



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

December 3, 2012

Dr. Paul Casciano, Superintendent
William Floyd Union Free School District
240 Mastic Beach Road
Mastic Beach, NY 11951

Dear Superintendent Casciano:

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: Dean Lucera

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 Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 14, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 580232030000

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

580232030000

1.2) School District Name: WILLIAM FLOYD UFSD

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

WILLIAM FLOYD UFSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

-
- Strengthening Teacher and Leader Effectiveness RFP (NYSED)
-

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	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	To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will utilize State approved 3rd party assessments - Measures of
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.

Academic Progress for ELA. 3rd grade will use Measures of Academic Progress ELA as a pre-test and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the 3rd grade ELA State Assessment (see 2.11 HEDI Tables). Grade K-2 HEDI scales will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
 Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
 Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average
 Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average.

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

A teacher will be rated Highly Effective if results are greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13). See 2.11 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Effective if results are Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. See 2.11 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Developing if results are less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. See 2.11 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Ineffective if results are less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. See 2.11 Tables

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will utilize State approved 3rd party assessments - Measures of Academic Progress for Math. 3rd grade will use Measures of Academic Progress Math as a pre-test and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the 3rd grade Math State Assessment (see 2.11 HEDI Tables). Grade K-2 HEDI scales will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:

Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13)
 Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average
 Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average
 Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average

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

A teacher will be rated Highly Effective if results are greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13). See 2.11 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Effective if results are Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. See 2.11 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Developing if results are less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. See 2.11 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Ineffective if results are less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. See 2.11 Tables

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	William Floyd Developed Grade 6 Science Assessment aligned with core curriculum
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	William Floyd Developed Grade 7 Science Assessment aligned with core curriculum
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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>For 6th grade Science, 5th grade NYS ELA and Math Assessment data will be utilized as a baseline to determine targets. For 7th grade Science, 6th grade Science final results will be utilized as a baseline to determine targets. For 8th grade Science, 7th grade Science final results will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the 8th grade Science State Assessment. William Floyd Developed assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to both pre- and post-assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories. See 2.11 tables</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>A teacher will be rated Effective if 62-89% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>A teacher will be rated Developing if 45-61% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>A teacher will be rated Ineffective if <30-44% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables</p>

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	William Floyd Developed Grade 6 social studies Assessment aligned with core curriculum
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	William Floyd Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment aligned with core curriculum
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	William Floyd Developed Grade 8 Social Studies Assessment aligned with core curriculum

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>For 6th grade Social Studies, 5th grade NYS ELA Assessment data will be utilized as a baseline to determine targets. For 7th grade Social Studies, 6th grade Social Studies final results will be utilized as a baseline to determine targets. For 8th grade Social Studies, 7th grade Social Studies final results will be utilized as a baseline to</p>
--	--

determine targets. William Floyd Developed assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to both pre- and post-assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI Categories. See 2.11 tables

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Effective if 62-89% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Developing if 45-61% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective if <30-44% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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	William Floyd Developed Global 1 Assessment aligned with core curriculum

	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.	For Global 1, 8th grade NYS ELA Assessment data will be utilized as a baseline to determine targets. For Global 2, the Global 1 final results will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Global 2 Regents Assessment. For American History, the Global 2 Regents will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the American History Regents Assessment. William Floyd Developed assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to
---	--

District created assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Students' prior performance on district assessments and/or prior Regents will be compared to the final Regents Assessment score where applicable. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI Categories. See 2.11 Table

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Effective if 62-89% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Developing if 45-61% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective if <30-44% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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.

For Living Environment, 8th grade NYS Science Assessment data will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Living Environment Regents. For Earth Science, the Living Environment Regents results will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Earth Science Regents. For Chemistry, the Earth Science Regents will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Chemistry Regents, and for Physics, the Chemistry Regents will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Physics Regents. Students' prior State Assessment and/or Regents scores will be compared to the final Regents score where applicable. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to

	determine targets for all HEDI Categories. See 2.11 Table
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Effective if 62-89% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Developing if 45-61% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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.	For Algebra 1, 8th grade Math State Assessment data will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Algebra 1 Regents Assessment. For Geometry, the Integrated Algebra Regents results will be utilized as a baseline baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Geometry Regents. For Algebra 2, the Geometry Regents will be utilized as a baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Algebra 1 Regents Assessment. Students' prior Regents scores will be compared to the final Regents Assessment score where applicable. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI Categories. See 2.11 Table
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Effective if 62-89% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Developing if 45-61% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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	William Floyd Developed Grade 9 ELA Assessment aligned with core curriculum
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	William Floyd Developed Grade 10 ELA Assessment aligned with core curriculum
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	English Regents

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	For Grade 9 ELA, 8th grade NYS ELA Assessment data will be utilized as a baseline to determine targets. For Grade 10 ELA, 8th grade NYS ELA Assessment data will be utilized as a baseline to determine targets. For Grade 11 ELA, 8th grade NYS ELA assessment data will be utilized as a baseline baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the 11th Grade English Regents Assessment. William Floyd Developed assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Students' baseline scores will be compared to the final assessment score. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI Categories. See 2.11 tables
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Effective if 62-89% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Developing if 45-61% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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
K-5 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Art Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)
6-8 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed 6, 7, 8 Art Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)
PE K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed PE K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 Fitness Assessment
K-5 Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Music Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)
1-3 Reading	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades 1-2) ELA (Grade 3)
4-5 Reading	State Assessment	NYS Grade 4 and 5 ELA Assessment (
Leveled Literacy Instruction	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
K-2 Resource	State-approved 3rd party assessment	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary Grades) ELA
3-5 Resource	State Assessment	NYS Grades 3, 4, 5 ELA Assessment
3-5 Life Skills	State Assessment	NYSAA
K-2 Life Skills	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed K, 1, 2 Life Skills NYSAA Replication Task
1-5 developmental	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSweb
K-2 ESL	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed Grade K, 1, 2 NYSESLAT
3-12 Non State Tested	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed Grade 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 NYSESLAT
3-8 ESL State Tested	State Assessment	NYS Grade 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 ELA Assessment
9, 10, 12, ESL	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed Grade 9, 10, 12 NYSESLAT
11 ESL	State Assessment	English Regents
6-8 Resource	State Assessment	NYS Grade 6, 7, 8 ELA Assessment

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

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

For all other courses, baseline assessments will be utilized to determine targets and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the State Assessment. William Floyd Developed assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Students' baseline scores will be compared to the

final assessment score. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to utilize baseline data and determine targets for all HEDI Categories. See 2.11 tables

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

A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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

A teacher will be rated Effective if 62-89% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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

A teacher will be rated Developing if 45-61% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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

A teacher will be rated Highly effective if 90-100% of verified students meet their target. See 2.11 tables

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)

[assets/survey-uploads/5364/128654-avH4IQNZMh/State and local 20% chart 9-24-12.xlsx](#)

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/5364/128654-TXEttx9bQW/2461025-WFSDHEDISate2.11_11.16.12.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 Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 21, 2012

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress ELA

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.	To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will utilize State approved 3rd party assessments - Measures of Academic Progress for ELA. HEDI scales will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 10.5 from this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories: Highly Effective - Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (10.5; Effective - Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average; Developing - Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or Less than or equal to- 2.4 standard deviations below average; Ineffective - Less than 2.4 standard deviations below average.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective if results are greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13). See 3.3 Tables
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective if results are less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. See 3.3 Tables
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing if results are less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or Less than or equal to- 2.4 standard deviations below average. See 3.3Tables
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective if results are less than 2.4 standard deviations below average. See 3.3 Tables

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress Math
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress Math
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress Math
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress Math
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress Math

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

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>To assign teachers to HEDI categories, we will utilize State approved 3rd party assessments - Measures of Academic Progress for Math. HEDI scales will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. From this point, we will use the following cut points to assign teachers to categories:</p> <p>Highly Effective: Greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13) Effective: Less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average Developing: Less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average Ineffective: Less than -2.1 standard deviations below average.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>A teacher will be rated Highly Effective if results are greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average (13). See 3.3 Tables</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>A teacher will be rated Effective if results are less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average. See 3.3 Tables</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>a teacher will be rated Developing if results are less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average. See 3.3 Tables</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>A teacher will be rated Ineffective if results are less than -2.1 standard deviations below average. See 3.3 Tables</p>

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/5139/128655-rhJdBgDruP/WFSD3.3HEDITable_3.docx

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

- 1) The change in percentage of a teacher's students who achieve a specific level of performance as determined locally, on such assessments/examinations compared to those students' level of performance on such assessments/examinations in the previous school year (e.g., a three percentage point increase in students earning the proficient level (three) or better performance level on the 7th grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6th grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4th grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3rd grade ELA or math State assessments)
- 2) Teacher specific growth score computed by the Department based on the percent of the teacher's students earning a State determined level of growth. The methodology to translate such growth into the State-established sub-component scoring ranges shall be determined locally
- 3) Teacher specific achievement or growth score computed in a manner determined locally based on a measure of student performance on the State assessments, Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations other than the measure described in 1) or 2), above
- 4) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State-approved 3rd party assessment
- 5) Student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
- 6) A school-wide measure of either student growth or achievement based on either:
 - (i) A State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in ELA or Math in Grades 4-8; or
 - (ii) A school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on a State, State-approved 3rd party, or district, regional or BOCES developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms
- 7) Student Learning Objectives (only allowable for teachers in grades/subjects without a Value-Added measure for the State Growth subcomponent). Used with one of the following assessments: State, State-approved 3rd party, or a district, regional or BOCES-developed assessment that is rigorous and comparable across classrooms

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the 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(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
1	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
2	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
3	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5

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.	To assign grade K-3 teachers to HEDI categories, each school's 5th grade ELA assessment Mean Growth Score results will be utilized. Results will be based on the negotiated scale shown in 3.13. HEDI categories will be based on the average of 5th grade teachers' MGP. Teachers can earn all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

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(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS Math Assessment Grade 5
1	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS Math Assessment Grade 5
2	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS Math Assessment Grade 5
3	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS Math Assessment Grade 5

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.	To assign grade K-3 teachers to HEDI categories, each school's 5th grade Math assessment Mean Growth Score results will be utilized. Results will be based on the negotiated scale shown in 3.13. HEDI categories will be based on the average of 5th grade teachers' MGP. Teachers can earn all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

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(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 8
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 8
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 8

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.	To assign grade 6-8 Science teachers to HEDI categories, each school's 8th grade ELA assessment Mean Growth Score results will be utilized. Results will be based on the negotiated scale shown in 3.13. HEDI categories will be based on the average of 8th grade teachers' MGP. Teachers can earn all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

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(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 8
7	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 8
8	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 8

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.	To assign grade 6-8 Social Studies teachers to HEDI categories, each school's 8th grade ELA assessment Mean Growth Score results will be utilized. Results will be based on the negotiated scale shown in 3.13. HEDI categories will be based on the average of 8th grade teachers' MGP. Teachers can earn all scale points from 0 to 20.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

3.8) High School Social Studies

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For High School teachers, HEDI categories will be assigned based on a composite measure of the increase in the percentage of required Regents' exams passed by all students in the 4 high school grades (9-12). Student progress will be tracked by the number of students meeting the benchmark at the end of the year for their grade level: Freshman year - 2 required Regents exams; Sophomore year - 3 required Regents exams; Junior year - 4 required Regents exams; and Senior year - 5 required Regents exams. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20. Highly Effective 18-20 = 74.3% - 74.5% or more Effective 9-17 = 70.2% - 74.2% Developing 3-8 = 67.2% - 70.1% Ineffective 0-2 = 0% - 67.1%
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

3.9) High School Science

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For High School teachers, HEDI categories will be assigned based on a composite measure of the increase in the percentage of required Regents' exams passed by all students in the 4 high school grades (9-12). Student progress will be tracked by the number of students meeting the benchmark at the end of the year for their grade level: Freshman year - 2 required Regents exams; Sophomore year - 3 required Regents exams; Junior year - 4 required Regents exams; and Senior year - 5 required Regents exams. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20. Highly Effective 18-20 = 74.3% - 74.5% or more Effective 9-17 = 70.2% - 74.2% Developing 3-8 = 67.2% - 70.1% Ineffective 0-2 = 0% - 67.1%
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

3.10) High School Math

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For High School teachers, HEDI categories will be assigned based on a composite measure of the increase in the percentage of required Regents' exams passed by all students in the 4 high school grades (9-12). Student progress will be tracked by the number of students meeting the benchmark at the end of the year for their grade level: Freshman year - 2 required Regents exams; Sophomore year - 3 required Regents exams; Junior year - 4 required Regents exams; and Senior year - 5 required Regents exams. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20. Highly Effective 18-20 = 74.3% - 74.5% or more Effective 9-17 = 70.2% - 74.2% Developing 3-8 = 67.2% - 70.1% Ineffective 0-2 = 0% - 67.1%
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

3.11) High School English Language Arts

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

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For High School teachers, HEDI categories will be assigned based on a composite measure of the increase in the percentage of required Regents' exams passed by all students in the 4 high school grades (9-12). Student progress will be tracked by the number of students meeting the benchmark at the end of the year for their grade level: Freshman year - 2 required Regents exams; Sophomore year - 3 required Regents exams; Junior year - 4 required Regents exams; and Senior year - 5 required Regents exams. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20. Highly Effective 18-20 = 74.3% - 74.5% or more Effective 9-17 = 70.2% - 74.2% Developing 3-8 = 67.2% - 70.1% Ineffective 0-2 = 0% - 67.1%
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Table
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Table
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Table
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Table

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 6-8 courses not listed above	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 8
All other HS courses not listed above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	NYS 5 Required Regents
6-8 Resource Room	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA and Math
6-12 Developmental/Life Skills	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	William Floyd Developed 6-12 Developmental/Life Skills Assessment based on IEP goals
K-5 Art	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
K-5 PE	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
K-5 Music	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
1-3 Reading	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
4-5 Reading	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
Leveled Literacy Instruction	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
K-2 Resource	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
3-5 Resource	4) State-approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
1-5 Developmental	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
K-5 Life Skills	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5
K-5 ESL	6(i) School-wide measure based on State-provided measure	NYS ELA Assessment Grade 5

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or	For High School teachers, HEDI categories will be assigned based on a composite measure of the increase in the percentage of required Regents' exams passed by
---	--

graphic at 3.13, below.

all students in the 4 high school grades (9-12). Student progress will be tracked by the number of students meeting the benchmark at the end of the year for their grade level: Freshman year - 2 required Regents exams; Sophomore year - 3 required Regents exams; Junior year - 4 required Regents exams; and Senior year - 5 required Regents exams.

Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20.

Highly Effective 18-20 = 74.3% - 74.5% or more
Effective 9-17 = 70.2% - 74.2%
Developing 3-8 = 67.2% - 70.1%
Ineffective 0-2 = 0% - 67.1%

To assign grade 6-8 teachers to HEDI categories, each school's 8th grade ELA assessment Mean Growth Score results will be utilized to assign teachers to categories. Results will be based on the negotiated scales shown in 3.13. HEDI scales will be based on total Mean growth Scores of 8th grade teachers divided by the number of teachers resulting in points. Points will then determine which rating a teacher will receive. Teachers can earn all scale points from 0 to 20.

To assign 6-8 Resource Room, 4-5 Reading, and 3-5 Resource teachers to HEDI categories, we will utilize State approved 3rd party assessments - Measures of Academic Progress for ELA. HEDI scales will assume a normal distribution of teacher effects centered on 13. Teachers can earn all scale points from 0 to 20.

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

A teacher will be rated Highly Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 18-20 points. See 3.13 Tables

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

12A teacher will be rated Effective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 9-17 points. See 3.13 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Developing using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 3-8 points. See 3.13 Tables

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

A teacher will be rated Ineffective using a School Wide measure based on a negotiated formula for 0-2 points. See 3.13 Tables

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)

[assets/survey-uploads/5139/128655-Rp00l6pk1T/State and local 20% chart 9-24-12.xlsx](#)

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.

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.

Teachers with more than one locally selected measure will have their point totals weighted proportionately.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 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.)

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

3. Summary of OTHER 60 points- Multiple Measures

Observations: The District will be using the NYSUT rubric, which will be used to assess teacher performance based on the NYS teaching standards. Videotaping of observations will not be used as a method to collect evidence. Evidence will be collected through multiple classroom observations as follows:

1) *Observation forms- The observation forms currently in the collective bargaining agreement will be utilized, except the check boxes on the form for non-tenured teachers will be removed.*

2) *Focus of the observation: The observer will focus on the seven (7) teaching standards and the rubric when writing about the*

strengths or growth areas of the lesson.

3) Timing of observations:

- a) A building administrator will meet with each teacher in the fall for an evaluation/self-reflection meeting, this meeting must precede the 1st observation*
- b) Observations will not occur before/after a holiday/break, unless the teacher agrees to have them at this time.*
- c) All observations will conclude by June 1st, unless there are extraordinary circumstances preventing them from occurring e.g. teacher on a leave).*

4) Pre-Conference Meeting/communication:

- a) Optional pre-conference communication- for scheduled observations all teachers will have the option of emailing the administrator, in advance of the observation, a summary of relevant class information, (ex: nature of the class, range of student abilities, strategies to differentiate instruction, plan for activities/changing activities based on student needs) or a modified page 8 from TED document.,*
- b) Required pre-conference meeting- Administrators will determine if a preconference meeting is necessary, for teachers on TIPs (Teacher Improvement Plan) and 1st year teachers. However, any teacher on an Appendix J will be required to attend one pre-conference meeting before their first formal observation.*

5) Formal Observations

a) Tenured Teachers

- i) Each teacher will have two (2) formal observations completed each year and committed to writing and placed in the official personnel file.*
- ii) One (1) observation will be scheduled and one (1) unscheduled. The first observation will be scheduled, unless the teacher requests it to be unscheduled.*
- iii) The TED documents will be used as a guide.*
- iv) Each observation will last one (1) class period, a minimum of 30 minutes -maximum of 45 minutes.*
- v) Report of observation- is due within 4 days (same as in current collective bargaining agreement).*
- vi) Teachers have the right to prepare a rebuttal to the observation. The rebuttal must be submitted to the administrator no later than 30 days from receiving the written observation.*
- vii) When there is more than one teacher in a classroom (i.e. co teaching model), the administrator will announce who they are there to observe.*

b) Non- Tenured

- i) A Total of 3- 5 formal observations, as per the current collective bargaining agreement will be conducted and committed to writing and placed in the official personnel file.*
- ii) At least one (1) observation will be scheduled and one (1) unscheduled. The first observation will be scheduled, unless the teacher requests it to be unscheduled.*
- iii) The TED documents will be used as a guide (pages 6-20).*
- iv) Each observation will last one (1) class period, a minimum of 30 minutes -maximum of 45 minutes.*
- v) Report of observation- is due within 4 days (same as in current collective bargaining agreement).*
- vi) Teachers have the right to prepare a rebuttal to the observation. The rebuttal must be submitted to the administrator no later than 30 days from receiving the written observation.*
- vii) When there is more than one teacher in a classroom (i.e. co teaching model), the administrator will announce who they are there to observe.*

6) Informal Observations- Informal observations will be conducted in accordance with the existing contract language. However, there is an addition that an Administrator can take notes and address, in writing, when they observe a concerning behavior or observe something positive. These written summaries will not be placed in the personnel file, but will be given to the teacher.

7) Post Observation Conference- a post conference meeting will occur no longer than 3 working days after the observation.

8) The district will develop a process to ensure observations are appropriately spaced out. All other terms and conditions in the current collective bargaining agreement pertaining to observations will apply, unless modified above.

Evaluation Process

1) Spring- Summative Evaluation Conferences: During the month of June all teachers will have a summative evaluation conference with a building administrator. The focus of the meeting will be a discussion of the results for the local 20 points (if available) and 60 points from the rubric results.

2) Summer - Rankings will be sent to teachers as per NYS regulation, grades 4-8.

- 3) Fall - Evaluation/self-reflection Meeting: Beginning in September all teachers will have an evaluation meeting with a building administrator. Discussions will focus on:
- a) Self- Reflection (TED form page 5) and their overall composite score 100 points (state student achievement measure 20 points, local student achievement measure 20 points and other multiple measures 60 points);
 - b) Conversation regarding what forms will be used during observations (Standard 2,3,4,5 of the rubric and TED pages 6-20);
 - c) For teachers required to complete SLO's there will be a conversation regarding student targets.
 - d) Evaluation forms will include: End of Year cover sheet only from the existing contract and TED checklist 30, 31, 32,
 - e) For Social Workers, Guidance Counselors, Psychologists, Librarians and Speech Teachers the existing evaluation forms will be used.
- 4). The 60 points will be obtained through a combination of observations and other sources of evidence as identified in the NYSUT Rubric. The 60 points will be assigned based on a conversion chart. All Rounding Rules will apply.

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/5091/128657-eka9yMJ855/2538210- Conversion Chart for Teacher APPR11.16.12_1.xlsx](#)

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.	Based on the NYSUT rubric teachers will be observed formally and informally to gather evidence to support the rating of highly effective. Observations and evidence will be aligned to the NYS teaching standards and earn an overall score of 59-60 points. All Rounding Rules will Apply.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Based on the NYSUT rubric teachers will be observed formally and informally to gather evidence to support the rating of effective. Observations and evidence will be aligned to the NYS teaching standards and earn an overall score of 57-58 points.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Based on the NYSUT rubric teachers will be observed formally and informally to gather evidence to support the rating of developing. Observations and evidence will be aligned to the NYS teaching standards and earn an overall score of 50-56 points.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Based on the NYSUT rubric teachers will be observed formally and informally to gather evidence to support the rating of ineffective. Observations and evidence will be aligned to the NYS teaching standards and earn an overall score of 0-49 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	5
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	5
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	10

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers 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 tenured teachers be done in person, by video, or both?

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Monday, September 24, 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 Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 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/5265/128659-Df0w3Xx5v6/WFSD Teacher Improvement Plan.docx

6.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

D. Teacher Appeal Procedure

William Floyd School District Teacher Appeals Process

This Agreement is made by and between the William Floyd School District ("District") and the William Floyd United Teachers' Association ("Association"), collectively referred to herein as the "Parties".

*In order to implement the requirements of N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c, the District and the Association hereby agree as follows:
Right to Appeal*

A teacher may appeal his or her Annual Professional Performance Review and the issuance and/or implementation of a legally required improvement plan (TIP) in accordance with the procedures and conditions set forth in this Agreement. Such procedures and conditions constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a teacher's performance review and/or TIP.

Scope Performance Review Appeals

- (1) Only a teacher who receives a rating of "developing" or "ineffective" on the composite score may appeal his or her performance review. Ratings of "highly effective" or "effective" cannot be appealed.*
- (2) A teacher may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review, the District's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, compliance with procedures applicable to the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the District's annual professional performance review plan, the issuance of a TIP and/or the implementation of the terms of a TIP.*
- (3) Appeals related to the issuance of a TIP shall be limited to issues regarding compliance with the requirements prescribed in applicable law and regulations for the issuance of improvement plans.*
- (4) A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or TIP. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review or TIP must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.*
- (5) Only tenured teachers may file an appeal. Non-tenured teachers will have the right to add a response to the annual evaluation or TIP, which will be kept in his/her personnel file with the annual evaluation.*

Timelines for the Commencement of an Initial Appeal

- (1) If a teacher receives an annual professional performance review rating of "ineffective" or "developing" and disagrees with the determination, the teacher's appeal must be filed within five (5) working days of the date when the teacher receives it. The attached appeal form must be completed and handed in to begin the initial appeal.*
- (2) Appeals concerning the issuance of a TIP plan must be filed within five (5) working days of the District's alleged failure to comply with the requirements prescribed in applicable law and regulations for the issuance of improvement plans either in whole or in part.*
- (3) Appeals concerning implementation of the terms of a TIP must be filed within five (5) working days from the date of the District's alleged failure to implement the terms of the TIP in either in whole or in part.*

Filing of an Initial Appeal

- (1) A teacher wishing to commence an initial appeal must submit, in writing using the attached appeal form, to the Administrator performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan or his/her designee, a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. Along with the detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement, the teacher must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the teacher's appeal and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal including the particular performance review and/or improvement plan, as appropriate. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.*
- (2) Within ten (10) working days of receipt of the appeal, the Administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Teacher Improvement Plan shall submit a written determination, noted on the appeal form.*

Filing of an Appeal to the Superintendent

Step 1 - Superintendent - If the teacher disagrees with the determination of the Administrator following the initial appeal, the teacher may submit a copy of the appeal form, within five (5) working days, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination to the Superintendent. Along with the detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement, the teacher must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the teacher's appeal and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal including the particular performance review and/or improvement plan, as appropriate. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The Superintendent will begin the process to assemble the review committee and he/she will forward this information to the review committee.

Step 2- APPR Review Committee

The affected teacher's appeal will be reviewed by an internal APPR Review Committee. The Committee make up shall be:

- a. Two administrators, certified to conduct evaluations, appointed by the Superintendent of his/her designee. The administrators appointed shall not be the administrator who authorized the evaluation.*
- b. Two tenured teachers appointed by the President of WFUT or his/her designee.*

The committee may recommend a modification of the TIP, and/or of the rating, along with their rationale for the same. The review

shall be completed within ten (10) working days of delivery of the written request for review to the committee. The teacher will have the opportunity to speak to the committee regarding their original appeal and discuss their supporting papers. The Committee may also request to meet with the Administrator who prepared the evaluation.

The committee shall reach its findings using a consensus model, which means all four (4) members must agree on the determination. The committee's written recommendation shall be transmitted to the Superintendent and the unit member upon completion. If consensus is not reached, the committee shall submit the opposing viewpoints in writing to the evaluator, the appellant, the Association president, and the Superintendent.

Step 3- Superintendent

The Superintendent shall consider the written review recommendation of the committee and shall issue a written decision within ten (10) working days thereof. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitral, nor reviewable in any other forum other than defenses and/or challenges provided under law, including but not limited to Education Law 3020-a.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, the teacher bringing the appeal bears the burden of proving by evidence the merits of his or her appeal.

Our District assures the appeal process will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education Law 3012-C.

Retention of District Rights

(1) An appeal or determination under this Agreement shall be exempt from the grievance and/or arbitration procedure of the Parties' Collective Bargaining Agreement.

(2) This appeals procedure shall not in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of, or deny tenure to, a probationary teacher, for Statutorily permissible reasons other than performance, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to Article III of the Parties' Collective Bargaining Agreement.

(3) The fact that a performance review is under appeal shall not delay or otherwise affect the process of formulating and implementing a Teacher Improvement Plan.

*William Floyd School District
Teacher Annual Personnel Performance Review Appeal Form*

Name: _____ School: _____

Subject Area: _____ Date of initial appeal request: _____
Administrator responsible for conducting review: _____

Description of precise points of disagreement:

additional sheet(s) if necessary).

List of additional documentation attached: _____

Signature of Teacher: _____

Determination of Initial Appeal: _____

Signature of Administrator: _____ Date: _____

Reason(s) for Initial Appeal determination: _____

Teacher: Check appropriate box below:

I am satisfied with the initial appeal decision

I am unsatisfied with the initial appeal decision and request that the Superintendent and the President of the William Floyd United Teachers assemble a review panel to reconsider my appeal and make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Schools who will make a final decision.

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Recommendation of APPR review committee, circle one: (Denied) (Revised) or (No Consensus)

Signature of Administrators:

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Teachers:

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Reason(s) for Committee Appeal determination:

Teacher: Check appropriate box below:

I am satisfied with decision of the APPR review committee

I am unsatisfied with the APPR review committee and request that the Superintendent reconsider my appeal

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Determination of Superintendent: _____

Signature of Superintendent: _____ Date: _____

Reason(s) for Superintendent's Appeal determination:

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.

F. Evaluator Training-

All evaluators will be appropriately trained before conducting an evaluation, but only lead evaluators will be certified to conduct evaluations. The District's plan will describe the duration and nature of the training provided to evaluators and lead evaluators and the process for certifying lead evaluators.

To qualify for certification as a lead evaluator, an individual must successfully complete the training program described below. Lead evaluators will also be recertified each year to ensure inter-rater reliability. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete an evaluation. Administrators are expected to collect evidence to support their evaluator status. This evidence can include, but is not limited to, certificates of attendance, copies of materials disseminated in trainings and artifacts that support understanding and learning.

"Lead Evaluator"

The lead evaluator is the primary person responsible for conducting and completing a teacher or principal's evaluation. Typically, the lead evaluator is the person who completes and signs the summative annual professional performance review. To the extent possible, the principal or his/her designee should be the lead evaluator of a classroom teacher. To the extent possible, the lead evaluator of a principal should be the superintendent or his/her designee.

•The Principal Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, and Director of Special Education.

•The Teacher Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, Director of Special Education, Principals, Coordinators and Director of STEM.

"Evaluator"

An evaluator is any individual, who conducts an evaluation of a teacher or principal, including any person who conducts an observation or assessment as part of a teacher or principal evaluation. For teachers, an evaluator must be a principal, other trained administrator, trained in-school peer teacher, or other trained independent evaluator. For principals, an evaluator must be the building principal's supervisor or a trained independent evaluator or a trained administrator.

•The Principal Evaluators will be the: Federal Grants Coordinator, Assistant Secondary Administrator(s), and Assistant Superintendent for Business.

•The Teacher Evaluators will be the: Assistant Principals and Assistant Directors

**Evaluators can move to the next level as lead evaluators if they meet qualifications at the Superintendent's discretion.*

Re-certification: Administrators will be re-certified as a part of their end of the year evaluation. Each administrator will be expected

to demonstrate an understanding of the relevant elements (as defined below).

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION:

The Principal Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, and Director of Special Education.

Training requirements: In order to become certified the administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 15 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding of elements 1-9. It is important to note that 1 workshop may cover multiple elements; therefore it is not necessary to attend a separate workshop for each required element.

- 1. ISLLC standards and their related functions (1 point required)*
- 2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)*
- 3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (1 point required)*
- 4. Application and use of the principal practice rubric (Multidimensional) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal's practice (1 point required)*
- 5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate 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. (1 point required)*
- 6. Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its principals (1 point required)*
- 7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (1 point required)*
- 8. Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a 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 principals' overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required)*
- 9. Specific considerations in evaluating principals of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)*
- 10. Other – Demonstration of Understanding (6 points required)*
 - 1) Participation in the development of the District's APPR Plan (10 hours = 1 point)*
 - 2) School Visits aligned with the Multidimensional Rubric (1 point per school)*
 - 3) Conduct Presentation/trainings for colleagues (1 point for each presentation)*

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION:

The Principal Evaluators will be the: Federal Grants Administrator, Assistant Secondary Administrator(s), and Assistant Superintendent for Business.

Training requirements: The administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 10 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding of the elements described below. It is important to note that 1 workshop may cover multiple elements; therefore it is not necessary to attend a separate workshop for each required element.

- 1. ISLLC standards and their related functions (1 point required)*
- 2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)*
- 3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (0 point required)*
- 4. Application and use of the principal practice rubric (Multidimensional) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal's practice (1 point required)*

5. *Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate 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. (1 point required)*
6. *Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its principals (0 point required)*
7. *Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (0 point required)*
8. *Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a 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 principals' overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required)*
9. *Specific considerations in evaluating principals of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)*
10. *Other – Demonstration of Understanding (4 points required)*
 - 1) *Participation in the development of the District's APPR Plan (10 hours = 1 point)*
 - 2) *Conduct Presentation/trainings for colleagues (1 point for each presentation)*

TEACHER EVALUATION:

The Teacher Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, Director of Special Education, Principals, Coordinators and Director of STEM.

Training requirements: In order to become certified the administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 15 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding of elements 1-9, described below.

1. *NYS Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators (1 point required)*
2. *Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)*
3. *Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (1 point required)*
4. *Application and use of the Teacher practice rubric (NYSUT) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice (1 point required)*
5. *Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc. (1 point required)*
6. *Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its teachers (1 point required)*
7. *Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (1point required)*
8. *Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a teacher 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required)*
9. *Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)*
10. *Other – Demonstration of Understanding (6 points required)*
 - 1) *Learning circles (1 point for each lesson observed). At least four (4) administrators must be in in each group, identify lesson observed and provide an analysis based on elements 1, 2, 4. Other programs will be explored such as Elevate.*
 - 2) *Participation in the development of the District's APPR Plan (10 hours = 1 point)*
 - 3) *Prior to September show 5 Observations that align with elements 1, 2, 4 (1 point)*
 - 4) *Conduct Presentation/trainings for colleagues (1 point for each presentation)*

TEACHER EVALUATION:

The Teacher Evaluators will be the: Federal Grants Administrator, Assistant Secondary Administrator(s), and Assistant Superintendent for Business, Assistant Principals and Assistant Directors

Training requirements: The administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 10 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding described below.

- 1. NYS Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators (1 point required)*
- 2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)*
- 3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (0 point required)*
- 4. Application and use of the Teacher practice rubric (NYSUT) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice (1 point required must attend WFSD workshop)*
- 5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc. (1 point required)*
- 6. Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its teachers (0 point required)*
- 7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (0 point required)*
- 8. Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a teacher 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required must attend WFSD workshop)*
- 9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)*
- 10. Other – Demonstration of Understanding (4 points required)*
 - 1) Learning circles (1 point for each lesson observed). At least four (4) administrators must be in each group, identify lesson observed and provide an analysis based on elements 1, 2, 4. Other programs will be explored such as Elevate.*
 - 2) Prior to September show 5 Observations that align with elements 1, 2, 4 (1 point)*

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure that SED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data, and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.	Checked
---	---------

6.7) Assurances -- Data Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.	Checked
---	---------

6.7) Assurances -- Data Assure scores for all teachers will be reported to NYSED for each subcomponent, as well as the composite rating, as per NYSED requirements.	Checked
---	---------

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

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

K-5
6-8
9-12
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

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

No 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 14, 2012

Updated Friday, November 30, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress K-1 (Primary Grades) and Measures of Academic Progress 2-5 ELA and Math Assessment
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	William Floyd Developed K-5 Assessments for all other teachers
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Measures of Academic Progress Grades 6-8 ELA and Math Assessment
6-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	William Floyd Developed 6-8 Assessments for all other teachers
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	All NYS Regents Assessments
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	William Floyd Developed 9-12 Assessments for all other teachers

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 principal's will receive a score based on the percentage of students who meet their targets set at the beginning of the school year on the following assessments: Measures of Academic Progress assessments; NYS Regents assessments, and William Floyd Developed assessments. Students' baseline scores will be compared to end of year assessment results (Measures of Academic Progress assessments, NYS Regents assessments, and William Floyd Developed assessments) to measure student growth. Principals will
---	--

meet with their supervisors in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories.
 Highly Effective: 90-100% of verified students meet their target
 Effective: 62-89% of verified students meet their target
 Developing: 45-61% of verified students meet their target
 Ineffective: 0-44% of verified students meet their target

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

Evidence indicates principal performance results in student learning that exceeds district expectations. 90-100% of verified students meet their target.

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

Evidence indicates principal performance results in student learning that meets district expectations. 62-89% of verified students meet their target.

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

Evidence indicates principal performance results in student learning that does not fully meet district expectations. 45-61% of verified students meet their target.

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

Evidence indicates principal performance results in student learning that does not meet district expectations. 0-44% of verified students meet their target.

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/5366/129479-qBFVOWF7fC/Task 8.1 Principal's HEDI.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: <!--

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Not Applicable

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

No 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.

Principals' locally selected measures will be based on the overall percentage of students meeting targets on each exam.

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 14, 2012

Updated Friday, November 30, 2012

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]	40
---	----

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.	20
--	----

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that if any points are assigned to goals, at least one goal will address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness based on one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers; correlation of student growth scores to teachers granted vs. denied tenure; or improvements in proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.	Checked
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).	Checked

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	Checked
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes (all count as one source)	Checked

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

*The Evaluations of building principals will be based on multiple measures aligned with the Educational Leadership Policy Standards. A principal's performance will be assessed using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (40 points) This assessment will be conducted by the building principal's supervisor each year and will incorporate one school visit and at least two other sources of evidence from the following options: structured feedback from teachers, students, and/or families; school visits by other trained evaluators; review of school documents, records, and/or state accountability processes; and/or other locally-determined sources. In addition to the assessment ambitious and measureable goals will be collaboratively developed by the Principal and Superintendent (20 points).
If all Domains earn a score of 1, the HEDI score will equal 0.*

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/129480-pMADJ4gk6R/WFSD principal rubric values 11.16.12 JG_1.xlsx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	A Highly Effective rating is achieved by demonstrating exemplary performance in the following Domains: 1) Shared Vision of Learning; 2) School Culture and Instructional Program; 3) Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment, 4) Community; 5) Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; 6) Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context; and Other If all Domains earn a score of 1, the HEDI score will equal 0.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	An Effective rating is achieved by demonstrating strong performance in the following Domains: 1) Shared Vision of Learning; 2) School Culture and Instructional Program; 3) Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment, 4) Community; 5) Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; 6) Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context; and Other

Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	A Developing rating is achieved by demonstrating a need for improvement in performance in the following Domains: 1) Shared Vision of Learning; 2) School Culture and Instructional Program; 3) Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment, 4) Community; 5) Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; 6) Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context; and Other
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	An Ineffective rating is achieved by demonstrating poor performance in the following Domains: 1) Shared Vision of Learning; 2) School Culture and Instructional Program; 3) Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment, 4) Community; 5) Integrity, Fairness, Ethics; 6) Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context; and Other.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	60
Effective	45-59
Developing	30-44
Ineffective	0-29

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, September 28, 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

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	60
Effective	45-59
Developing	30-44
Ineffective	0-29

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 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/5276/128663-Df0w3Xx5v6/WFSDPrincipal Improvement Plan.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

D. Principal Appeal Process

William Floyd School District Principal Appeals Process

This Agreement is made by and between the William Floyd School District ("District") and the William Council of Administrators and Supervisors ("CAS"), collectively referred to herein as the "Parties".

In order to implement the requirements of N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c, the District and the Association hereby agree as follows:

Right to Appeal

A Principal may appeal his or her Annual Professional Performance Review and the issuance and/or implementation of a legally required improvement plan (PIP) in accordance with the procedures and conditions set forth in this Agreement. Such procedures and conditions constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to a Principal's performance review and/or PIP.

Scope Performance Review Appeals

- (1) Only a Principal who receives a rating of "developing" or "ineffective" on the composite score may appeal his or her performance review. Ratings of "highly effective" or "effective" cannot be appealed.*
- (2) A Principal may appeal only the substance of his or her performance review, the District's adherence to standards and methodologies required for such reviews, adherence to applicable regulations of the commissioner of education, compliance with procedures applicable to the conduct of performance reviews set forth in the District's annual professional performance review plan, the issuance of a PIP and/or the implementation of the terms of a PIP.*
- (3) Appeals related to the issuance of a PIP shall be limited to issues regarding compliance with the requirements prescribed in applicable law and regulations for the issuance of improvement plans.*
- (4) A Principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review or PIP. All grounds for appealing a particular performance review or PIP must be raised within the same appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.*
- (5) Only tenured Principals may file an appeal. Non-tenured Principals will have the right to add a response to the annual evaluation or PIP, which will be kept in his/her personnel file with the annual evaluation.*

Timelines for the Commencement of an Initial Appeal

- (1) If a Principal receives an annual professional performance review rating of "ineffective" or "developing" and disagrees with the determination, the Principal's appeal must be filed within five (5) working days of the date when the Principal receives it. The attached appeal form must be completed and handed in to begin the initial appeal.*
- (2) Appeals concerning the issuance of a PIP plan must be filed within five (5) working days of the District's alleged failure to comply with the requirements prescribed in applicable law and regulations for the issuance of improvement plans either in whole or in part.*
- (3) Appeals concerning implementation of the terms of a PIP must be filed within five (5) working days from the date of the District's alleged failure to implement the terms of the PIP in either in whole or in part.*

Filing of an Initial Appeal

- (1) A Principal wishing to commence an initial appeal must submit, in writing using the attached appeal form, to the Administrator performing the Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan or his/her designee, a detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement over his or her performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of the terms of his or her improvement plan. Along with the detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement, the Principal must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the Principal's appeal and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal including the particular performance review and/or improvement plan, as appropriate. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.*
- (2) Within ten (10) working days of receipt of the appeal, the Administrator conducting the Annual Professional Performance Review or Principal Improvement Plan shall submit a written determination, noted on the appeal form.*

Filing of an Appeal to the Superintendent

Step 1 - Superintendent - If the Principal disagrees with the determination of the Administrator following the initial appeal, the Principal may submit a copy of the appeal form, within five (5) working days, and a written statement explaining in detail the basis for disagreement with the determination to the Superintendent. Along with the detailed description of the precise point(s) of disagreement, the Principal must include any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) of disagreement that support the Principal's appeal and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal including the particular performance review and/or improvement plan, as appropriate. Any such additional information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The Superintendent will begin the process to assemble the review committee and he/she will forward this information to the review committee.

Step 2- APPR Review Committee

The affected Principal's appeal will be reviewed by an internal APPR Review Committee. The Committee make up shall be:

- a. Two District Office administrators, certified to conduct evaluations, appointed by the Superintendent of his/her designee. The administrators appointed shall not be the administrator who authorized the evaluation.*
- b. Two tenured Principals appointed by the President of WFUT or his/her designee.*

The committee may recommend a modification of the PIP, and/or of the rating, along with their rationale for the same. The review shall be completed within ten (10) working days of delivery of the written request for review to the committee. The Principal will have the opportunity to speak to the committee regarding their original appeal and discuss their supporting papers. The Committee may also request to meet with the Administrator who prepared the evaluation.

The committee shall reach its findings using a consensus model, which means all four (4) members must agree on the determination. The committee's written recommendation shall be transmitted to the Superintendent and the unit member upon completion. If consensus is not reached, the committee shall submit the opposing viewpoints in writing to the evaluator, the appellant, the Association president, and the Superintendent.

Step 3- Superintendent

The Superintendent shall consider the written review recommendation of the committee and shall issue a written decision within ten (10) working days thereof. The determination of the Superintendent of Schools shall be final and shall not be grievable, arbitral, nor reviewable in any other forum other than defenses and/or challenges provided under law, including but not limited to Education Law 3020-a.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, the Principal bringing the appeal bears the burden of proving by evidence the merits of his or her appeal.

Our District assures the appeal process will be timely and expeditious in compliance with Education law 3012-c.

Retention of District Rights

(1) An appeal or determination under this Agreement shall be exempt from the grievance and/or arbitration procedure of the Parties' Collective Bargaining Agreement.

(2) This appeals procedure shall not in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of, or deny tenure to, a probationary Principal, for statutorily permissible reasons other than performance, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to Article III of the Parties' Collective Bargaining Agreement.

(3) The fact that a performance review is under appeal shall not delay or otherwise affect the process of formulating and implementing a Principal Improvement Plan.

*William Floyd School District
Principal Annual Personnel Performance Review Appeal Form*

Name: _____ School: _____

Subject Area: _____ Date of initial appeal request: _____

District Office Administrator responsible for conducting review: _____

Description of precise points of disagreement:

additional sheet(s) if necessary).

List of additional documentation attached: _____

Signature of Principal: _____

Determination of Initial Appeal: _____

Signature of District Office Administrator: _____ Date: _____

Reason(s) for Initial Appeal determination: _____

Principal: Check appropriate box below:

I am satisfied with the initial appeal decision

I am unsatisfied with the initial appeal decision and request that the Superintendent and the President of CAS assemble a review panel to reconsider my appeal and make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Schools who will make a final decision.

Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____

Recommendation of APPR review committee, circle one: (Denied) (Revised) or (No Consensus)

Signature of District Office Administrators:

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Principals:

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name: Signature: _____ Date: _____

Reason(s) for Committee Appeal determination:

Principal: Check appropriate box below:

I am satisfied with decision of the APPR review committee

I am unsatisfied with the APPR review committee and request that the Superintendent reconsider my appeal

Principal Signature: _____ Date: _____

Determination of Superintendent: _____

Signature of Superintendent: _____ Date: _____

Reason(s) for Superintendent's Appeal determination: _____

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.

F. Evaluator Training-

All evaluators will be appropriately trained before conducting an evaluation, but only lead evaluators will be certified to conduct evaluations. The District's plan will describe the duration and nature of the training provided to evaluators and lead evaluators and the process for certifying lead evaluators.

To qualify for certification as a lead evaluator, an individual must successfully complete the training program described below. Lead evaluators will also be recertified each year to ensure inter-rater reliability. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete an evaluation. Administrators are expected to collect evidence to support their evaluator status. This evidence can include, but is not limited to, certificates of attendance, copies of materials disseminated in trainings and artifacts that support understanding and learning.

"Lead Evaluator"

The lead evaluator is the primary person responsible for conducting and completing a teacher or principal's evaluation. Typically, the lead evaluator is the person who completes and signs the summative annual professional performance review. To the extent possible, the principal or his/her designee should be the lead evaluator of a classroom teacher. To the extent possible, the lead evaluator of a principal should be the superintendent or his/her designee.

- The Principal Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, and Director of Special Education.*
- The Teacher Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, Director of Special Education, Principals, Coordinators and Director of STEM.*

"Evaluator"

An evaluator is any individual, who conducts an evaluation of a teacher or principal, including any person who conducts an observation or assessment as part of a teacher or principal evaluation. For teachers, an evaluator must be a principal, other trained administrator, trained in-school peer teacher, or other trained independent evaluator. For principals, an evaluator must be the building principal's supervisor or a trained independent evaluator or a trained administrator.

- The Principal Evaluators will be the: Federal Grants Coordinator, Assistant Secondary Administrator(s), and Assistant Superintendent for Business.*
- The Teacher Evaluators will be the: Assistant Principals and Assistant Directors*

**Evaluators can move to the next level as lead evaluators if they meet qualifications at the Superintendent's discretion.*

Re-certification: Administrators will be re-certified as a part of their end of the year evaluation. Each administrator will be expected to demonstrate an understanding of the relevant elements (as defined below).

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION:

The Principal Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, and Director of Special Education.

Training requirements: In order to become certified the administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 15 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding of elements 1-9. It is important to note that 1 workshop may cover multiple elements; therefore it is not necessary to attend a separate workshop for each required element.

- 1. ISLLC standards and their related functions (1 point required)*
- 2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)*
- 3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (1 point required)*
- 4. Application and use of the principal practice rubric (Multidimensional) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal's practice (1 point required)*
- 5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate 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. (1 point required)*
- 6. Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its principals (1 point required)*
- 7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (1 point required)*
- 8. Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a 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 principals' overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required)*
- 9. Specific considerations in evaluating principals of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)*
- 10. Other – Demonstration of Understanding (6 points required)*
 - 1) Participation in the development of the District's APPR Plan (10 hours = 1 point)*
 - 2) School Visits aligned with the Multidimensional Rubric (1 point per school)*
 - 3) Conduct Presentation/trainings for colleagues (1 point for each presentation)*

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION:

The Principal Evaluators will be the: Federal Grants Administrator, Assistant Secondary Administrator(s), and Assistant Superintendent for Business.

Training requirements: The administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 10 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding of the elements described below. It is important to note that 1 workshop may cover multiple elements; therefore it is not necessary to attend a separate workshop for each required element.

- 1. ISLLC standards and their related functions (1 point required)*
- 2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)*
- 3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (0 point required)*
- 4. Application and use of the principal practice rubric (Multidimensional) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal's practice (1 point required)*
- 5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate 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. (1 point required)*

6. Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its principals (0 point required)

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (0 point required)

8. Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a 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 principals' overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required)

9. Specific considerations in evaluating principals of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)

10. Other – Demonstration of Understanding (4 points required)

1) Participation in the development of the District's APPR Plan (10 hours = 1 point)

2) Conduct Presentation/trainings for colleagues (1 point for each presentation)

TEACHER EVALUATION:

The Teacher Lead Evaluators will be the: Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources, Director of Special Education, Principals, Coordinators and Director of STEM.

Training requirements: In order to become certified the administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 15 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding of elements 1-9, described below.

1. NYS Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators (1 point required)

2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)

3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (1 point required)

4. Application and use of the Teacher practice rubric (NYSUT) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice (1 point required)

5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc. (1 point required)

6. Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its teachers (1 point required)

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (1point required)

8. Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a teacher 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required)

9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)

10. Other – Demonstration of Understanding (6 points required)

1) Learning circles (1 point for each lesson observed). At least four (4) administrators must be in each group, identify lesson observed and provide an analysis based on elements 1, 2, 4. Other programs will be explored such as Elevate.

2) Participation in the development of the District's APPR Plan (10 hours = 1 point)

3) Prior to September show 5 Observations that align with elements 1, 2, 4 (1 point)

4) Conduct Presentation/trainings for colleagues (1 point for each presentation)

TEACHER EVALUATION:

The Teacher Evaluators will be the: Federal Grants Administrator, Assistant Secondary Administrator(s), and Assistant Superintendent for Business, Assistant Principals and Assistant Directors

Training requirements: The administrator is expected to accumulate a total of 10 points by attending William Floyd School District/External professional development workshops that provide an understanding described below.

- 1. NYS Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators (1 point required)*
- 2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research (1 point required)*
- 3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model (0 point required)*
- 4. Application and use of the Teacher practice rubric (NYSUT) for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice (1 point required must attend WFSD workshop)*
- 5. Application and use of any assessment tools used to evaluate teachers, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc. (1 point required)*
- 6. Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its teachers (0 point required)*
- 7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System (0 point required)*
- 8. Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district to evaluate a teacher 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 overall rating and their subcomponent ratings (1 point required must attend WFSD workshop)*
- 9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities (1 point required)*
- 10. Other – Demonstration of Understanding (4 points required)*
 - 1) Learning circles (1 point for each lesson observed). At least four (4) administrators must be in in each group, identify lesson observed and provide an analysis based on elements 1, 2, 4. Other programs will be explored such as Elevate.*
 - 2) Prior to September show 5 Observations that align with elements 1, 2, 4 (1 point)*

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

-
- Checked
-

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Friday, May 11, 2012

Updated Friday, November 30, 2012

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/5581/128664-3Uqgn5g9Iu/WFSD APPR Cert Form 11.30.12.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.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1				State 20%				Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
5	ELEMENTARY ALL COURSES								
6	Elem	k	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
7	Elem	1	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
8	Elem	2	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
9	Elem	k	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
10	Elem	1	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
11	Elem	2	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
12	Elem	3	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	State	3rd grade ELA state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
13	Elem	3	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	State	3rd grade Math state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
14	Elem	Grade 4	ELA	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
15	Elem	Grade 4	Math	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
16	Elem	Grade 5	ELA	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
17	Elem	Grade 5	Math	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5rd grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
18	Elem	Grade 1-3 reading	Reading	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
19	Elem	Grade 4-5 reading	Reading	State Assessment	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Assessment	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
20	Elem	Elem LLI	Reading	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
21	Elem	K-2 Resource	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
22	Elem	3-5 Resource	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
23	Elem	K-2 ESL	ESL	District	William Floyd developed pre-assessment (Prior NYSESLAT)	District	William Floyd developed NYSESLAT	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
24	Elem	3-5 ESL Non State tested	ESL	District	William Floyd developed pre-assessment (Prior NYSESLAT)	District	William Floyd developed NYSESLAT	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
25	Elem	3-5 ESL State Tested	ESL	District	William Floyd developed pre-assessment (Prior NYSESLAT)	State	ELA Grade 3-5 state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
26	Elem	K-2 Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
27	Elem	K-2 Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
28	Elem	3rd Grade Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	State	3rd grade ELA state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
29	Elem	3rd Grade Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	State	3rd grade Math state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
30	Elem	4th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
31	Elem	4th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math
32	Elem	5th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
33	Elem	5th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5th grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math
34	Elem	1-5 Developmental classes	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb ELA	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
35	Elem	1-5 Developmental classes	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb Math	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
36	Elem	Elem Life skills classes	Special Ed	District	William Floyd Developed pre-Assessment Comparable to NYSAA	State	NYSAA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA/Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
37	Elem	K-5 Art	Art	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
38	Elem	k-5 PE	PE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Prior Year's Fitness Assessment)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
39	Elem	K-5 Music	Music	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
40	SECONDARY ALL COURSES							
41	HS	ADV DESIGN 1	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
42	HS	AP ADVANCED ART	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
43	HS	ART HISTORY	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	Art History Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
44	HS	CERAMICS	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
45	HS	DRAWING	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
46	HS	FASHION DESIGN	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
47	HS	ILLUSTRATION	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
48	HS	PHOTOGRAPHY 1	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
49	HS	PHOTOGRAPHY 2	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
50	HS	PHOTOGRAPHY 3	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
51	HS	PORTFOLIO PREP	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
52	HS	SCULPTURE	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
53	HS	STUDIO IN ART	ART	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Essential Elements)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
54	HS	STUDIO PAINTING	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
55	HS	Physical Education	ATHLETICS/PE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Prior Year's Fitness Assessment)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
56	HS	PROJECT ADVENTURE	ATHLETICS/PE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Prior Year's Fitness Assessment)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
57	HS	ACCOUNTING	BUSINESS	State	Integated Algebra regents	District	William Floyd Developed NOCTI/CTE project (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
58	HS	BUS OWNER/MGMT	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
59	HS	BUSINESS ENGLISH	BUSINESS	State	English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
60	HS	BUSINESS LAW	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
61	HS	BUSINESS OF MUSIC	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
62	HS	INTERN. PROGRAM	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
63	HS	CAREER PORTFOLIO	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
64	HS	COLLEGE ACCOUNTING	BUSINESS	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
65	HS	COLLEGE PREP	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Deveoped pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
66	HS	COMPUTER APPS	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
67	HS	ENTERTAINMENT MKTG	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
68	HS	FASHION MARKETING	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
69	HS	MATH APPS FOR BUS.	BUSINESS	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Math Apps for Business Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
70	HS	MONEY MANAGEMENT	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
71	HS	PERSONAL KEYBOARDING	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
72	HS	SPORTS MARKETING	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
73	HS	VIDEO GAME DESIGN	BUSINESS	District	District created pre-assessment (Combo Art & Tech)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
74	HS	VIRTUAL ENTERPRISE	BUSINESS	District	District created pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
75	HS	WEB DESIGN	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Combo Art & Tech)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
76	HS	WORK BASED EXPERIENCE	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
77	HS	CARPENTRY	CTE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
78	HS	COSMETOLOGY	CTE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
79	HS	CULINARY	CTE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
80	HS	AP ENG LIT 12	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
81	HS	AP ENGLISH LANG 11	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	State	ELA Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
82	HS	BRITISH LIT.	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
83	HS	CHILDREN'S LITERATURE	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
84	HS	CREATIVE WRITING	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
85	HS	ENGLISH 10 & 10H	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
86	HS	ENGLISH 11	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	State	English Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
87	HS	ENGLISH 12H	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
88	HS	ENGLISH 9 & 9H	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
89	HS/MS	ESL	ESL	State	Prior Year NYSESLAT	State	NYSESLAT	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
90	HS	ITALIAN 1	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (8th grade Italian final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint A	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
91	HS	ITALIAN 2	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint A)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
92	HS	ITALIAN 3R	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Level 2 Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint B	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
93	HS	ITALIAN 4	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
94	HS	ITALIAN 5 ACC	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
95	HS	SPANISH 1	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (8th grade Spanish final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint A	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
96	HS	SPANISH 2	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint A)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
97	HS	SPANISH 3R	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Level 2 Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint B	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
98	HS	SPANISH 4	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
99	HS	SPANISH 5 ACCL	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
100	HS	HEALTH	HEALTH	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
101	HS	INTRODUCTION TO MEDICINE	HEALTH	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
102	HS	ADVANCED ALGEBRA	MATH	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
103	HS	ALGEBRA 2	MATH	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
104	HS	ALGEBRA 2 / TRIGONOMETRY	MATH	State	Geometry Regents	State	Algebra II Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
105	HS	/TRIGONOMETRY ACC	MATH	State	Geometry Regents	State	Algebra II Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
106	HS	ALGEBRA I (Integrated)	MATH	State	Math grade 8 state assessment or Int Alg regents	State	Integrated Algebra regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
107	HS	AP CALCULUS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig Regents	State	AP exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
108	HS	BUSINESS MATH	MATH	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
109	HS	CALCULUS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
110	HS	GEOMETRY	MATH	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	State	Geometry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
111	HS	GEOMETRY (NR)	MATH	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
112	HS	GEOMETRY HONORS	MATH	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	State	Geometry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
113	HS	PRE-ALGEBRA	MATH	State	Math grade 8 state assessment or Int Alg regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
114	HS	PRE-CALCULUS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
115	HS	PRE-CALCULUS HONORS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
116	HS	STATISTICS	MATH	State	Integated Algebra regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
117	HS	TRIGONOMETRY	MATH	State	Geometry regents	State	Trigonometry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
118	HS	MUSIC IN OUR LIVES	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
119	HS	MUSIC THEORY 1	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
120	HS	MUSIC THEORY 2	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Music Theory 1 Final)	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
121	HS	Performing Choir 11-12	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
122	HS	Performing Concert Band 9-11	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
123	HS	Performing Concert Orchestra 9-11	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
124	HS	Performing Symphonic 9-12	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
125	HS	Performing Wind 10-12	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
126	HS	PIANO 1	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
127	HS	PIANO 2	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Score)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
128	HS	PIANO 3	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Score)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
129	HS	Women's Choir 10-11	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Score)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
130	HS	NJROTC 1	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
131	HS	NJROTC 2	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
132	HS	NJROTC 3	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
133	HS	NJROTC 4	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
134	HS	AP BIOLOGY	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
135	HS	AP BIOLOGY HONORS	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
136	HS	AP CHEMISTRY HONORS	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science regents	State	Chemistry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
137	HS	ASTRONOMY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
138	HS	CHEMISTRY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	State	Chemistry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
139	HS	EARTH SCIENCE	SCIENCE	State	Living Env. Regents	State	Earth Science Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
140	HS	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	SCIENCE	State	Living Env. Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
141	HS	FORENSICS	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
142	HS	GENERAL CHEMISTRY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	State	Chemistry regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
143	HS	LIVING ENVIRONMENT	SCIENCE	State	Science grade 8 state assessment	State	Living Env. Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
144	HS	MARINE SCIENCE	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
145	HS	METEOROLOGY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
146	HS	PHYSICS	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry Regents	State	Physics Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
147	HS	PHYSICS HONORS	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry Regents	State	Physics Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
148	HS	AP ECONOMICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	State	Regents - Physics	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
149	HS	AP US GOV'T & POLITICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
150	HS	AP US HISTORY	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	Global II Regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
151	HS	AP WORLD HISTORY	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (a prior AP exam)	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
152	HS	CRIM JUSTICE	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
153	HS	ECONOMICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
154	HS	GLOBAL ST. 1	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
155	HS	GLOBAL ST. 2	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	Global 1 - Final	State	Global Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
156	HS	PART IN GOV'T	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
157	HS	PSYCHOLOGY	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
158	HS	US HIST & GOVT	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	Global II Regents	State	US History Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
159	HS	WORLD HISTORY AP PREP	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
160	HS	BUSINESS MATH	SPECIAL ED	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
161	HS	CAREER PORTFOLIO	SPECIAL ED	District	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
162	HS	CONSUMER MATH	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
163	HS	CONSUMER MATH 11/12/12+ NB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
164	HS	CONSUMER MATH 9/10	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
165	HS	CONSUMER MATH LAB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
166	HS	CONSUMER MATH PM BOCES	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
167	HS	EARTH SCIENCE	SPECIAL ED	State	Living Env. Regents	State	Regents - Earth Science	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
168	HS	ECONOMICS	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
169	HS	ECONOMICS/PART IN GOV'T	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
170	HS	ECONOMICS/PART IN GOV'T	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
171	HS	ENGLISH 10	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
172	HS	ENGLISH 11	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years english regents)	State	English regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
173	HS	ENGLISH 12	SPECIAL ED	State	English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
174	HS	ENGLISH 9	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
175	HS	EXPLORATORY FINE ARTS	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
176	HS	FINE ARTS	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
177	HS	GEOMETRY (NR)	SPECIAL ED	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
178	HS	GEOMETRY NR (9th)	SPECIAL ED	State	Integrated Algebra regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
179	HS	GLOBAL ST 1	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
180	HS	GLOBAL ST 2	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Global 1 - Final)	State	Global Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
181	HS	HEALTH	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
182	HS	INTEGRATED ALGEBRA	SPECIAL ED	State	Math grade 8 state assessment or Int Alg regents	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
183	HS	LANGUAGE REMEDIATION	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed English Grade 9 Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
184	HS	LIFE SKILLS	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
185	HS	LIFE SKILLS 1C	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
186	HS	LIFE SKILLS 11/12/12+ NB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
187	HS	LIFE SKILLS 5	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
188	HS	LIFE SKILLS 9/1C	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
189	HS	LIVING ENVIRONMENT	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years Regents)	State	Living Env. Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
190	HS	LIVING ENVIRONMENT 9	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years Regents)	State	Living Env. Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
191	HS	ENVIRONMENT X1	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years Regents)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
192	HS	PART IN GOVT	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
193	HS	PRE-ALGEBRA	SPECIAL ED	State	Math grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
194	HS	READING	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
195	HS	READING 11/12/12+ NB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
196	HS	READING 9/10	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
197	HS	Resource Room	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	State	English Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
198	HS	SCHOOL TO WORK	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Performance Checklist)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
199	HS	SCHOOL TO WORK 12	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Performance Checklist)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
200	HS	US HISTORY	SPECIAL ED	State	Global II Regents	State	US History Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
201	HS	US HISTORY & GOV'T	SPECIAL ED	State	Global II Regents	State	US History Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
202	HS	WRITING	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
203	HS	WRITING 9/10	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
204	HS	ADV COMP ANIM.	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
205	HS	ADV. C.A.D.	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
206	HS	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
207	HS	ARCHITECT. PROB.	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
208	HS	C.A.D.	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
209	HS	COMP ANIM./MULTI	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
210	HS	DESIGN & DRAWING	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
211	HS	ELECTRONICS	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
212	HS	MATERIALS PROCESSING	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
213	HS	MEDIA PROD TECH	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
214	HS	PRINC. OF ENGINEERING	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
215	HS	PRODUCTION SYSTEMS	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
216	HS	TRANS. SYSTEMS	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
217	MS	Art 6-8	Art	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
218	MS	English 6-8	English	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
219	MS	Italian 8	FOR. LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
220	MS	Spanish 8	FOR. LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
221	MS	Health 6-8	HEALTH	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
222	MS	Math 6-8	Math	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
223	MS	General Music, Band, Chorus & Orchestra	Music	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
224	MS	P.E. 6-8	Phys. Ed.	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
225	MS	Science 6	SCIENCE	State	ELA and Math Grade 5 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
226	MS	Science 7	SCIENCE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (6th grade final from prior year)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
227	MS	Science 8 Honors (EARTH SCIENCE)	SCIENCE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (7th grade final from prior year)	State	8th grade state Assesment in science or Earth Science regents exam	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
228	MS	Science 8 (Living Environment)	SCIENCE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (7th grade final from prior year)	State	8th grade state Assesment in science or Earth Science regents exam	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
229	MS	S.S. 6	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	ELA Grade 5 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
230	MS	S.S. 7	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (6th grade final from prior year)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
231	MS	S.S. 8	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (7th grade science final from prior year)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
232	MS	Resource Room (6-8)	SPECIAL ED	State	Prior ELA state assessment	State	ELA State Assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA/Math	
233	MS	12.1.1	SPECIAL ED.	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
234	MS	8.1.1	SPECIAL ED.	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
235	MS	15:1:1 6th grade ELA	SPECIAL ED.	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
236	MS	15:1:1 6th grade Math	SPECIAL ED.	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
237	MS	Reading	SPECIAL ED.	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
238	MS	Technology 6-8	Technology	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
239	MS	Family and Consumer Science 7	Family and Consumer Science 7	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
240									

ALL teachers K-2 and 2.10 teachers Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

The William Floyd School District will be using conditional growth index (CGI) based on the NWEA MAP assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the comparable growth measures in ELA in grades K-2 (*same information can be used in grades 9 & 10 as applicable*). The conditional growth index captures the contributions educators make to student learning on the NWEA MAP assessments, by comparing actual student growth to the student growth norms. These norms reflect the amount of growth that might be expected from these students based on their grade, subject, and starting RIT score. CGI scores are expressed in standard deviation units, or z-scores, with scores above zero indicating students exceeded the growth norms, whereas scores below zero indicate growth less than the growth norm. CGI scores of zero are indicative of students meeting their growth norms. To construct an evaluative rating, CGI scores for all students linked to a particular teacher will be averaged, with this average CGI score converted to the four-category HEDI range. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. Major modeling and score translation decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

Grades K-2 ELA and 2.10 teachers - Measures of Academic Progress

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

WILLIAM FLOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT 9/25/2012

2.11 HEDI Tables for 2.2-2.10

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9

2.11 HEDI Tables for 2.2-2.10

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1

Grades K-2 MATH

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
18	0.9	1.1
19	1.1	1.3
20	1.3	

WILLIAM FLOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT 9/25/2012

2.11 HEDI Tables for 2.2-2.10

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
9	-0.9	-0.7
10	-0.7	-0.5
11	-0.5	-0.3
12	-0.3	-0.1
13	-0.1	0.1
14	0.1	0.3
15	0.3	0.5
16	0.5	0.7
17	0.7	0.9

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
3	-2.1	-1.9
4	-1.9	-1.7
5	-1.7	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.3
7	-1.3	-1.1
8	-1.1	-0.9

WILLIAM FLOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT 9/25/2012

2.11 HEDI Tables for 2.2-2.10

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.1 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
0		-2.5
1	-2.5	-2.3
2	-2.3	-2.1

2.2 Grade 3 ELA

Measures of Academic Progress in ELA will be utilized as a baseline assessment. Students’ baseline scores will be compared to the NYS ELA Assessment. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories.

Highly Effective: 90-100% of verified students meet their target

Effective: 62-89% of verified students meet their target

Developing: 45-61% of verified students meet their target

Ineffective: <30-44% of verified students meet their target

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	95-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	72-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	30-0%

2.3 Grade 3 Math

Measures of Academic Progress in Math will be utilized as a baseline assessment. Students’ baseline scores will be compared to the NYS Math Assessment. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories.

Highly Effective: 90-100% of verified students meet their target

Effective: 62-89% of verified students meet their target

Developing: 45-61% of verified students meet their target

Ineffective: <30-44% of verified students meet their target

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	95-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	72-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	30-0%

2.4 Grade 8 Science

For 8th grade Science, 7th grade Science final results will be utilized as a baseline. Students’ baseline scores will be compared to the NYS Science Assessment. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories.

Highly Effective: 90-100% of verified students meet their target

Effective: 62-89% of verified students meet their target

Developing: 45-61% of verified students meet their target

Ineffective: <30-44% of verified students meet their target

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	95-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	72-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	30-0%

2.4 Grade 6-7 Science

2.5 Grade 6-8 Social Studies

2.6 High School Social Studies Global Studies 1

2.9 High School English Language Arts

2.10 All other courses with District Created Assessments - K-5 Art, 6-8 Art, K-12 Physical Education, K-5 Music, K-2 ESL, 3-12 Non-Tested ESL

District Developed Assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Students’ baseline scores will be compared to the final assessment score. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories.

Highly Effective: 90-100% of verified students meet their target

Effective: 62-89% of verified students meet their target

Developing: 45-61% of verified students meet their target

Ineffective: <30-44% of verified students meet their target

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	95-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	72-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	30-0%

2.6 High School Social Studies Regents Courses - Global 2 and American History

2.7 High School Science Regents Courses – Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics

2.8 High School Math Regents Courses – Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2

2.10 11th grade ESL

Students’ prior State Assessment or Regents scores will be compared to the final Regents score where applicable. Prior state assessment or Regents scores will provide the baseline and points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets for each Regents assessment. District Developed Assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to District created assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Students’ baseline scores will be compared to the final NYS Regents assessment score. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories.

points will be assigned based on the percentage of students meeting targets on the Global 2 Regents Assessment.

Highly Effective: 90-100% of verified students meet their target

Effective: 62-89% of verified students meet their target

Developing: 45-61% of verified students meet their target

Ineffective: <30-44% of verified students meet their target

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	95-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	72-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	30-0%

2.10 All other courses – Grade 1-5 Developmental Classes, 3-5 Life Skills, K-2 Life Skills

District Developed Assessments will be rigorous, aligned with NYS Common Core Standards, and comparable across classrooms. All test security measures will be applied to both pre- and post- assessments, and to the extent practicable valid and reliable as defined by the standards of Educational and Psychological Testing. Students' pretest scores will be compared to the final assessment score. Teachers will meet with principals in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories

Grade 1-5 Developmental Classes

The three elementary developmental classrooms (12:1:1) will use targets set for acceptable growth based on each student's starting point. The students will use Aimsweb. Specific starting points of assessment will be off-graded, and will be established at the beginning of the year between the teacher and the Assistant Director of Special Education. We will adhere to the Aimsweb grade level expectations to the extent practicable, except in circumstances where students are unable to obtain a score in the areas of RCBM, MAZE, MCOMP and MCAP. Those students will be assessed on the Test of Early Literacy and the Test of Early Numeracy. There are 2 unique factors when evaluating these classes, which supports the use of a differentiated scale than we are using for other classes. First, the small class size allows that 1 student can have a major impact on points. Secondly, the teachers will be a larger part of the collaborative process in goal setting, as they understand the student's demonstrated previous growth.

Procedure

The three elementary developmental classrooms (12:1:1) will use targets set for acceptable growth based on each student's starting point. The students will use Aimsweb. Specific starting points of assessment will be established at the beginning of the year between the teacher and the Assistant Director of Special Education. We will adhere to the Aimsweb grade level expectations to the extent practicable, except in circumstances where students are unable to obtain a score in the areas of RCBM, MAZE, MCOMP and MCAP. Those students will be assessed on the Test of Early Literacy and the Test of Early Numeracy.

Roll Out

1. Principals will meet with all special education teachers to establish goal setting (September)
2. Assistant Directors will train elementary 12:1:1 teachers in the administration and scoring of AIMSWEB assessments.
3. At the completion, the teacher will meet with the AD and set performance targets for the students based on the rate of growth.
4. After the third administration, point conversions will be sent to the building principals, as lead evaluators.

2.11 HEDI Tables for 2.2-2.10

Scoring

The following point values will be assigned based on the spring benchmark:

3 points for each student who exceeds the growth target

2 points for each student who meets the growth target

1 point for each student who makes progress towards the growth target

0 points for students who do not make progress and/or regress

The table below assigns a HEDI score based upon the percentage of total points available:

Highly Effective: 90-100%

Effective: 62-89%

Developing: 45-61%

Ineffective: 0-44%

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	94-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	73-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	40-0%

Grade 3-5 Life Skills

Our District’s minimum growth expectation is that all students will earn a minimum level of 3 on the NYSAA. Teachers will be scored based on the percentage of students meeting the minimum growth expectation.

Highly Effective: 90-100%

Effective: 62-89%

Developing: 45-61%

Ineffective: 0-44%

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	94-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	73-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	40-0%

Grade K-2 Life Skills

Unique factors must be taken into consideration when assessing the growth of students with severe disabilities. These students are often un-testable on traditional standardized tests. The curriculum is completely modified and students are required to meet alternate performance indicators (AGLI’s) rather than the general performance indicators of the New York State Standards and Common Core Standards.

At this time, New York State assesses these students through the New York State Alternate Assessment, which is a datafolio of student evidence that aligns with the alternate performance indicators of the grade equivalent areas being tested in the general education classes. For the purposes of measuring student growth for APPR, the district will conduct a parallel process where teachers will submit evidence of student work in ELA and Mathematics (directly from the NYSAA when applicable) to the Assistant Directors of Special Education for the purpose of evaluating the work for student growth and rigor.

Procedure

Classroom teachers will establish starting points by using each student’s Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Teachers will focus on the present levels of performance, assessment data and annual goals to determine the alternate performance indicator in ELA and Mathematics. Teachers will create a baseline assessment task that will be scored for accuracy and independence, and will be used to measure growth herein. Four *additional* data points will be assessed from October through May, which must reflect increased rigor. At the completion of the assessment period, all data will be submitted to the respective Assistant Director of Special Education to evaluate the growth and rigor and will be scored with the established point value submitted to the state.

Roll Out

1. Principals will meet with all special education teachers to establish goal setting (September)
2. The Assistant Director will train all 6:1:1 and 8:1:1 teachers in establishing baseline, selecting appropriate and rigorous alternate performance indicators, evidence collection and the scoring process.
3. The Assistant Director will meet with all 6:1:1 and 8:1:1 teachers in February to see the data from the 4 points of data collection (from the NYSAA when applicable). At that time, the necessary evidence for the 5th data collection point will be established individually.
4. The final datafolio will be submitted to the Assistant Director of Special Education for final scoring and conversion to HEDI. Scoring will be based on the 4 data points after the baseline. A total collective count for all students in the class who have attended school for at least 75 days will be added together and the HEDI score will be based on the percentage of points achieved out of the maximum possible.

Example: 6 students (who have attended at least 75 days) x 128 points = 768 maximum

Total points received: 691

691/768= 90% = 18 HEDI points = Highly Effective

5. Point conversions will be sent to the building principals, as lead evaluators.

**Scoring Criteria (Sample Form)
Scoring Summary Table for English Language Arts and Math**

<p>Student Performance</p> <p>AGLI 1</p>	<p>Baseline</p> <p>Date 1:</p>	<p>Date 2:</p>	<p>Date 3:</p>	<p>Date 4:</p>	<p>Date 5:</p>
<p>Level of Accuracy</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>
<p>Level of Independence</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>	<p>____%</p> <p>___Rating</p>
<p>AGLI 2</p>	<p>Baseline</p> <p>Date 1:</p>	<p>Date 2:</p>	<p>Date 3:</p>	<p>Date 4:</p>	<p>Date 5:</p>

WILLIAM FLOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT 9/25/2012
 2.11 HEDI Tables for 2.2-2.10

Level of Accuracy	_____% ____ Rating				
Level of Independence	_____% ____ Rating				

____/

Percent to Rating Conversion Table

Scoring Rubric	Level	100%-80%	79%-60%	59%-30%	29%-0%
	Rating	4	3	2	1

Datafolio Points to HEDI Conversion with a Maximum Point Value for One Student

Highly Effective: 90-100%

Effective: 62-89%

Developing: 45-61%

Ineffective: 0-44%

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	94-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	73-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	30-0%
122-128 pts.	119-121 pts.	115-118 pts.	111-114 pts.	109-110 pts.	105-108 pts.	102-104 pts.	96-101 pts.	94-95 pts.	89-93 pts.	84-88 pts.	79-83 pts.	77-78 pts.	74-76 pts.	71-73 pts.	69-70 pts.	64-68 pts.	57-63 pts.	51-56 pts.	39-50 pts.	0-38 pts.

3.1 Grade 4-8 ELA NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

The William Floyd School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA MAP assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades 4-8. The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. William Floyd’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

GRADES 4-8 ELA

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
14	0.9	1.2
15	1.2	

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
8	-0.9	-0.6
9	-0.6	-0.3
10	-0.3	0.0
11	0.0	0.3
12	0.3	0.6
13	0.6	0.9

3.3 HEDI Tables

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
3	-2.4	-2.1
4	-2.1	-1.8
5	-1.8	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.2
7	-1.2	-0.9

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-3.0
1	-3.0	-2.7
2	-2.7	-2.4

3.2 Grade 4-8 Math

GRADES 4-8 MATH

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
14	0.9	1.2
15	1.2	

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
8	-0.9	-0.6
9	-0.6	-0.3
10	-0.3	0.0
11	0.0	0.3
12	0.3	0.6
13	0.6	0.9

WILLIAM FLOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT 9/23/2012

3.3 HEDI Tables

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
3	-2.4	-2.1
4	-2.1	-1.8
5	-1.8	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.2
7	-1.2	-0.9

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
0		-3.0
1	-3.0	-2.7
2	-2.7	-2.4

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1				State 20%				Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
5	ELEMENTARY ALL COURSES								
6	Elem	k	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
7	Elem	1	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
8	Elem	2	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
9	Elem	k	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
10	Elem	1	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
11	Elem	2	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
12	Elem	3	ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	State	3rd grade ELA state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
13	Elem	3	Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	State	3rd grade Math state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
14	Elem	Grade 4	ELA	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
15	Elem	Grade 4	Math	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
16	Elem	Grade 5	ELA	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
17	Elem	Grade 5	Math	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5rd grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
18	Elem	Grade 1-3 reading	Reading	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
19	Elem	Grade 4-5 reading	Reading	State Assessment	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Assessment	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
20	Elem	Elem LLI	Reading	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
21	Elem	K-2 Resource	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
22	Elem	3-5 Resource	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
23	Elem	K-2 ESL	ESL	District	William Floyd developed pre-assessment (Prior NYSESLAT)	District	William Floyd developed NYSESLAT	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
24	Elem	3-5 ESL Non State tested	ESL	District	William Floyd developed pre-assessment (Prior NYSESLAT)	District	William Floyd developed NYSESLAT	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
25	Elem	3-5 ESL State Tested	ESL	District	William Floyd developed pre-assessment (Prior NYSESLAT)	State	ELA Grade 3-5 state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
26	Elem	K-2 Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
27	Elem	K-2 Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
28	Elem	3rd Grade Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	State	3rd grade ELA state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
29	Elem	3rd Grade Self Contained	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	Measures of Academic Progress Math	State	3rd grade Math state assessment	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
30	Elem	4th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
31	Elem	4th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	4th grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math
32	Elem	5th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5th grade ELA state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA
33	Elem	5th Grade self contained	Special Ed	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	5th grade Math state assessment	Measures of Academic Progress Math
34	Elem	1-5 Developmental classes	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb ELA	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb ELA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
35	Elem	1-5 Developmental classes	Special Ed	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb Math	Approved 3rd party	AIMSweb Math	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
36	Elem	Elem Life skills classes	Special Ed	District	William Floyd Developed pre-Assessment Comparable to NYSAA	State	NYSAA	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA/Math Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
37	Elem	K-5 Art	Art	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
38	Elem	k-5 PE	PE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Prior Year's Fitness Assessment)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
39	Elem	K-5 Music	Music	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	For each school, average of 5th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)
40	SECONDARY ALL COURSES							
41	HS	ADV DESIGN 1	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
42	HS	AP ADVANCED ART	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
43	HS	ART HISTORY	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	Art History Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
44	HS	CERAMICS	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
45	HS	DRAWING	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
46	HS	FASHION DESIGN	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
47	HS	ILLUSTRATION	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
48	HS	PHOTOGRAPHY 1	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
49	HS	PHOTOGRAPHY 2	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
50	HS	PHOTOGRAPHY 3	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
51	HS	PORTFOLIO PREP	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
52	HS	SCULPTURE	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
53	HS	STUDIO IN ART	ART	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Essential Elements)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
54	HS	STUDIO PAINTING	ART	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	District	William Floyd Developed Studio Art Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
55	HS	Physical Education	ATHLETICS/PE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Prior Year's Fitness Assessment)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
56	HS	PROJECT ADVENTURE	ATHLETICS/PE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Prior Year's Fitness Assessment)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
57	HS	ACCOUNTING	BUSINESS	State	Integated Algebra regents	District	William Floyd Developed NOCTI/CTE project (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
58	HS	BUS OWNER/MGMT	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
59	HS	BUSINESS ENGLISH	BUSINESS	State	English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
60	HS	BUSINESS LAW	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
61	HS	BUSINESS OF MUSIC	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
62	HS	INTERN. PROGRAM	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
63	HS	CAREER PORTFOLIO	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
64	HS	COLLEGE ACCOUNTING	BUSINESS	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
65	HS	COLLEGE PREP	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Deveoped pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
66	HS	COMPUTER APPS	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
67	HS	ENTERTAINMENT MKTG	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
68	HS	FASHION MARKETING	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
69	HS	MATH APPS FOR BUS.	BUSINESS	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Math Apps for Business Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
70	HS	MONEY MANAGEMENT	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
71	HS	PERSONAL KEYBOARDING	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
72	HS	SPORTS MARKETING	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
73	HS	VIDEO GAME DESIGN	BUSINESS	District	District created pre-assessment (Combo Art & Tech)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
74	HS	VIRTUAL ENTERPRISE	BUSINESS	District	District created pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
75	HS	WEB DESIGN	BUSINESS	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Combo Art & Tech)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
76	HS	WORK BASED EXPERIENCE	BUSINESS	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
77	HS	CARPENTRY	CTE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
78	HS	COSMETOLOGY	CTE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
79	HS	CULINARY	CTE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
80	HS	AP ENG LIT 12	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
81	HS	AP ENGLISH LANG 11	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	State	ELA Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
82	HS	BRITISH LIT.	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
83	HS	CHILDREN'S LITERATURE	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
84	HS	CREATIVE WRITING	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
85	HS	ENGLISH 10 & 10H	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
86	HS	ENGLISH 11	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	State	English Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
87	HS	ENGLISH 12H	ENGLISH	State	Prior years English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
88	HS	ENGLISH 9 & 9H	ENGLISH	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
89	HS/MS	ESL	ESL	State	Prior Year NYSESLAT	State	NYSESLAT	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
90	HS	ITALIAN 1	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (8th grade Italian final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint A	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
91	HS	ITALIAN 2	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint A)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
92	HS	ITALIAN 3R	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Level 2 Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint B	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
93	HS	ITALIAN 4	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
94	HS	ITALIAN 5 ACC	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
95	HS	SPANISH 1	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (8th grade Spanish final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint A	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
96	HS	SPANISH 2	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint A)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
97	HS	SPANISH 3R	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Level 2 Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Checkpoint B	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
98	HS	SPANISH 4	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
99	HS	SPANISH 5 ACCL	FOR.LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Checkpoint B)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
100	HS	HEALTH	HEALTH	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
101	HS	INTRODUCTION TO MEDICINE	HEALTH	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
102	HS	ADVANCED ALGEBRA	MATH	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
103	HS	ALGEBRA 2	MATH	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
104	HS	ALGEBRA 2 / TRIGONOMETRY	MATH	State	Geometry Regents	State	Algebra II Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
105	HS	/TRIGONOMETRY ACC	MATH	State	Geometry Regents	State	Algebra II Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
106	HS	ALGEBRA I (Integrated)	MATH	State	Math grade 8 state assessment or Int Alg regents	State	Integrated Algebra regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
107	HS	AP CALCULUS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig Regents	State	AP exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
108	HS	BUSINESS MATH	MATH	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
109	HS	CALCULUS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
110	HS	GEOMETRY	MATH	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	State	Geometry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
111	HS	GEOMETRY (NR)	MATH	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
112	HS	GEOMETRY HONORS	MATH	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	State	Geometry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
113	HS	PRE-ALGEBRA	MATH	State	Math grade 8 state assessment or Int Alg regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
114	HS	PRE-CALCULUS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
115	HS	PRE-CALCULUS HONORS	MATH	State	Algebra 2/Trig regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
116	HS	STATISTICS	MATH	State	Integated Algebra regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
117	HS	TRIGONOMETRY	MATH	State	Geometry regents	State	Trigonometry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
118	HS	MUSIC IN OUR LIVES	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
119	HS	MUSIC THEORY 1	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
120	HS	MUSIC THEORY 2	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Music Theory 1 Final)	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
121	HS	Performing Choir 11-12	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
122	HS	Performing Concert Band 9-11	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
123	HS	Performing Concert Orchestra 9-11	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
124	HS	Performing Symphonic 9-12	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
125	HS	Performing Wind 10-12	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
126	HS	PIANO 1	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Scored)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
127	HS	PIANO 2	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Score)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
128	HS	PIANO 3	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Score)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
129	HS	Women's Choir 10-11	MUSIC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment Audition (Rubric Score)	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Evaluation (Rubric Score)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
130	HS	NJROTC 1	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
131	HS	NJROTC 2	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
132	HS	NJROTC 3	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
133	HS	NJROTC 4	NJROTC	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
134	HS	AP BIOLOGY	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
135	HS	AP BIOLOGY HONORS	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
136	HS	AP CHEMISTRY HONORS	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science regents	State	Chemistry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
137	HS	ASTRONOMY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
138	HS	CHEMISTRY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	State	Chemistry Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
139	HS	EARTH SCIENCE	SCIENCE	State	Living Env. Regents	State	Earth Science Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
140	HS	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	SCIENCE	State	Living Env. Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
141	HS	FORENSICS	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
142	HS	GENERAL CHEMISTRY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	State	Chemistry regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
143	HS	LIVING ENVIRONMENT	SCIENCE	State	Science grade 8 state assessment	State	Living Env. Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
144	HS	MARINE SCIENCE	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
145	HS	METEOROLOGY	SCIENCE	State	Earth Science Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
146	HS	PHYSICS	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry Regents	State	Physics Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
147	HS	PHYSICS HONORS	SCIENCE	State	Chemistry Regents	State	Physics Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
148	HS	AP ECONOMICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	State	Regents - Physics	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
149	HS	AP US GOV'T & POLITICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
150	HS	AP US HISTORY	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	Global II Regents	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
151	HS	AP WORLD HISTORY	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (a prior AP exam)	State	AP Exam	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
152	HS	CRIM JUSTICE	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
153	HS	ECONOMICS	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
154	HS	GLOBAL ST. 1	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
155	HS	GLOBAL ST. 2	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	Global 1 - Final	State	Global Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
156	HS	PART IN GOV'T	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
157	HS	PSYCHOLOGY	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
158	HS	US HIST & GOVT	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	Global II Regents	State	US History Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
159	HS	WORLD HISTORY AP PREP	SOCIAL STUDIES	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
160	HS	BUSINESS MATH	SPECIAL ED	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
161	HS	CAREER PORTFOLIO	SPECIAL ED	District	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
162	HS	CONSUMER MATH	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
163	HS	CONSUMER MATH 11/12/12+ NB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
164	HS	CONSUMER MATH 9/10	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
165	HS	CONSUMER MATH LAB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
166	HS	CONSUMER MATH PM BOCES	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
167	HS	EARTH SCIENCE	SPECIAL ED	State	Living Env. Regents	State	Regents - Earth Science	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
168	HS	ECONOMICS	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
169	HS	ECONOMICS/PART IN GOV'T	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
170	HS	ECONOMICS/PART IN GOV'T	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
171	HS	ENGLISH 10	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
172	HS	ENGLISH 11	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years english regents)	State	English regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
173	HS	ENGLISH 12	SPECIAL ED	State	English Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
174	HS	ENGLISH 9	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
175	HS	EXPLORATORY FINE ARTS	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
176	HS	FINE ARTS	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Performance Based Assessment (Rubric Scored)	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
177	HS	GEOMETRY (NR)	SPECIAL ED	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
178	HS	GEOMETRY NR (9th)	SPECIAL ED	State	Integrated Algebra regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
179	HS	GLOBAL ST 1	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
180	HS	GLOBAL ST 2	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Global 1 - Final)	State	Global Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
181	HS	HEALTH	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
182	HS	INTEGRATED ALGEBRA	SPECIAL ED	State	Math grade 8 state assessment or Int Alg regents	State	Integrated Algebra Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
183	HS	LANGUAGE REMEDIATION	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed English Grade 9 Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
184	HS	LIFE SKILLS	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
185	HS	LIFE SKILLS 1C	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
186	HS	LIFE SKILLS 11/12/12+ NB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
187	HS	LIFE SKILLS 5	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
188	HS	LIFE SKILLS 9/1C	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
189	HS	LIVING ENVIRONMENT	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years Regents)	State	Living Env. Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1				State 20%				Local 20%
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline			Summative	
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)
190	HS	LIVING ENVIRONMENT 9	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years Regents)	State	Living Env. Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
191	HS	ENVIRONMENT X1	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (prior years Regents)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
192	HS	PART IN GOVT	SPECIAL ED	State	US History Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
193	HS	PRE-ALGEBRA	SPECIAL ED	State	Math grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
194	HS	READING	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
195	HS	READING 11/12/12+ NB	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
196	HS	READING 9/10	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
197	HS	Resource Room	SPECIAL ED	State	ELA Grade 8 state assessment	State	English Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
198	HS	SCHOOL TO WORK	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Performance Checklist)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
199	HS	SCHOOL TO WORK 12	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Performance Checklist)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
200	HS	US HISTORY	SPECIAL ED	State	Global II Regents	State	US History Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
201	HS	US HISTORY & GOV'T	SPECIAL ED	State	Global II Regents	State	US History Regents	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
202	HS	WRITING	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
203	HS	WRITING 9/10	SPECIAL ED	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
204	HS	ADV COMP ANIM.	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
205	HS	ADV. C.A.D.	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
206	HS	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
207	HS	ARCHITECT. PROB.	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
208	HS	C.A.D.	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
209	HS	COMP ANIM./MULTI	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.
210	HS	DESIGN & DRAWING	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1					State 20%			Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service		Baseline		Summative		
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
211	HS	ELECTRONICS	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
212	HS	MATERIALS PROCESSING	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
213	HS	MEDIA PROD TECH	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
214	HS	PRINC. OF ENGINEERING	TECHNOLOGY	State	Integated Algebra Regents	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
215	HS	PRODUCTION SYSTEMS	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
216	HS	TRANS. SYSTEMS	TECHNOLOGY	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (Grade 8 Tech Final)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	The increase in the percentage of students passing the five required regents exams with their cohort.	
217	MS	Art 6-8	Art	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
218	MS	English 6-8	English	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
219	MS	Italian 8	FOR. LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
220	MS	Spanish 8	FOR. LANGUAGE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
221	MS	Health 6-8	HEALTH	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
222	MS	Math 6-8	Math	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
223	MS	General Music, Band, Chorus & Orchestra	Music	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
224	MS	P.E. 6-8	Phys. Ed.	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
225	MS	Science 6	SCIENCE	State	ELA and Math Grade 5 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
226	MS	Science 7	SCIENCE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (6th grade final from prior year)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
227	MS	Science 8 Honors (EARTH SCIENCE)	SCIENCE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (7th grade final from prior year)	State	8th grade state Assesment in science or Earth Science regents exam	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
228	MS	Science 8 (Living Environment)	SCIENCE	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (7th grade final from prior year)	State	8th grade state Assesment in science or Earth Science regents exam	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
229	MS	S.S. 6	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	ELA Grade 5 state assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
230	MS	S.S. 7	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (6th grade final from prior year)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	

William Floyd APPR TEMPLATE Elementary/Secondary (State and Local 20%)

12/3/2012

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	
1				State 20%				Local 20%	
2		Course Name	Department/Service	Baseline		Summative			
3	School			Type	Description	Type	Description	Local (To Be Negotiated)	
231	MS	S.S. 8	SOCIAL STUDIES	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment (7th grade science final from prior year)	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
232	MS	Resource Room (6-8)	SPECIAL ED	State	Prior ELA state assessment	State	ELA State Assessment	Measures of Academic Progress ELA/Math	
233	MS	12.1.1	SPECIAL ED.	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
234	MS	8.1.1	SPECIAL ED.	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment comparable to NYSAA	District	William Floyd Developed Student specific assessment based on IEP Goals	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
235	MS	15:1:1 6th grade ELA	SPECIAL ED.	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress ELA	
236	MS	15:1:1 6th grade Math	SPECIAL ED.	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	Measures of Academic Progress Math	
237	MS	Reading	SPECIAL ED.	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	State	State Assessment (State provided Measure of Student Growth)	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
238	MS	Technology 6-8	Technology	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
239	MS	Family and Consumer Science 7	Family and Consumer Science 7	District	William Floyd Developed pre-assessment	District	William Floyd Developed Course Final	For each school, average of 8th grade teachers' State Provided ELA Mean Growth Percentile (MGP)	
240									

3.4: Grades K-3 ELA

Formula for Determining HEDI Scales:

For each School, each 5th grade teacher’s State Provided MGP (Mean Growth Percentile) for ELA and Math will be added and then divided by the total number of 5th grade teachers resulting in a point value. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20.

- Highly Effective: 18-20
- Effective: 9-17
- Developing: 3-8
- Ineffective: 0-2

Example:

6 Teacher State scores = 81
 $81/6 = 13.5$ points = 14 points

- Highly Effective = 101-120
- Effective = 49-102
- Developing = 13-48
- Ineffective = 0-12

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
120-115	114-109	108-103	102-97	96-91	90-85	84-79	78-73	72-67	66-61	60-55	54-49	48-42	42-37	36-31	30-25	24-19	18-13	12-7	6-1	0

3.5: Grades K-3 Math

Formula for Determining HEDI Scales:

For each School, each 5th grade teacher’s State Provided MGP (Mean Growth Percentile) for Math will be added and then divided by the total number of 5th grade teachers resulting in a point value. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20.

Highly Effective: 18-20

Effective: 9-17

Developing: 3-8

Ineffective: 0-2

Example:

6 Teacher State scores = 81

$81/6 = 13.5$ points = 14 points

Highly Effective = 101-120

Effective = 49-102

Developing = 13-48

Ineffective = 0-12

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
120-115	114-109	108-103	102-97	96-91	90-85	84-79	78-73	72-67	66-61	60-55	54-49	48-42	42-37	36-31	30-25	24-19	18-13	12-7	6-1	0

3.6: Grades 6-8 Science

3.7: Grades 6-8 Social Studies

Formula for Determining HEDI Scales:

For each School, each 8th grade teacher’s State Provided MGP (Mean Growth Percentile) for ELA will be added and then divided by the total number of 8th grade teachers resulting in a point value. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20.

Highly Effective: 18-20

Effective: 9-17

Developing: 3-8

Ineffective: 0-2

Example:

6 Teacher State scores = 81

$81/6 = 13.5$ points = 14 points

Highly Effective = 101-120

Effective = 49-102

Developing = 13-48

Ineffective = 0-12

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
120-115	114-109	108-103	102-97	96-91	90-85	84-79	78-73	72-67	66-61	60-55	54-49	48-42	42-37	36-31	30-25	24-19	18-13	12-7	6-1	0

3.8: High School Social Studies

3.9: High School Science

3.10: High School Math

3.11: High School English Language Arts

Formula for Determining HEDI Scales:

For High School teachers, HEDI categories will be assigned based on a composite measure of the increase in the percentage of required Regents' exams passed by all students in the 4 high school grades (9-12). Student progress will be tracked by the number of students meeting the benchmark at the end of the year for their grade level: Freshman year - 2 required Regents exams; Sophomore year - 3 required Regents exams; Junior year - 4 required Regents exams; and Senior year - 5 required Regents exams. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20 and reflect an increase in the percentage of students achieving passing scores for the 5 required regents.

Highly Effective 18-20 = 74.3% - 74.5% or more

Effective 9-17 = 70.2% -74.2%

Developing 3-8 = 67.2% - 70.1%

Ineffective 0-2 = 0% - 67.1%

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
74.5% +	74.4%	74.3%	74.2%	74.1- 73.7%	73.6- 73.2%	73.1- 72.7%	72.6- 72.2%	72.1- 71.7%	71.6- 71.2%	71.1- 70.7%	70.6- 70.2%	70.1- 69.7%	69.6- 69.2%	69.1- 68.7%	68.6- 68.2%	68.1- 67.7%	67.6- 67.2%	67.1- 66.7%	66.6- 66.2%	66.1- 0%
+0.1	+0.1	+0.1	+0.1	+0.1- 0.5	+1- 66.1															

3.12: All other courses

All other 6-8 Courses not listed above, K-5 Art, K-5 Physical Education, K-5 Music, 1-3 Reading, Leveled Literacy Instruction, K-2 Resource, 1-5 Developmental, K-5 Life Skills, K-5 English as a Second Language

Formula for Determining HEDI Scales:

For each Grade 6-8 School, each 8th grade teacher’s State Provided MGP (Mean Growth Percentile) for ELA will be added and then divided by the total number of 8th grade teachers resulting in a point value. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20.

Highly Effective: 18-20

Effective: 9-17

Developing: 3-8

Ineffective: 0-2

Example:

6 Teacher State scores = 81
 $81/6 = 13.5$ points = 14 points

Highly Effective = 101-120

Effective = 49-102

Developing = 13-48

Ineffective = 0-12

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
120-115	114-109	108-103	102-97	96-91	90-85	84-79	78-73	72-67	66-61	60-55	54-49	48-42	42-37	36-31	30-25	24-19	18-13	12-7	6-1	0

All other High School Courses not listed above.

Formula for Determining HEDI Scales:

For High School teachers, HEDI categories will be assigned based on a composite measure of the increase in the percentage of required Regents' exams passed by all students in the 4 high school grades (9-12). Student progress will be tracked by the number of students meeting the benchmark at the end of the year for their grade level: Freshman year - 2 required Regents exams; Sophomore year - 3 required Regents exams; Junior year - 4 required Regents exams; and Senior year - 5 required Regents exams. Point values will be distributed across the HEDI scale. The HEDI scale range will be determined by the maximum number of points (20) that can be earned. Points will be distributed between 0 and 20 and reflect an increase in the percentage of students achieving passing scores for the 5 required regents.

Highly Effective 18-20 = 74.3% - 74.5% or more

Effective 9-17 = 70.2% -74.2%

Developing 3-8 = 67.2% - 70.1%

Ineffective 0-2 = 0% - 67.1%

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE			
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
74.5%	74.4%	74.3%	74.2%	74.1-73.7%	73.6-73.2%	73.1-72.7%	72.6-72.2%	72.1-71.7%	71.6-71.2%	71.1-70.7%	70.6-70.2%	70.1-69.7%	69.6-69.2%	69.1-68.7%	68.6-68.2%	68.1-67.7%	67.6-67.2%	67.1-66.7%	66.6-66.2%	66.1-0%
+0.1	+0.1	+0.1	+0.1	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+0.1-0.5	+1-66.1

6-8 Resource Room, 4-5 Reading, 3-5 Resource – NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP)

The William Floyd School District will be using value-added measures based on the NWEA MAP assessment to calculate teacher-level effectiveness ratings for the locally selected measures of student growth in ELA in grades 4-8. The term “value-added” refers to the contributions educators and schools make to student outcomes, such as performance on standardized assessments. Value-added models provide a way to measure this contribution separately from factors that influence student outcomes, but over which a teacher or school has no control. They do this by statistically controlling for factors such as students’ socio-economic status and projecting how students will perform on assessments based on actual outcomes from similar students in the state. This allows the model to produce estimates of productivity – value-added indicators – under the counterfactual assumption that all schools serve the same group of students. This facilitates apples-to-apples teacher comparisons, rather than apples-to-oranges comparisons. The objective is to facilitate valid and fair comparisons of productivity with respect to student outcomes, given that teachers often serve very different student populations. William Floyd’s analyses will be conducted by the Value-Added Research Center on NWEA’s MAP assessment. Major modeling decisions were decided by a Technical Advisory Panel made up of volunteer districts from across the state.

GRADES 4-8 ELA

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
14	0.9	1.2
15	1.2	

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
8	-0.9	-0.6
9	-0.6	-0.3
10	-0.3	0.0
11	0.0	0.3
12	0.3	0.6
13	0.6	0.9

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
3	-2.4	-2.1

3.13 HEDI Tables for 3.4-3.12

4	-2.1	-1.8
5	-1.8	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.2
7	-1.2	-0.9

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
0		-3.0
1	-3.0	-2.7
2	-2.7	-2.4

GRADES 4-8 MATH

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

Within the category of Highly Effective, those teachers who fall at greater than or equal to .9 standard deviations above average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	≥	<
14	0.9	1.2
15	1.2	

WILLIAM FLOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT 9/25/2012
3.13 HEDI Tables for 3.4-3.12

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

Within the category of Effective, those teachers who fall at less than .9 standard deviations above average and greater than or equal to -.9 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
8	-0.9	-0.6
9	-0.6	-0.3
10	-0.3	0.0
11	0.0	0.3
12	0.3	0.6
13	0.6	0.9

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

Within the category of Developing, those teachers who fall at less than -.9 standard deviations below average and greater than or equal to -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
3	-2.4	-2.1
4	-2.1	-1.8

WILLIAM FLOYD SCHOOL DISTRICT 9/25/2012

3.13 HEDI Tables for 3.4-3.12

5	-1.8	-1.5
6	-1.5	-1.2
7	-1.2	-0.9

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

Within the category of Ineffective, those teachers who fall at less than -2.4 standard deviations below average, we further divide the distribution to determine specific points. The specific point breakdown, with upper and lower bounds denoted in standard deviation units, is as follows:

APPR Point	\geq	$<$
0		-3.0
1	-3.0	-2.7
2	-2.7	-2.4

	A	B
1	Total Average Rubric Score	Category
2		Ineffective 0-49
3	1	
4	1.1	
5	1.2	
6	1.3	
7	1.4	
8	1.5	
9	1.6	
10		Developing 50-56
11	1.7	
12	1.8	
13	1.9	
14	2	
15	2.1	
16	2.2	
17	2.3	
18	2.4	
19	2.5	
20	2.6	
21		Effective 57-58
22	2.7	
23	2.8	
24	2.9	
25	3	
26	3.1	
27	3.2	
28	3.3	
29	3.4	
30	3.5	
31	3.6	
32		Highly Effective 59-60
33	3.7	
34	3.8	
35	3.9	

	A	B
36	4	
37		
38	*All Rules of Rounding Apply.	

	C
1	Conversion score for composite
2	
3	0
4	8.2
5	16.4
6	24.6
7	32.8
8	41
9	49
10	
11	50
12	50.6
13	51.2
14	51.9
15	52.5
16	53.2
17	53.9
18	54.5
19	55.2
20	56
21	
22	57
23	57.1
24	57.2
25	57.3
26	57.4
27	57.5
28	57.6
29	57.7
30	57.8
31	58
32	
33	59
34	59.3
35	59.6

	c
36	60
37	
38	

Revised HEDI Language for Task 8 Principals scoring

The principal's will receive a score based on the percentage of students who meet their targets set at the beginning of the school year on the following assessments: Measures of Academic Progress assessments; NYS Regents assessments, and William Floyd Developed assessments. Students' baseline scores will be compared to end of year assessment results (Measures of Academic Progress assessments, NYS Regents assessments, and William Floyd Developed assessments) to measure student growth. Principals will meet with their supervisors in the fall to determine targets for all HEDI categories.

Highly Effective: 90-100% of verified students meet their target

Effective: 62-89% of verified students meet their target

Developing: 45-61% of verified students meet their target

Ineffective: 0-44% of verified students meet their target

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE			EFFECTIVE									DEVELOPING						INEFFECTIVE		
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-96%	95-93%	92-90%	89-87%	86-85%	84-82%	81-80%	79-75%	74-73%	72-70%	69-66%	65-62%	61-60%	59-58%	57-56%	55-54%	53-50%	49-45%	44-40%	39-31%	30-0%

Domain 1- shared vision of learning (5 points)

	ineffective	Developing	Effective	highly effective
Culture (3 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Sustainability (1 area)	1	2	3	4
POINT TOTAL DOMAIN 1	4	8	12	16

CONVERSION CHART	
4 POINTS-7 points	TOTAL = 1.25
8 POINTS - 11 points	TOTAL = 2.5
12 POINTS to 15 points	TOTAL= 3.
16 POINTS	TOTAL= 5

Domain 2- School Culture and Instructional Program (8 Points)

	ineffective	Developing	Effective	highly effective
Culture (3 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Instructional program (3 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Capacity building (2 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Sustainability (1 area)	1	2	3	4
Strategic planning process (1 area)	1	2	3	4
POINT TOTAL DOMAIN 2	10	20	30	40

CONVERSION CHART	
10 POINTS - 19 points	TOTAL = 2
20 POINTS-29 points	TOTAL = 4
30 POINTS-39 points	TOTAL= 6
40 POINTS	TOTAL= 8

Domain 3 - Safe, Efficient , Effective Learning Environment (6 points)

	ineffective	Developing	Effective	highly effective
Capacity building (2 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Culture (1 area)	1	2	3	4
Sustainability (1 area)	1	2	3	4
Instructional Program (1 area)	1	2	3	4
POINT TOTAL DOMAIN 3	5	10	15	20

CONVERSION CHART	
5 POINTS -9 point	TOTAL = 1.5
10 POINTS-14 points	TOTAL = 3
15 POINTS -19 points	TOTAL= 4.5
20 POINTS	TOTAL= 6

Domain 4 – Community (5 points)

	ineffective	Developing	Effective	highly effective
Strategic planning process (1 area)	1	2	3	4
Culture (1 area)	1	2	3	4
Sustainability (1 area)	1	2	3	4
POINT TOTAL DOMAIN 4	3	6	9	12

CONVERSION CHART	
3 POINTS -5 points	TOTAL = 1.25
6 POINTS -8 points	TOTAL = 2.5
9 POINTS -11 points	TOTAL= 3.75
12 POINTS	TOTAL= 5

Domain 5 Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (6 points)

	ineffective	Developing	Effective	highly effective
Sustainability (3 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Culture (3 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
POINT TOTAL DOMAIN 5	6	12	18	24

CONVERSION CHART	
6 POINTS-11 points	TOTAL = 1.5
12 POINTS-17 points	TOTAL = 3.0
18 POINTS-23 points	TOTAL= 4.5
24 POINTS	TOTAL= 6

Domain 6- Political, Social, Economic, Legal and cultural context (5 points)

	ineffective	Developing	Effective	highly effective
Sustainability (2 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Culture (1 area)	1	2	3	4
POINT TOTAL DOMAIN 6	3	6	9	12

CONVERSION CHART	
3 POINTS- 5 points	TOTAL = 1.25
6 POINTS- points	TOTAL = 2.5
9 POINTS - 11 points	TOTAL= 3.75
12 POINTS	TOTAL= 5

Other- (5 points)

	ineffective	Developing	Effective	highly effective
Uncovering goals (4 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Strategic Planning (4 areas)	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Taking Action 3 areas	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
Evaluating attainment (3 areas)	1	2	3	4

CONVERSION CHART	
14 POINTS - 27 points	TOTAL = 1.5
28 POINTS - 41 points	TOTAL = 3.0
42 POINTS -55 points	TOTAL= 3.75
56 POINTS	TOTAL= 5

	1	2	3	4
	1	2	3	4
POINT TOTAL OTHER	14	28	42	56
TOTAL POINT VALUE ALL DOMAINS	31	62	93	124

*If all Domains earn a score of 1, the HEDI score will equal 0.

FINAL CONVERSION CHART

Domain	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
Domain 1	1.25	2.5	3.75	5
Domain 2	2	4	6	8
Domain 3	1.5	3	4.5	6
Domain 4	1.25	2.5	3.75	5
Domain 5	1.5	3	4.5	6
Domain 6	1.25	2.5	3.75	5
Domain 7- OTHER	1.25	2.5	3.75	5
Principal's Contribution	2.5	5	7.5	10
Building Goals	1.25	2.5	3.75	5
Individual Goals	1.25	2.5	3.75	5
New Point Range	0-29 points	30-44 points	45-59 points	60 points

- A. **Teacher Improvement Plan:** An improvement plan defines specific standards-based goals that a teacher must make progress toward attaining within a specific period of time, and shall include the identification of areas that need improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support improvement in these areas.

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

In the final stage of the improvement plan, the teacher should meet with his or her supervisor to review the plan, alongside any artifacts and evidence from evaluations, in order to determine if adequate improvement has been made in the required areas outlined within the plan for the teacher. A teacher is entitled to bring a union representative or other colleague to participate in all TIP meetings.

In accordance with regulations the implementation of the TIP must begin no later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the school year for which such teacher's performance is being measured.

William Floyd School District

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Areas That Need Improvement:

Timeline:

Assessment of Improvement:

Activities to Support Improvement:

Comments:

Teacher:

Date

Principal:

Date

Superintendent or Designee :

Date

A. **Principal Improvement Plan:** An improvement plan defines specific standards-based goals that a principal must make progress towards attaining within a specific period of time, and shall include the identification of areas that need improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support improvement in these areas.

The plan will clearly describe the professional learning activities that the educator must complete. These activities should be connected directly to the areas needing improvement. The artifacts that the Principal must produce that can serve as benchmarks of improvement and as evidence for the final stage of the improvement plan should be described, and could include items such as lesson plans and supporting materials, including student work. The supervisors will clearly state in the plan the additional support and assistance that the educator will receive. In the final stage of the improvement plan, the Principal should meet with his or her supervisor to review the plan, alongside any artifacts and evidence from evaluations, in order to determine if adequate improvement has been made in the required areas outlined within the plan for the principal.

In accordance with regulations, the implementation of the PIP must begin no later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the school year for which such principal's performance is being measured.

William Floyd School District
Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

- 1. Areas that need improvement**
- 2. Timeline**
- 3. Assessment of improvement**
- 4. Activities to support improvement**
- 5. Comments**

Principal

Date

Superintendent or Designee

Date

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date:

Pat Curran 11/29/12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Rollin H. Hays 11/28/12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

M. G. Mansh 11/30/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

Pat Hays 11/28/12