as an attachment.

The options in the drop-down menus below are abbreviated from the following list:<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
	K-3	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Weighted Average of New York State Assessments (see attachment)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher. The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

	The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this. See upload for material change.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Growth in Proficiency or Mastery - see uploaded attachment.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/131792-T8MlGWUVm1/Local Measure with Material Change 5.docx

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

No Controls

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Not Applicable

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Monday, July 15, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/131793-qacV8kg1ux/Principal Other Measures Document.docx

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

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.

See attached in Task 9.2

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.

(No response)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principals who receive a rubric score of 3.3-4.0 will recevie 59-60 HEDI Points
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals who receive a rubric score of 2.5-3.2 will receive 57-58 HEDI Points
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals who receive a rubric score of 1.5-2.4 will receive 50-56 HEDI Points
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principals who receive a rubric score of 1.0-1.4 will receive 0-49 HEDI Points

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Tuesday, October 09, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Tuesday, November 20, 2012

Page 1

11.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below.

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

11.2) Attachment: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5276/131795-Df0w3Xx5v6/WP PIP plan.doc

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

PROCEDURES FOR APPEALING THE PRINCIPAL ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

7.1 The following procedures are the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a tenured principal's annual professional performance review. The procedures contained herein are not available to probationary principals.

7.2 The grievance and/or arbitration procedures in any negotiated agreement shall not be used to appeal or review a tenured principal's annual professional performance review. To the extent that a conflict exists between a negotiated agreement and this procedure, the terms and conditions of this procedure shall prevail and be applied.

7.3 This procedure shall be in effect unless changed by the parties or until the requirement to have such a procedure under Education Law §3012-c is repealed by law, regulation or a valid ruling by a court or administrative agency with jurisdiction.

(1) A tenured principal who receives a composite rating of "ineffective" may appeal his or her performance review. Ratings of "highly effective", "effective" or "developing" cannot be appealed.

(2) A tenured principal may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review, the school district's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, and compliance with the procedures for the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the annual professional performance review plan.

(3) Under this appeal process the tenured principal has the burden of proving a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he/she seeks relief. The burden of proof shall be by the preponderance of the credible evidence.

(4) A tenured principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same composite performance review. All grounds for appealing a particular composite performance review must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.

(5) A tenured principal may have an association representative present at any time during the appeal process.

(6) It is the desired objective of the parties to encourage the prompt and informal resolution of potential appeals. Therefore, before any formal appeal is initiated, the tenured principal and Evaluator should attempt to address and resolve any disputes. This conversation should be initiated no later than five (5) work days after the date when the principal receives his/her composite performance review and be conducted and completed within 5 day of initiation of the conversation.

(7) If a resolution is not achieved through the informal meeting of the tenured principal and Evaluator, he/she will have five (5) work days from the date of this informal meeting to notify the Superintendent of the intent to file a formal appeal. The principal shall then have ten (10) work days from the date of notification of the intent to appeal to submit the APPR Appeal Form and documentation, except for special circumstances or as agreed upon by the principal and the Superintendent. Failure to submit the APPR Appeal Form with documentation within the required/agreed upon time frame shall result in a waiver of the principal's right to appeal that performance review.

Formal appeals must include a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over the principal's performance review on the APPR Appeal Form, along with any and all additional documents or written materials that he/she believes are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

The formal appeal process is intended to span no more than thirty (30) days, with the hearing lasting no longer than one day and the Superintendent issuing a written decision on the merits of the appeal no later than ten (10) calendar days from the date the appeal hearing ends. If the Superintendent sustains the appeal he/she shall issue an appropriate remedy.

(8) If the tenured principal chooses to appeal the written decision of the Superintendent, a final step would be to appeal to the BOCES District Superintendent. If the BOCES District Superintendent sustains the appeal, he/she will issue an appropriate remedy. If he/she dismisses or denies the appeal, the principal's score and evaluation shall remain unchanged and the appeal process shall end. The BOCES District Superintendent will issue a final decision within thirty (30) work days of the request of the tenured principal.

(9) In no way will this appeal process not be timely and expeditious.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

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

EVALUATOR TRAINING

The Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in

accordance with regulation. The district will utilize BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. 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.

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in ongoing training and are re-certified on an annual basis to ensure inter-rater reliability. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations.

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	Checked

prescribed by the Commissioner.	
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 Monday, May 21, 2012
Updated Tuesday, August 27, 2013

Page 1

12.1)Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

assets/survey-uploads/5581/131796-3Uqgn5g9Iu/08-27-2013 Signature Page.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.

Principal Growth HEDI Score

The K-3 Principal's HEDI score will be determined using a school-wide (K-3) SLO gap-closing measure. The SLO process will use a school-wide weighted average of all K-3 ELA and Math pre-tests administered at the beginning of the year compared to a school-wide weighted average of all of K-3 ELA and Math post-tests administered at the end of the year, including the NYS ELA and Math 3rd grade Assessment. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

K-3 ELA and Math pre-tests will be administered generally in the first 5 weeks of the course. K-2 ELA and Math post-tests will be administered generally within the last 5 weeks and the NYS 3rd Grade ELA and Math Assessments will be administered according to the state-determined schedule.

Gap Closing Calculations:

Pre-test/Goal Setting:

1. After the pre-tests are administered and scored, a school-wide K-3 ELA and Math pre-test weighted average will be calculated. The pre-test weighted average will be calculated by using the following calculation:

$$\textit{Pre-test Weighted Average} = \frac{\textit{Total of All K-3 ELA and Math Pre-test Scores}}{\textit{Total number of students taking the K-3 ELA and Math Pre-Tests}}$$

2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap-Closing Formula.

$$\textit{Gap Closing Goal} = (100 - \textit{pre-test weighted school average}) \times 17\%$$

3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating the Principal's SLO.

Post-test/ Determining Growth:

1. After the post-tests are administered and scored, a school-wide K-3 ELA and Math post-test weighted average will be calculated using those on the course rosters who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test.

$$\textit{Post-test Weighted Average} = \frac{\textit{Total of All K-3 ELA and Math Post-Test Scores}}{\textit{Total number of students taking the K-3 ELA and Math Post-Tests}}$$

2. Once the school-wide weighted average on the ELA and Math post-tests are determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for K-3 ELA and Math shall be determined as follows:

$$\textit{\% Gap Closed} = \left[\frac{\textit{(Post-test Weighted Average)} - \textit{(Pre Test Weighted Average)}}{100 - \textit{Pre-Test Weighted Average}}\right] \times 100$$

Principals who receive 26% or greater gap closing will receive 18-20 HEDI Points.

Principals who receive 13-25% gap closing will receive 9-17 HEDI Points. Principals who meet the target of 17% gap closing will receive 13 HEDI Points.

Principals who receive 5-12% gap closing will receive 3-8 HEDI Points.

Principals who receive a negative or 0% to 4% gap closing will receive 0-2 HEDI Points.

Band	**% Gap Closed**	**HEDI Points out of 20**
Highly effective	30% or greater	20
Highly effective	28-29%	19
Highly effective	26-27%	18
Effective	24-25%	17
Effective	22-23%	16
Effective	20-21%	15
Effective	18-19%	14
Effective	17%	13
Effective	16%	12
Effective	15%	11
Effective	14%	10
Effective	13%	9
Developing	12%	8
Developing	11%	7
Developing	10%	6
Developing	9%	5
Developing	7-8%	4

Developing	5-6%	3
Ineffective	3-4%	2
Ineffective	1-2%	1
Ineffective	0 or negative	0

MATERIAL CHANGE ON NEXT PAGE

For the state tests not scored on a 0-100% scaled score the following conversion chart will be used:

State Test Score Correlations		
Level	Scaled Score	% Score
Level 4	50% and higher of scaled score band	95
	49% and lower of scaled score band	90
Level 3	50% and higher of scaled score band	85
	49% and lower of scaled score band	75
Level 2	50% and higher of scaled score band	70
	49% and lower of scaled score band	60
Level 1	50% and higher of scaled score band	55
	49% and lower of scaled score band	45

Example		
State Test Score Correlations		
Level	Scaled Score	% Score
Level 4	50% and higher of scaled score band (325-350)	95
Band 300-350	49% and lower of scaled score band (300-324)	90
Level 3	50% and higher of scaled score band (249-299)	85
Band 200-299	49% and lower of scaled score band (200-248)	75
Level 2	50% and higher of scaled score band (147-199)	70

B. Student Learning Objectives

For teachers, other than 4-8 ELA and math, growth scores will be based on Student Learning Objectives. A Student Learning Objective (SLO) is an academic goal for a teacher's students, which is set at the start of a course after pre-tests have been administered and analyzed. It represents the most important learning for the year (or, semester, where applicable). It must be specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, and aligned to Common Core Learning Standards, state or national standards, as well as any other school and District priorities. In the Whitney Point Central School District, growth will be measured using a gap closing formula. An SLO meeting will take place within the first 10 weeks of school for full-year courses, within the first five weeks for courses that are less than a full year, or by a date agreed upon by the educator and administrator.

The SLO process to be used in the District shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the course and a post-test administered at the end of the course. All students on the roster at the time of the tests will be expected to take the pre-test and post-test. All possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

- Full-year Courses:
  - Pre-tests will be administered *generally* in the first 5 weeks of the course
  - Post-tests will be administered *generally* within the last 5 weeks of the course
- All Other Courses:
  - Pre-tests will be administered *generally* in the first 2 weeks of course
  - Post-tests will be administered *generally* within the last 2 weeks of the course

Gap Closing Calculations:

Pre-test/Goal Setting

1. After the pre-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster (enrolled) and who take the pre-test will be calculated.
2. Growth score goals will be calculated using a Seventeen Percent (17%) Gap Closing Formula.

   (100 – class average) x 17% = Gap Closing Goal
   *See Gap Closing Calculation Document for automatic calculation

3. The Gap Closing Goal will be used in creating SLOs.

Post-test/ Determining Growth

1. After the post-test is administered and scored, a course average using those on the course roster who have been continuously enrolled and have taken the post-test will be determined. Continuously enrolled for year-long courses is defined as enrolled between BEDS day and the day of the administration of the post-test. For courses less than a full year, continuously enrolled is defined as enrolled from the first day of the course to the day of the administration of the post-test.

2. Once the course average on the post-test is determined, the average Gap Closing percentile for the course shall be determined as follows:

   % Gap Closed = (Final Average – Pre Test Average) / (100 - Pre-Test average)

Multiple SLOs
If multiple courses are used for a teacher's SLO score, a weighted average of the scores as per State regulations must be determined:

1. District/evaluator will assess the results of each SLO separately, arriving at a HEDI rating and point value between 0-20 points.
2. Each SLO must then be weighted proportionately based on the number of students included in all SLOs. This will provide for one overall growth component score between 0-20 points. Always round to the nearest whole number; ≥.5 rounds up and <.5 rounds down.

Overall Growth Component (Round to the nearest whole number; ≥.5 rounds up and <.5 rounds down) =
(# of students in course 1 x HEDI Score in course 1)/Total # of Students Served +
(# of students in course 2 x HEDI Score in course 2)/Total # of Students Served+
(# of students in course 3 x HEDI Score in course 3)/Total # of Students Served
* See Gap Closing Calculation Document for automatic calculation

The following scale will be used to determine points achieved by a teacher based on his/her gap closing percentile:

Band	% Gap Closed	HEDI Points out of 20
Highly effective	30% or greater	20
Highly effective	28-29%	19
Highly effective	26-27%	18
Effective	24-25%	17
Effective	22-23%	16
Effective	20-21%	15
Effective	18-19%	14
Effective	17%	13
Effective	16%	12
Effective	15%	11
Effective	14%	10
Effective	13%	9
Developing	12%	8
Developing	11%	7
Developing	10%	6
Developing	9%	5
Developing	7-8%	4
Developing	5-6%	3
Ineffective	3-4%	2
Ineffective	1-2%	1
Ineffective	0 or negative	0

Material Change on Next Page

For the state tests not scored on a 0-100% scaled score the following conversion chart will be used:

State Test Score Correlations		
Level	Scaled Score	% Score
Level 4	50% and higher of scaled score band	95
	49% and lower of scaled score band	90
Level 3	50% and higher of scaled score band	85
	49% and lower of scaled score band	75
Level 2	50% and higher of scaled score band	70
	49% and lower of scaled score band	60
Level 1	50% and higher of scaled score band	55
	49% and lower of scaled score band	45

Example		
State Test Score Correlations		
Level	Scaled Score	% Score
Level 4	50% and higher of scaled score band (325-350)	95
Band 300-350	49% and lower of scaled score band (300-324)	90
Level 3	50% and higher of scaled score band (249-299)	85
Band 200-299	49% and lower of scaled score band (200-248)	75
Level 2	50% and higher of scaled score band (147-199)	70
Band 95-199	49% and lower of scaled score band (95-146)	60
Level 1	50% and higher of scaled score band (47-94)	55
Band 0-94	49% and lower of scaled score band (0-46)	45

Principal – Other Measures

Each principal shall be evaluated by the Superintendent of Schools, based on at least two meetings of thirty minutes or more to the school, while in session. Two meetings will be agreed to between the Superintendent and principal, and one will be unannounced. Visits are to be completed by the following dates: 1st Visit – February 15; 2nd Visit – May 31st.

Each principal's score and rating on the Locally Selected Measures subcomponent (if available) and on the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent (60 points) must be computed and provided to the principal in writing no later than the last day of the school year. If data for the Locally Selected Measures of Achievement is not available by June 30, that score and rating shall be provided within 10 work days of receipt of those achievement results.

The final evaluation must be completed and provided to each principal not later than September 1, but in no event more than 10 work days after receipt of State scores and data except for special circumstances or as agreed upon by the Principal and the Superintendent.

Scoring of Observations

The Superintendent of Schools will evaluate and score principals in a holistic manner using the full 60 points for the entire rubric, including Domain 7 (goal setting and attainment). The district will not be assigning any point to the State determined "ambitious and measureable goals."

Domain	Categories	Percent for Each Domain	Percent for each Category of Domain
Domain 1:Shared Vision and Learning		10%	
	A. Culture		50%
	B. Sustainability		50%
Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Program		20%	
	A. Culture		20%
	B. Instructional Program		20%
	C. Capacity Building		20%
	D. Sustainability		20%
	E. Strategic Planning Process: Monitoring and Inquiry		20%
Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment		20%	
	A. Communicating with Students		20%
	B. Questioning/Prompts and Discussion		20%
	C. Engaging Students in Learning		20%
	D. Using Assessment in Instruction		20%
	E. Using Flexibility and Responsiveness		20%

Domain 4: Community		10%	
	A. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry		34%
	B. Culture		33%
	C. Sustainability		33%
Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness and Ethics		20%	
	A. Sustainability		50%
	B. Culture		50%
Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural		10%	
	A. Sustainability		50%
	B. Culture		50%
Domain 7: Other: Goal Setting and Attainment		10%	
	A. Uncovering Goals		25%
	B. Strategic Planning		25%
	C. Taking Action		25%
	D. Evaluating Attainment		25%

HEDI Ranges: H=59-60 E=57-58 D=50-56 I=0-49

Measure of Effectiveness Score	**Evaluation Score**	Measure of Effectiveness Score	Evaluation Score	Measure of Effectiveness Score	Evaluation Score	Measure of Effectiveness Score	Evaluation Score
1	**0**	1.169	**21**	1.342	**42**	2.8	**58**
1.008	**1**	1.177	**22**	1.35	**43**	2.9	**58**
1.017	**2**	1.185	**23**	1.358	**44**	3	**58**
1.025	**3**	1.192	**24**	1.367	**45**	3.1	**58**
1.033	**4**	1.2	**25**	1.375	**46**	3.2	**58**
1.042	**5**	1.208	**26**	1.383	**47**	3.3	**59**
1.05	**6**	1.217	**27**	1.392	**48**	3.4	**59**
1.058	**7**	1.225	**28**	1.4	**49**	3.5	**59**
1.067	**8**	1.233	**29**	1.5	**50**	3.6	**59**

1.075	**9**	1.242	**30**	1.6	**51**	3.7	**60**
1.083	**10**	1.25	**31**	1.7	**51**	3.8	**60**
1.092	**11**	1.258	**32**	1.8	**52**	3.9-4.0	**60**
1.1	**12**	1.267	**33**	1.9	**53**		
1.108	**13**	1.275	**34**	2	**54**		
1.115	**14**	1.283	**35**	2.1	**54**		
1.123	**15**	1.292	**36**	2.2	**55**		
1.131	**16**	1.3	**37**	2.3	**56**		
1.138	**17**	1.308	**38**	2.4	**56**		
1.146	**18**	1.317	**39**	2.5	**57**		
1.154	**19**	1.325	**40**	2.6	**57**		
1.162	**20**	1.333	**41**	2.7	**57**		

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model).

All teachers/principals in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation.
The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness.

The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher.

The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

Assessments:
Regents: English, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Global History, U.S. History, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, ELA 3-8, Math 3-8, Science 4, Science 8

Weighted average: Weighted Average = $\frac{\text{Total number of students at proficiency or mastery}}{\text{Total number of students taking all assessments}}$

Measurement: Growth = (Current year weighted average) – (Prior year's weighted average)

Band	**Growth in Proficiency* or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	1.0 plus	20
Highly Effective	.951 to .999	19
Highly Effective	.851 to .950	18
Effective	.751 to .850	17
Effective	.651 to .750	16
Effective	.551 to .650	15
Effective	.451 to .550	14
Effective	.351 to .450	13
Effective	.251 to .350	12
Effective	.151 to .250	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Developing	-.50 to less than 0	8

Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 20-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

Band	**Growth* in Proficiency or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	.951 to 1.0 plus	15
Highly Effective	.751 to .950	14
Effective	.551 to .750	13
Effective	.351 to .550	12
Effective	.151 to .350	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Effective	-.50 to less than zero	8
Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 or below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 15-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

See Next Page for Material Change

Local 20 Material Change (For Teacher and Principal)

The Whitney Point Central School District will make the following adjustment to the Local Measure.

New: Example Below

- **Step 1:** Determine the difference in percentage points of the State Average for current (2012-2013) tests and the State Average for previous year's (2011-2012) tests (for proficiency and mastery rates).
- **Step 2:** Apply the percentage point difference to the current Whitney Point (2012-2013) tests proficiency and mastery rates resulting in an adjusted percentage rate.
- **Step 3:** Use the adjusted percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery compared to the previous year's percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery.
- **Step 4:** Calculate the percentage rate for the 2012-2013 school year and apply it to the chart.

Example for Steps 1 and 2:

State Average Test A 2011-2012:	55%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 1**
State Average Test A 2012-2013:	- 40%	proficiency or mastery	
Difference	15	percentage points	
Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:	30%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 2**
Percentage Point Adjustment	+15	percentage points	
Adjusted Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:		45%	

Adjusted percentage: 45% **Step 3**

Last year's percentage 44.5%

Difference + .5 percent = 14 HEDI points. **Step 4**

Note: This material change adjustment is only for the 2012-2013 school year. If a successor APPR plan is not renegotiated for the 2013-2014 school year, the previously approved measure without the adjustments noted in material change will be used for 2013-2014.

In addition, the adjustments noted in this material change will only apply to calculations related to the 2012-13 3-8 ELA and Math State Assessments.

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model).

All teachers/principals in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation.
The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness.

The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher.

The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

Assessments:
Regents: English, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Global History, U.S. History, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, ELA 3-8, Math 3-8, Science 4, Science 8

Weighted average: Weighted Average = $\frac{\text{Total number of students at proficiency or mastery}}{\text{Total number of students taking all assessments}}$

Measurement: Growth = (Current year weighted average) – (Prior year's weighted average)

Band	**Growth in Proficiency* or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	1.0 plus	20
Highly Effective	.951 to .999	19
Highly Effective	.851 to .950	18
Effective	.751 to .850	17
Effective	.651 to .750	16
Effective	.551 to .650	15
Effective	.451 to .550	14
Effective	.351 to .450	13
Effective	.251 to .350	12
Effective	.151 to .250	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Developing	-.50 to less than 0	8

Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 20-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

Band	**Growth* in Proficiency or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	.951 to 1.0 plus	15
Highly Effective	.751 to .950	14
Effective	.551 to .750	13
Effective	.351 to .550	12
Effective	.151 to .350	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Effective	-.50 to less than zero	8
Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 or below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 15-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

See Next Page for Material Change

Local 20 Material Change (For Teacher and Principal)

The Whitney Point Central School District will make the following adjustment to the Local Measure.

New: Example Below

- **Step 1:** Determine the difference in percentage points of the State Average for current (2012-2013) tests and the State Average for previous year's (2011-2012) tests (for proficiency and mastery rates).
- **Step 2:** Apply the percentage point difference to the current Whitney Point (2012-2013) tests proficiency and mastery rates resulting in an adjusted percentage rate.
- **Step 3:** Use the adjusted percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery compared to the previous year's percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery.
- **Step 4:** Calculate the percentage rate for the 2012-2013 school year and apply it to the chart.

Example for Steps 1 and 2:

State Average Test A 2011-2012:	55%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 1**
State Average Test A 2012-2013:	- 40%	proficiency or mastery	
Difference	15	percentage points	
Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:	30%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 2**
Percentage Point Adjustment	+15	percentage points	
Adjusted Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:		45%	

Adjusted percentage: 45% **Step 3**

Last year's percentage 44.5%

Difference + .5 percent = 14 HEDI points. **Step 4**

Note: This material change adjustment is only for the 2012-2013 school year. If a successor APPR plan is not renegotiated for the 2013-2014 school year, the previously approved measure without the adjustments noted in material change will be used for 2013-2014.

In addition, the adjustments noted in this material change will only apply to calculations related to the 2012-13 3-8 ELA and Math State Assessments.

Multiple Measures of Effectiveness

The remaining 60% (or 60 out of the total 100 point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score shall be based on teacher observations and the summative meeting. As part of the observation process, teachers are encouraged to submit evidence pertaining to any element of the rubric for consideration by an evaluator during pre- and post- observation conferences and summative meeting. For any documentation provided, the teacher should specifically indicate which of the four domains and their components are being addressed.

E. Rubric

Based on its inclusion of the SED-approved list of rubrics, the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised) rubric will be used to evaluate classroom teachers. Teachers shall be evaluated annually on the four rubric domains:

1. Planning and Preparation
2. Classroom Environment
3. Instruction
4. Professional Responsibilities

F. Professional Development

Professional development for teachers will be based on the evaluation, in addition to school and/or district priorities.

G. Timely Provision of Feedback

Observations:

<u>Tenured Teachers</u>
Each tenured teacher shall have at least one (1) announced observation with a pre- and post- conference and at least one (1) unannounced observation. Duration of announced observations will generally be a class period but will be mutually agreed upon during the pre-conference and will be a minimum of 25 minutes. Unannounced observation(s) will be a minimum of 10 minutes. There will be no required pre or post observation conferences for unannounced observations but a post conference may be requested by the educator or evaluator. For unannounced observations, an *Unannounced Observation Form* developed by the District and Teacher's Association will be used.

<u>Probationary Teachers</u>
Each probationary teacher shall have a minimum of two (2) announced observations with a pre- and post-conference and at least two (2) unannounced observations. Duration of announced observations will generally be a class period but will be mutually agreed upon during the pre-conference and will be a minimum of 25 minutes. Unannounced observation(s) will be a minimum of 10 minutes. There will be no required pre or post observation conferences for unannounced observations but a post conference may be requested by the educator or evaluator. For unannounced observations, an *Unannounced Observation Form* developed by the District and Teacher's Association will be used.

Pre- and Post-Conferences:

For all announced observations, a pre-observation conference will occur no earlier than one (1) week before the scheduled observation, except for special circumstances or as agreed upon by the educator and the evaluator. In advance of the pre-conference, or as arranged with the evaluator, teachers shall provide a copy of the completed *Pre-Observation (Planning) Form*, *Lesson Plan Form,* and other evidence related to the relevant rubric elements. Pre-observation conferences will focus on the elements of Rubric Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation) and Domain 2 (The Classroom Environment).

Post-observations conferences should be completed within two (2) weeks of the observation, except for special circumstances or as agreed upon by the educator and the evaluator. Prior to the post-conference, evidence of the lesson observed will be made available to the teacher in a written or digital format. For the post-conference, teachers should complete a *Post-Observation (Reflection) Form* and bring evidence of student work and other evidence related to the relevant rubric elements. Post-observation conferences for announced or unannounced observations will focus on the elements of Rubric Domain 2 (The Classroom Environment) and Domain 3 (Instruction).

The evaluator shall provide the teacher with a copy of the completed *Announced Post-Observation Evaluation Form* within two (2) weeks of the post-conference except for special circumstances or as agreed upon by the educator and the evaluator. Teachers shall sign/accept the document and return it/respond with comments/reflections within five (5) days, except for special circumstances or as agreed upon by the educator and the evaluator.

Annual Summative Evaluation:

An annual summative evaluation meeting will occur after April 1 of each year. At the summative evaluation meeting, the teacher and the evaluator will discuss all rubric domains and observations but the focus will be on Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities). The teacher will present evidence for the elements of Domain 4 and may also submit specific evidence for indicators of the rubric that may not have been previously evaluated by an evaluator. The teacher and evaluator will discuss ratings for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent (60 points) of the composite effectiveness score and next steps for professional growth.

Final Composite Scores:

Annual professional performance reviews for each educator must be completed and results provided to the educator by **September 1** of the school year following the evaluation year. The rating on the "other measures" subcomponent and any of the other two subcomponents for which the evaluation rating is available shall be computed and provided to the educator before the end of the school year for which the performance is being measured.

H. Scoring of Observations

Evaluators conducting observations will evaluate and score teachers in a holistic manner using jointly developed forms based on the four domains of the rubric.

1. **Relative Value of Each Domain will be equal**
   a. Planning and Preparation 25%
   b. Classroom Environment 25%
   c. Instruction 25%
   d. Professional Responsibilities 25%

   Observation = 45 Points

   Structured Review = 15 Points

2. **Relative Value of Each Component**

   a. Planning and Preparation
      - Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy 17%
      - Knowledge of Students 17%
      - Setting Instructional Outcomes 17%
      - Knowledge of Resources 15%
      - Designing Coherent Instruction 17%
      - Designing Student Assessments 17%

      25%
      15 Points Observation

   b. Classroom Environment
      - Respect and Rapport 20%
      - Culture for Learning 20%
      - Managing Classroom Procedures 20%
      - Managing Student Behavior 20%
      - Organizing Physical Spaces 20%

      25%
      15 Points Observation

   c. Instruction
      - Communicating with Students 20%
      - Questioning/Prompts and Discussion 20%
      - Engaging Students in Learning 20%
      - Using Assessment and Instruction 20%
      - Using Flexibility and Responsiveness 20%

      25%
      15 Points Observation

   d. Professional Responsibilities
      - Reflecting on Teaching 17%
      - Maintaining Accurate Records 17%
      - Communicating with Families 15%
      - Participating in a Professional Community 17%
      - Growing and Developing Professionally 17%
      - Showing Professionalism 17%

      25%
      15 Points
      Structured Review

3. **Each Component is Rated from 1 to 4**
   (4= HE, 3= E, 2= D, 1=I)

4. **Determine Weighted Component Scores**
   (Rating X Relative Value = Weighted Component Score)

5. **For Each Domain, Determine the Total Domain Score**
   (Sum of Each Weighted Component Score)

6. **Determine Weighted Total Of Each Domain**
   (Sum of the Weighted Component Score X Relative Value of the Domain)

7. **Total Weighted Domain Scores = Evaluation Score**
   (Sum of the Weighted Domain Scores)

8. **Use the Evaluation Score to Determine the Measure of Effectiveness Score Using the Negotiated Scale (see chart below)**

9. **Determine HEDI Score from the Measure of Effectiveness Score using the negotiated HEDI Bands:** H=59-60 E=57-58 D=50-56 I=0-49

Measure of Effectiveness Score	**Evaluation Score**	Measure of Effectiveness Score	Evaluation Score	Measure of Effectiveness Score	Evaluation Score	Measure of Effectiveness Score	Evaluation Score
1	**0**	1.169	**21**	1.342	**42**	2.8	**58**
1.008	**1**	1.177	**22**	1.35	**43**	2.9	**58**
1.017	**2**	1.185	**23**	1.358	**44**	3	**58**
1.025	**3**	1.192	**24**	1.367	**45**	3.1	**58**
1.033	**4**	1.2	**25**	1.375	**46**	3.2	**58**
1.042	**5**	1.208	**26**	1.383	**47**	3.3	**59**
1.05	**6**	1.217	**27**	1.392	**48**	3.4	**59**
1.058	**7**	1.225	**28**	1.4	**49**	3.5	**59**
1.067	**8**	1.233	**29**	1.5	**50**	3.6	**59**
1.075	**9**	1.242	**30**	1.6	**51**	3.7	**60**
1.083	**10**	1.25	**31**	1.7	**51**	3.8	**60**
1.092	**11**	1.258	**32**	1.8	**52**	3.9-4.0	**60**
1.1	**12**	1.267	**33**	1.9	**53**		
1.108	**13**	1.275	**34**	2	**54**		
1.115	**14**	1.283	**35**	2.1	**54**		
1.123	**15**	1.292	**36**	2.2	**55**		
1.131	**16**	1.3	**37**	2.3	**56**		
1.138	**17**	1.308	**38**	2.4	**56**		
1.146	**18**	1.317	**39**	2.5	**57**		
1.154	**19**	1.325	**40**	2.6	**57**		
1.162	**20**	1.333	**41**	2.7	**57**		

HEDI BANDS: H=59-60 E=57-58 D=50-56 I=0-49

WHITNEY POINT CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)

The District's **Annual Professional Performance Review process (APPR)** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the teaching-learning process. The majority of teachers (as defined in the WPTA contract) will be well served by the APPR process and will find it to be a valuable experience for professional growth. There may be a small number of individuals, however, who need additional support. That support will come through a mutually developed plan related to the Annual Professional Performance Review process.

The **Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the teaching-learning process. The TIP also is designed to help teachers address areas in need of improvement based on one or more of the seven New York Teaching Standards:

1. **Knowledge of Students and Student Learning**: Teachers acquire knowledge of each student, and demonstrate knowledge of student development and learning to promote achievement for all students;
2. **Knowledge of Content and Instructional Planning**: Teachers know the content they are responsible for teaching, and plan instruction that ensures growth and achievement for all students;
3. **Instructional Practice**: Teachers implement instruction that engages and challenges all students to meet or exceed the learning standards;
4. **Learning Environment**: Teachers work with all students to create a dynamic learning environment that supports achievement and growth;
5. **Assessment for Student Learning**: Teachers use multiple measures to assess and document student growth, evaluate instructional effectiveness, and modify instruction. This includes assessment techniques based on appropriate learning standards designed to measure students' progress in learning and that he or she successfully utilizes analysis of available student performance.
6. **Professional Responsibilities and Collaboration**: Teachers demonstrate professional responsibility and engage relevant stakeholders to maximize student growth, development, and learning. This includes the development of effective collaborative relationships with students, parents or caregivers, as needed, and appropriate support personnel to meet the learning needs of students; and
7. **Professional Growth**: Teachers set informed goals and strive for continuous professional growth.

THE TIP PROCEDURES

The TIP procedures are guidelines for the administrator and teacher involved in the TIP process. The teacher may choose to involve a selected representative such as a skillful teacher, mentor, or a WPTA representative.

THE TIP PROCESS

For teachers who receive a rating of "ineffective" or "developing" an improvement plan designed to improve identified deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) work days after the start of a school year. The teacher and the supervising administrator will develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the "ineffective" or "developing" evaluation.
2. Identified members of the support team.
3. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
4. Specific improvement action steps.
5. A reasonable timeline for achieving improvement.
6. Required resources to achieve the goals/outcomes.
7. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the improvement timeline and include teacher reflection and administrator feedback. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the TIP timeline.
8. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
9. A final summative assessment, delineating progress made with an opportunity for teacher comments.

Whitney Point CSD
TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Area(s) of Concern:

Support Team Members:

Goal/Outcome Statements:

Improvement Action Steps:

Timeline for Achieving Improvement:

Required Resources to Achieve Goals/Outcomes:

Formative Evaluation Process:

Meeting One: **Date:**

Teacher Reflection:

Administrative Feedback:
(Including commentary on teacher progress towards improvement goals)

Meeting Two: **Date:**

Teacher Reflection:

Administrative Feedback:
(Including commentary on teacher progress towards improvement goals)

Summative Assessment:

Teacher Comments:

_____

Teacher Signature Date

_____

Administrator Signature Date

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model).

All teachers/principals in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation.
The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness.

The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher.

The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

Assessments:
Regents: English, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Global History, U.S. History, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, ELA 3-8, Math 3-8, Science 4, Science 8

Weighted average: Weighted Average = $\frac{\text{Total number of students at proficiency or mastery}}{\text{Total number of students taking all assessments}}$

Measurement: Growth = (Current year weighted average) – (Prior year's weighted average)

Band	**Growth in Proficiency* or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	1.0 plus	20
Highly Effective	.951 to .999	19
Highly Effective	.851 to .950	18
Effective	.751 to .850	17
Effective	.651 to .750	16
Effective	.551 to .650	15
Effective	.451 to .550	14
Effective	.351 to .450	13
Effective	.251 to .350	12
Effective	.151 to .250	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Developing	-.50 to less than 0	8

Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 20-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

Band	**Growth* in Proficiency or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	.951 to 1.0 plus	15
Highly Effective	.751 to .950	14
Effective	.551 to .750	13
Effective	.351 to .550	12
Effective	.151 to .350	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Effective	-.50 to less than zero	8
Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 or below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 15-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

See Next Page for Material Change

Local 20 Material Change (For Teacher and Principal)

The Whitney Point Central School District will make the following adjustment to the Local Measure.

New: Example Below

- **Step 1:** Determine the difference in percentage points of the State Average for current (2012-2013) tests and the State Average for previous year's (2011-2012) tests (for proficiency and mastery rates).
- **Step 2:** Apply the percentage point difference to the current Whitney Point (2012-2013) tests proficiency and mastery rates resulting in an adjusted percentage rate.
- **Step 3:** Use the adjusted percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery compared to the previous year's percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery.
- **Step 4:** Calculate the percentage rate for the 2012-2013 school year and apply it to the chart.

Example for Steps 1 and 2:

State Average Test A 2011-2012:	55%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 1**
State Average Test A 2012-2013:	- 40%	proficiency or mastery	
Difference	15	percentage points	
Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:	30%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 2**
Percentage Point Adjustment	+15	percentage points	
Adjusted Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:		45%	

Adjusted percentage: 45% **Step 3**

Last year's percentage 44.5%

Difference + .5 percent = 14 HEDI points. **Step 4**

Note: This material change adjustment is only for the 2012-2013 school year. If a successor APPR plan is not renegotiated for the 2013-2014 school year, the previously approved measure without the adjustments noted in material change will be used for 2013-2014.

In addition, the adjustments noted in this material change will only apply to calculations related to the 2012-13 3-8 ELA and Math State Assessments.

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

Twenty percent (20%) of the composite effectiveness score is based on State assessments or other locally-selected measures of student achievement that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms as defined by the Commissioner (decreased to 15% upon implementation of value-added growth model).

All teachers/principals in the district will receive the same score for this component of the evaluation.
The intention of utilizing this metric is that together, all teachers and administrators can work to support student learning and to maximize the education for all children in the district. Our goal is to provide students with rich and rigorous opportunities across the curriculum that will support future college and career readiness.

The measure will be a comparison of student scores from the previous year and will be based upon a weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency for all state assessments OR a weighted average of percent of students meeting mastery for all state assessments, whichever is higher.

The baseline for the proficiency goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting proficiency on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this proficiency number by one (1) percentage point or more. Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

The baseline for the mastery goal will be the weighted average of the percent of students meeting mastery on all state assessments from the previous year. The goal will be to increase this mastery number by one (1) percentage point or more each year. Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments. All students on the roster will be expected to take the examination and all possible efforts should be made to achieve this.

Assessments:
Regents: English, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Global History, U.S. History, Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry, Physics, ELA 3-8, Math 3-8, Science 4, Science 8

Weighted average: Weighted Average = $\frac{\text{Total number of students at proficiency or mastery}}{\text{Total number of students taking all assessments}}$

Measurement: Growth = (Current year weighted average) – (Prior year's weighted average)

Band	**Growth in Proficiency* or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	1.0 plus	20
Highly Effective	.951 to .999	19
Highly Effective	.851 to .950	18
Effective	.751 to .850	17
Effective	.651 to .750	16
Effective	.551 to .650	15
Effective	.451 to .550	14
Effective	.351 to .450	13
Effective	.251 to .350	12
Effective	.151 to .250	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Developing	-.50 to less than 0	8

Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 20-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

Band	**Growth* in Proficiency or Mastery* (Percentage Point Increase /Decrease)**	**HEDI Points**
Highly Effective	.951 to 1.0 plus	15
Highly Effective	.751 to .950	14
Effective	.551 to .750	13
Effective	.351 to .550	12
Effective	.151 to .350	11
Effective	.051 to .150	10
Effective	0 to .050	9
Effective	-.50 to less than zero	8
Developing	-.501 to -1.00	7
Developing	-1.01 to -1.50	6
Developing	-1.51 to -2.00	5
Developing	-2.01 to -2.50	4
Developing	-2.51 to -3.00	3
Ineffective	-3.01 to -3.50	2
Ineffective	-3.51 to -3.99	1
Ineffective	-4.0 or below	0

*Proficiency is defined as students who attain 65 or better on Regents examinations and level 3 and 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.
*Mastery is defined as students who attain 85 or better on Regents examination and level 4 on 3-8 ELA, science and math assessments.

The 15-point scale will be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

See Next Page for Material Change

Local 20 Material Change (For Teacher and Principal)

The Whitney Point Central School District will make the following adjustment to the Local Measure.

New: Example Below

- **Step 1:** Determine the difference in percentage points of the State Average for current (2012-2013) tests and the State Average for previous year's (2011-2012) tests (for proficiency and mastery rates).
- **Step 2:** Apply the percentage point difference to the current Whitney Point (2012-2013) tests proficiency and mastery rates resulting in an adjusted percentage rate.
- **Step 3:** Use the adjusted percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery compared to the previous year's percentage of students meeting proficiency or mastery.
- **Step 4:** Calculate the percentage rate for the 2012-2013 school year and apply it to the chart.

Example for Steps 1 and 2:

State Average Test A 2011-2012:	55%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 1**
State Average Test A 2012-2013:	- 40%	proficiency or mastery	
Difference	15	percentage points	
Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:	30%	proficiency or mastery	**Step 2**
Percentage Point Adjustment	+15	percentage points	
Adjusted Grade Level Test A average 2012-2013:		45%	

Adjusted percentage: 45% **Step 3**

Last year's percentage 44.5%

Difference + .5 percent = 14 HEDI points. **Step 4**

Note: This material change adjustment is only for the 2012-2013 school year. If a successor APPR plan is not renegotiated for the 2013-2014 school year, the previously approved measure without the adjustments noted in material change will be used for 2013-2014.

In addition, the adjustments noted in this material change will only apply to calculations related to the 2012-13 3-8 ELA and Math State Assessments.

WHITNEY POINT CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW
PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

The District's **Annual Professional Performance Review process (APPR)** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the leadership process. All Principals will be well served by the APPR process and will find it to be a valuable experience for professional growth. There may be a small number of individuals, however, who need additional support. That support will come through a mutually developed plan related to the Annual Professional Performance Review process.

The **Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)** is designed to recognize, support, and improve the leadership process. The PIP also is designed to help Principals address areas in need of improvement based on one or more of the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards:

1. **Vision, Mission, and Goals**: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders;

2. **Teaching and Learning**: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;

3. **Managing Organizational Systems and Safety**: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;

4. **Collaborating with Families and Stakeholders**: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources;

5. **Ethics and Integrity**: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and

6. **The Education System**: An education leader ensures the success of all students by influencing interrelated systems of political, economic, legal and cultural contexts affecting education to advocate for their teachers' and students' needs.

THE PIP PROCEDURES

The PIP procedures are guidelines for the Superintendent and Principal involved in the PIP process. The Superintendent may choose to involve a selected representative such as a skillful mentor.

THE PIP PROCESS

For Principals who receive a rating of "ineffective" or "developing" an improvement plan designed to improve identified deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) work days after the start of a school year. The Principal and the supervising administrator will develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the "ineffective" or "developing" evaluation.
2. Identified members of the support team.
3. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
4. Specific improvement action steps.
5. A reasonable timeline for achieving improvement.
6. Required resources to achieve the goals/outcomes.

7. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the improvement timeline and include Principal reflection and Superintendent feedback. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the PIP timeline.
8. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
9. A final summative assessment, delineating progress made with an opportunity for Principal comments.

Whitney Point CSD
PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Area(s) of Concern:

Support Team Members:

Goal/Outcome Statements:

Improvement Action Steps:

Timeline for Achieving Improvement:

Required Resources to Achieve Goals/Outcomes:

Formative Evaluation Process:

Meeting One: **Date:**

Principal Reflection:

Superintendent Feedback:
(Including commentary on progress towards improvement goals)

Meeting Two: **Date:**

Principal Reflection:

Superintendent Feedback:
(Including commentary on progress towards improvement goals)

Summative Assessment:

Superintendent Comments:

_____

Principal Signature Date

_____

Superintendent 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 make the following specific certifications with respect to their APPR Plan:

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Patricia A Tallette 8/27/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Lindsay M Bh 8-27-13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Bruce Tyte 8-27-13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Sam y Ra 8/27/13