



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

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

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

August 14, 2013

Revised

Sharon Huff, Superintendent
Yorkshire-Pioneer Central School District
12125 County Line Rd.
PO Box 579
Yorkshire, NY 14173

Dear Superintendent Huff:

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: Lynda Quick

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

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

Annual Professional Performance Reviews: 2012-13

Created Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Monday, July 22, 2013

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 043501060000

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

043501060000

1.2) School District Name: YORKSHIRE-PIONEER CSD

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

YORKSHIRE-PIONEER CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

-
- 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?

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

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

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	ELA	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWeb
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWeb
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWeb

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

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

Students K-3 will be given a pre-test. Based upon the pre-test, teachers and principals will develop individual student growth targets. Based upon the post-test, teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Highly Effective - Student Growth Percentile 81%-100% = HEDI 20 points (91%-100%) 19 points (86%-90%) 18 points (81%-85%)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Effective - Student Growth Percentile 61%- 80% = HEDI 17 points (79%-80%) 16 points (77%-78%) 15 points (75%-76%) 14 points (73%-74%) 13 points (71%-72%) 12 points (69%-70%) 11 points (67%-68%) 10 points (64%-66%) 9 points (61%-63%)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Developing - Student Growth Percentile 41%-60% = HEDI 8 points (58%-60%) 7 points (55%-57%) 6 points (52%-54%) 5 points (49%-51%) 4 points (45%-48%) 3 points (41%-44%)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Ineffective - Student Growth Percentile 0%-40% = HEDI 2 points (27%-40%) 1 point (13%-26%) 0 points (0-12%)

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	AIMSWeb
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWeb
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWeb

	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.	Students K-3 will be given a pre-test. Based upon the pre-test, teachers and principals will develop individual student growth targets. Based upon the post-test, teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Highly Effective - Student Growth Percentile 81%-100% = HEDI 20 points (91%-100%)

	19 points (86%-90%) 18 points (81%-85%)
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Effective - Student Growth Percentile 61%- 80%= HEDI 17 points (79%-80%) 16 points (77%-78%) 15 points (75%-76%) 14 points (73%-74%) 13 points (71%-72%) 12 points (69%-70%) 11 points (67%-68%) 10 points (64%-66%) 9 points (61%-63%)
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Developing - Student Growth Percentile 41%-60% = HEDI 8 points (58%-60%) 7 points (55%-57%) 6 points (52%-54%) 5 points (49%-51%) 4 points (45%-48%) 3 points (41%-44%)
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Ineffective - Student Growth Percentile 0%-40% = HEDI 2 points (27%-40%) 1 point (13%-26%) 0 points (0-12%)

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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally developed 7th grade science assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students 7-8 will be given a pre-test. Based upon the pre-test, teachers and principals will develop individual student growth targets. Based upon the post-test, teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets. The SLOs for 7th grade Science will be based on student growth from the regionally developed pre and post 7th grade science assessment. Individual student growth targets will be set by the
---	--

7th grade teacher and principal. Students' pre-test scores will be the baseline and compared to the final assessment score (post test) to determine growth. 8th grade teachers will pre-test students based on a locally developed exam created in eDoctrina. The secure test was designed to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. Individual growth targets will be set by the 8th grade teachers and principal. 8th grade teachers will post-test their students using the New York State provided science examination. The HEDI score will be given based on the percentage of students reaching the targets.

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

Highly Effective - Student Growth Percentile
 81%-100% = HEDI
 20 points (91%-100%)
 19 points (86%-90%)
 18 points (81%-85%)

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

Effective - Student Growth Percentile
 61%- 80% = HEDI
 17 points (79%-80%)
 16 points (77%-78%)
 15 points (75%-76%)
 14 points (73%-74%)
 13 points (71%-72%)
 12 points (69%-70%)
 11 points (67%-68%)
 10 points (64%-66%)
 9 points (61%-63%)

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

Developing - Student Growth Percentile
 41%-60% = HEDI
 8 points (58%-60%)
 7 points (55%-57%)
 6 points (52%-54%)
 5 points (49%-51%)
 4 points (45%-48%)
 3 points (41%-44%)

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

Ineffective - Student Growth Percentile
 0%-40% = HEDI
 2 points (27%-40%)
 1 point (13%-26%)
 0 points (0-12%)

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	Not applicable	Not applicable
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cattaraugus-Allegany Regionally developed 7th grade social studies assessment.
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cattaraugus-Allegany Regionally developed 8th grade social studies assessment.

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

Comparable Growth Measures subcomponent. Include any district-determined expectations for student performance.

<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>The SLOs for 7th grade social studies will be based on student growth from the regionally developed pre and post 7th grade social studies assessment. Individual student growth targets will be set by the 7th grade teacher and principal. Students' pre-test scores will be the baseline and compared to the final assessment score (post test) to determine growth. 8th grade teachers will pre-test students based on a locally developed exam created in eDoctrina. The secure test was designed to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. Individual growth targets will be set by the 8th grade teachers and principal. 8th grade teachers will post-test their students using a regionally developed 8th grade social studies examination. The HEDI score will be given based on the percentage of students reaching the targets.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Highly Effective - Student Growth Percentile 81%-100% = HEDI 20 points (91%-100%) 19 points (86%-90%) 18 points (81%-85%)</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Effective - Student Growth Percentile 61%- 80% = HEDI 17 points (79%-80%) 16 points (77%-78%) 15 points (75%-76%) 14 points (73%-74%) 13 points (71%-72%) 12 points (69%-70%) 11 points (67%-68%) 10 points (64%-66%) 9 points (61%-63%)</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Developing - Student Growth Percentile 41%-60% = HEDI 8 points (58%-60%) 7 points (55%-57%) 6 points (52%-54%) 5 points (49%-51%) 4 points (45%-48%) 3 points (41%-44%)</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>Ineffective - Student Growth Percentile 0%-40% = HEDI 2 points (27%-40%) 1 point (13%-26%) 0 points (0-12%)</p>

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	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade 9 Global 1 Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test for Regents Social Studies Courses. Based upon the pre-test, teachers and principals will develop individual student growth targets. The NYS Regents Exam will be used as the post-test for Regents courses. Teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective 81%-100% HEDI 20 points - 91% - 100% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 19 points - 86% - 90% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 18 points - 81% - 85% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective 61%-80% HEDI 17 points - 79% - 80% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 16 points - 77% - 78% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 15 points - 75% - 76% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 14 points - 73% - 74% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 13 points - 71% - 72% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 12 points - 69% - 70% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 11 points - 67% - 68% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 10 points - 64% - 66% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 9 points - 61% - 63% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing 41%-60% HEDI 8 points - 58% - 60% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 7 points- 55% - 57% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 6 points- 52% - 54% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 5 points - 49% - 51% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 4 points - 45% - 48% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 3 points - 41% - 44% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective 0%-40% 2 points - 27% - 40% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 1 points - 13% - 26% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 0 points - 0% - 12% of students achieve their SLO Goals

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.	Students will be given a pre-test for Regents Science Courses. Based upon the pre-test, teachers and principals will develop individual student growth targets. The NYS Regents Exam will be used as the post-test for Regents courses. Teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective 81%-100% HEDI 20 points - 91% - 100% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 19 points - 86% - 90% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 18 points - 81% - 85% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective 61%-80% HEDI 17 points - 79% - 80% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 16 points - 77% - 78% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 15 points - 75% - 76% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 14 points - 73% - 74% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 13 points - 71% - 72% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 12 points - 69% - 70% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 11 points - 67% - 68% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 10 points - 64% - 66% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 9 points - 61% - 63% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing 41%-60% HEDI 8 points - 58% - 60% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 7 points- 55% - 57% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 6 points- 52% - 54% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 5 points - 49% - 51% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 4 points - 45% - 48% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 3 points - 41% - 44% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective 0%-40% HEDI 2 points - 27% - 40% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 1 points - 13% - 26% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 0 points - 0% - 12% of students achieve their SLO Goals

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.	Students will be given a pre-test for High School Math specific to each content area (Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2, Pre-Calculus). Based upon the pre-test, teachers will collaborate with the building principal in setting individual growth targets. The NYS Regents Exam will be used as the post-test for Regents courses. The pre and post-test results will be used to calculate each student's success on his/her growth goal. Teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective 81%-100% HEDI 20 points - 91% - 100% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 19 points - 86% - 90% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 18 points - 81% - 85% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective 61%-80% HEDI 17 points - 79% - 80% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 16 points - 77% - 78% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 15 points - 75% - 76% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 14 points - 73% - 74% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 13 points - 71% - 72% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 12 points - 69% - 70% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 11 points - 67% - 68% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 10 points - 64% - 66% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 9 points - 61% - 63% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing 41%-60% HEDI 8 points - 58% - 60% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 7 points- 55% - 57% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 6 points- 52% - 54% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 5 points - 49% - 51% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 4 points - 45% - 48% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 3 points - 41% - 44% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective 0%-40% 2 points - 27% - 40% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 1 points - 13% - 26% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 0 points - 0% - 12% of students achieve their SLO Goals

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	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed ELA Grade 9
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed ELA Grade 10
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Grade 11 ELA Regents exam

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	Students will be given a pre-test for High School ELA specific to each content area (Grade 9 & 10 ELA, AP English & 9 & 10 ELA Honors, Grade 11 Regents ELA). Based upon the pre-test, teachers and principals will develop individual student growth targets. The NYS Regents Exam will be used as the post-test for Grade 11 ELA. Teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective 81%-100% HEDI 20 points - 91% - 100% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 19 points - 86% - 90% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 18 points - 81% - 85% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective 61%-80% HEDI 17 points - 79% - 80% of students achieve thier SLO Goals; 16 points - 77% - 78% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 15 points - 75% - 76% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 14 points - 73% - 74% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 13 points - 71% - 72% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 12 points - 69% - 70% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 11 points - 67% - 68% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 10 points - 64% - 66% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 9 points - 61% - 63% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing 41%-60% HEDI 8 points - 58% - 60% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 7 points- 55% - 57% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 6 points- 52% - 54% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 5 points - 49% - 51% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 4 points - 45% - 48% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 3 points - 41% - 44% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective 0%-40% HEDI 2 points - 27% - 40% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 1 points - 13% - 26% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 0 points - 0% - 12% of students achieve their SLO Goals

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
All other ELA Teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific All other ELA Teachers not named above
All other Math Teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Math Assessments All other Math Teachers not named above
All other Social Studies Teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Social Studies Assessment All other Social Studies Teacher not named above
All other Science Teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Science Assessments All other Science Teachers not named above
All LOTE Teachers not tested through a Regents Exam	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific LOTE Assessments All LOTE Teachers not tested through a Regents exam
All AP Teachers where subject matter is not tested through a Regents Exam	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific All AP Teachers where subject matter is not through a Regents exam
All Physical Education Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Physical Education Assessments
All Art Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Art Assessments
All Music Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Music Assessments
All Technology Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Technology Assessments
All Agriculture Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Agriculture Assessments
All Business Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Business Assessments
All Home and Careers/Family and Consumer Sciences Teachers	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Home and Careers/FACS Assessments
All Health Teachers	District, Regional or	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific Health

	BOCES-developed	Assessments
All College-level Teachers where subject matter is not tested through a Regents Exam	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES Regionally Developed Grade and Subject Specific College Course Assessments
K-4 Librarians	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSweb K-2
All Self-Contained Special Education Teachers where subject matter is not tested through a State Assessment	State-approved 3rd party assessment	STAR Reading Enterprise (9-12) AIMSweb (K - 8)

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.	Students will be given a pre-test specific to the course. Based upon the pre-test, teachers and principals will develop individual student growth targets. Based upon the post-test, teachers will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	Highly Effective 81%-100% HEDI 20 points - 91% - 100% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 19 points - 86% - 90% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 18 points - 81% - 85% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	Effective 61%-80% HEDI 17 points - 79% - 80% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 16 points - 77% - 78% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 15 points - 75% - 76% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 14 points - 73% - 74% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 13 points - 71% - 72% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 12 points - 69% - 70% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 11 points - 67% - 68% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 10 points - 64% - 66% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 9 points - 61% - 63% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	Developing 41%-60% HEDI 8 points - 58% - 60% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 7 points - 55% - 57% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 6 points - 52% - 54% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 5 points - 49% - 51% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 4 points - 45% - 48% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 3 points - 41% - 44% of students achieve their SLO Goals
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	Ineffective 0%-40% HEDI 2 points - 27% - 40% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 1 points - 13% - 26% of students achieve their SLO Goals; 0 points - 0% - 12% of students achieve their SLO Goals

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

(No response)

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 response)

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

in ways that improve student learning and instruction.

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 Friday, July 19, 2013

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA state assessments
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments

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.

<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>For grades 3 & 4 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 3 & 4 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 760 x 15 (or 20 with no value added). A score of 760 or more will receive a maximum score of 15 points (or 20 with no value added). Points are assigned by building including two elementary buildings. For the middle school, grades 5-8 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 5-8 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 1520 x 15 (or 20 with no value added). A score of 1520 or more will receive a maximum of 15 points (or 20 with no value added). The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score. Where value added does not apply, it would be allocated as follows: 0-2 ineffective; 3-8 developing; 9-17 effective and 18-20 highly effective. Performance Index (PI) will be calculated as follows: A PI from 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $[(\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4})] \div [\text{Count of Cohort Members}] \times 100$.</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>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results far exceed district goals.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Effective (8-13 points) Results meet district goals.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Developing (3-7 points) Results slightly below district goals.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.</p>

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA state assessments

5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 5-8 Math & ELA State assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	For grades 3 & 4 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 3 & 4 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 760 x 15 (or 20 with no value added). A score of 760 or more will receive a maximum of 15 points (or 20 with no value added). Points are assigned by building including two elementary. For the middle school grades 5-8 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 5-8 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 1520 x 15 (or 20 with no value added). A score of 1520 or more will receive a maximum of 15 points (or 20 with no value added). The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score. Where as value added does not apply, it would be allocated as follows: 0-2 ineffective; 3-8 developing; 9-17 effective and 18-20 highly effective. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{[(\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4})] \div [\text{Count of Cohort Members}] \times 100.$
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (8-13 points) Results meet district goals.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-7 points) Results slightly below district goals.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

(No response)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

Measures based on:

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA state assessments
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA State assessments
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA State assessments
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grades 3 & 4 Math & ELA State assessments

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.	For grades 3 & 4 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 3 & 4 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 760 x 20. A score of 760 or more will receive a maximum score of 20 points. Points are assigned by building including two separate elementary buildings. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{[(\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4})]}{[\text{Count of Cohort Members}]} \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17 points) Results meet district goals.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.

3.5) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA state assessments
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA state assessments
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Grade 3 & 4 Math & ELA state assessments

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.

<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 3.13, below.</p>	<p>For grades 3 & 4 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 3 & 4 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 760 x 20. A score of 760 or more will receive a maximum of 20 points. Points are assigned by building including two separate elementary buildings. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $[(\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4})] \div [\text{Count of Cohort Members}] \times 100$.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet district goals.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.</p>

3.6) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 5-8 Math & ELA state assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 5-8 Math & ELA state assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 5-8 Math & ELA state assessments

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this</p>	<p>For the middle school grades 5-8 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 5-8 ELA and Math Performance Index</p>
---	---

subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	divided by 1520 x 20. A score of 1520 or more will receive a maximum of 20 points. The The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $[(\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4})] \div [\text{Count of Cohort Members}] \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17 points) Results meet district goals.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.

3.7) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 5-8 Math & ELA state assessments
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 5-8 Math & ELA state assessments
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grades 5-8 Math & ELA state assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	For the middle school, grades 5-8 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 5-8 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 1520 x 20. A score of 1520 or more will receive a maximum score of 20 points. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $[(\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4})] \div [\text{Count of Cohort Members}] \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17 points) Results meet district goals.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.

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	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments

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.	There is one high school. Points for the high school will be the sum of the Regents Integrated Algebra and Regents ELA Performance Index divided by 380 x 20. A score of 380 or more will receive a maximum score of 20 points. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. Regents scores are converted to a 1-4 rating as follows: ELA 90-100 = 4; 75-89 = 3; 65-74 = 2; 0-64 = 1. Math 90-100 = 4; 80-89 = 3; 65-79 = 2; 0-64 = 1. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{((\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4}))}{[\text{Count of Cohort Members}]} \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Effective (9-17 points) Results meet district goals.

grade/subject.	Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.
	Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.

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	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments

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.	There is one high school. Points for the high school will be the sum of the Regents Integrated Algebra and Regents ELA Performance Index divided by 380 x 20. A score of 380 or more will receive a maximum score of 20 points. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. Regents scores are converted to a 1-4 rating as follows: ELA 90-100 = 4; 75-89 = 3; 65-74 = 2; 0-64 = 1. Math 90-100 = 4; 80-89 = 3; 65-79 = 2; 0-64 = 1. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{((\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4}))}{[\text{Count of Cohort Members}]} \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.

grade/subject.	Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17 points) Results meet district goals.
	Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.

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	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments

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.	There is one high school. Points for the high school will be the sum of the Regents Integrated Algebra and Regents ELA Performance Index divided by 380 x 20. A score of 380 or more will receive a maximum score of 20 points. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. Regents scores are converted to a 1-4 rating as follows: ELA 90-100 = 4; 75-89 = 3; 65-74 = 2; 0-64 = 1. Math 90-100 = 4; 80-89 = 3; 65-79 = 2; 0-64 = 1. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{((\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4}))}{[\text{Count of Cohort Members}]} \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-13 points) Results meet district goals.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) Results significantly below district goals.

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	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Grade 9 Integrated Algebra Regents and Grade 11 ELA Regents assessments

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.	There is one high school. Points for the high school will be the sum of the Regents Integrated Algebra and Regents ELA Performance Index divided by 380×20 . A score of 380 or more will receive a maximum score of 20 points. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. Regents scores are converted to a 1-4 rating as follows: ELA 90-100 = 4; 75-89 = 3; 65-74 = 2; 0-64 = 1. Math 90-100 = 4; 80-89 = 3; 65-79 = 2; 0-64 = 1. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{((\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4}))}{[\text{Count of Cohort Members}]} \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17 points) Results meet district goals.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	Developing (3-8 points) Results slightly below district goals.

Members]) × 100.

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

Highly Effective (18-20 points)
Results far exceed district goals.

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

Effective (9-17 points)
Results meet district goals.

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

Developing (3-8 points)
Results slightly below district goals.

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

Ineffective (0-2 points)
Results significantly below district goals.

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

(No response)

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

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.

There will only be one score for our locally selected measure based on a performance index.

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 Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Effectiveness Framework

Danielson's Framework for Teaching

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)

assets/survey-uploads/5091/128368-2UoxI2HPmn/Thoughtful Education Teacher Effectiveness Framework Chart.docx

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The Thoughtful Classroom Teacher Effectiveness Framework rubric (Silver and Strong Associates, 2010-2012) will be used for the rating of teacher observations (with the exception of school librarians) on ten dimensions with a distribution of points for dimensions 1-9 and dimension 10 (a,b,c). Each indicator within each dimension is scored on a scale of 1-4 these are averaged together to reach a score for each dimension. The average of the domain scores will be the final score which will be applied to the conversion table to generate a HEDI score (0 - 60).

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2007) rubric will be used for the rating of librarian observations for domains 1-4. Domains 1 will have a weighting of 13%; Domains 2 & 3 will have a weighting of 21% each and Domain 4 a weighting of 45% for a total of 60 points.

Teachers will be observed twice per year by a certified administrator employed by the school district. One observation will be announced. One observation will be unannounced. This includes tenured and non-tenured teaching staff. The attached table will be used for point distribution. This will associate with the appropriate HEDI rating.

"We understand that the final 0-60 composite score must be a whole number." Normal rounding rules will apply but in no event will the rounding of the HEDI score result in movement within the HEDI bands.

Teachers will be scored on a scale of 1 - 4 for each component of each of the 4 Danielson domains. The simple average of the component scores for each domain will be calculated (each domain will have a score anywhere between 1 - 4). The domain scores will be multiplied by a weighting factor to arrive at a weighted score per domain. The sum of the weighted domain scores will be the final score which will be applied to the conversion table to generate a HEDI score (0 - 60). The rubric value listed on the chart is the minimum value necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5091/128368-eka9yMJ855/TE Rubric Conversion.pdf](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Highly Effective: 59-60 points
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Effective: 57-58 points
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Developing: 50-56 points
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Ineffective: 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	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	0
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Enter Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- Both
-

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

-
- Both
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	2
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	0
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- Both
-

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

-
- Both
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Monday, August 13, 2012

Updated Friday, November 02, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

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

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

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

**Locally-selected Measures of
growth or achievement**

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Monday, August 27, 2012

Updated Thursday, July 18, 2013

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/168690-Df0w3Xx5v6/TIP plan and form (PCS).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:

Upon receiving a rating of “developing” or “ineffective” a teacher shall be provided with a TIP. The TIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year. The Parties understand and agree that the sole and exclusive purpose of the TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher. Union representation shall be afforded at the teacher’s request. The Association President shall be informed within twenty-four hours,

whenever a teacher is placed on a TIP and, with the agreement of the teacher, shall be provided with a copy of the TIP. A TIP shall clearly specify: (i) the area(s) in need of improvement; (ii) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timelines the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating; (iii) how improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress; and (iv) the appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher

The teacher, the building administrator, mentor (if one has been assigned) and an Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet, according to the schedule identified in the TIP, to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP, for the purpose of assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. A teacher who believes that the terms of a TIP are arbitrary, unreasonable, inappropriate or defective, or that the District has failed to meet its obligation to properly implement the terms of the TIP, may seek relief through an appeal to the Superintendent. The decision of the Superintendent on the merits of the TIP shall be final. Based on the outcome of the Superintendent's decision, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

All costs associated with the implementation of a TIP including, but not limited to, tuition, fees, books, and travel, shall be borne by the District in their entirety.

The timeline for the appeals process is as follows.

An APPR or TIP challenge must be submitted in writing to the administrator performing the review within 10 work days of the issuance of the APPR.

The administrator will schedule a meeting within 7 work days to discuss the challenge.

Within 10 work days of the meeting the administrator conducting the APPR shall submit to the teacher a detailed written response to the appeal.

For a covered unit member that received a rating of highly effective or effective, the administrators decision will be final.

If the teacher disagrees he/she may submit a written statement to be included in his/her file.

If a tenured covered unit member received a rating of ineffective, developing, or a TIP and disagrees with the administrators response to the challenge, the challenge may be submitted to the Superintendent within seven work days of the receipt of the administrator's response.

A meeting will be scheduled within seven work days to discuss the appeal.

The superintendent shall render a final determination of the challenge within 10 work days of the scheduled meeting.

If a probationary covered unit member following the second year of employment received a rating of ineffective and disagrees with the administrators response to the challenge the teacher may submit the challenge to the Superintendent within 7 days of the receipt of the administrators response.

A meeting will be scheduled within 7 working days to discuss the appeal.

The Superintendent will render a final determination of the challenge within 10 working days of the scheduled meeting.

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.

District administrators have been and will be trained by Network Team trainers from Cattaraugus Allegany Board of Cooperative Educational Services (CABOCES) on the 9 elements of teacher evaluation Section 30-29 of the rules of the Board of Regents. In addition, administrators were fully trained on the Thoughtful Education Rubric (Silver and Strong) by Thoughtful Education Associates. Administrators received training on Danielson's Framework for Teaching for evaluation of school librarians. Administrators have and will have on-going in-house training to ensure inter-rater reliability.

Certification Criteria & Plan for Implementation:

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

All administrators have been trained in the ISLLC Standards. New administrators will be trained as needed. This training was held in the summer of 2010 by CABOCES staff based on the work of Green.

Time will be devoted at administrative meetings to address the application of the ISLLC Standards in the district setting.

2. Evidence-based observation techniques

All administrators have been provided with training on evidence-based observation techniques. The training was completed by the Danielson Group, Network Team Members of CABOCES, and Thoughtful Education Associates.

Additional professional development will be given throughout the 2012-2013 school year to support evaluators in the Thoughtful Education Rubric and Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. Anticipated additional staff development is planned for November 2012, January 2013 and May 2013.

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

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

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

Inter-rater reliability was a significant component of all CABOCES trainings as well as Thoughtful Education Training. Evaluators observed videos of teachers, applied their evidence to the rubric, discussed observation and translated the results into appropriate ratings. Any differences in ratings were discussed and adjusted based on evidence.

Additional work will be done with this throughout the 2012-2013 school year by the Network Team staff and the Thoughtful Education Associates.

5. Application and use of any assessment tools you intend to use

All administrators have been trained in the areas of the use of SLO's and have participated in local decisions.

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

The third party assessment being used is AIMSWeb. This program has been implemented in the district for three years. All current administrators have been trained in AIMSWeb. Incoming administrators will be trained accordingly.

7. Use of Statewide Instructional Reporting System

Principals are reviewing ongoing updates from the Office of Instruction/Technology on the information provided by NYSED regarding the Instructional Reporting System

8. The Scoring Methodology used by the department/district

All administration and Pioneer Teacher Association have and will continue to participate in the scoring decisions that relate to APPR.

9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners

There is a District emphasis on best practices for ELL and Students with disabilities for curriculum, instruction, and assessment. This will be addressed through data collection and review and the Data Driven Instruction Model by Paul Santoyo. All administrators have been trained in this model by CABOCES staff.

The certification process will contain the same elements. Administrators will be offered a variety of professional development options offered by the area BOCES Network Trainers. The Superintendent will certify evaluators.

Recertification will occur in the same manner as certification annually. Based upon successful completion of all certification training, administrators will receive certification to evaluate teachers.

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 Wednesday, May 09, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

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

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

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

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

5-8
9-12
(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
Arcade & Delevan Elementary School K - 3	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWeb
Arcade & Delevan Elementary School 3 & 4	State assessment	Grades 3 & 4 ELA & Math State assessments

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.	Students who will be utilizing AIMSWeb and Grade 3 ELA and Math assessments will be given a pre-test. Based upon the pre-test, the principal in collaboration with the superintendent will develop individual student growth targets. Principals will receive a HEDI score based upon the percentage of students reaching the targets. For the grade 4 ELA and Math assessments the District will utilize the state provided student growth scores. The grade 4 state provided growth scores will then be weighted proportionally with the results from the other SLO's for grades K-3. This will result in a single HEDI score for the principal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Highly Effective (18-20 points) 81%-100% 18-81%-85% 19-86%-90% 20-91%-100%
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Effective (9-17 points) 61%-80% 9- 61%-63% 10-64%-66% 11-67%-68% 12-69%-70% 13-71%-72% 14-73%-74% 15-75%-76% 16-77%-78% 17-79%-80%

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Developing (3-8 points) 41%-60% 3-41%-44% 4-45- 48% 5-49%-51% 6-52%-54% 7-55%-57% 8-58%-60%
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	Ineffective (0-2 points) 0%-40% 0-0%-12% 1-13%-26% 2-27%-40%

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.

Not applicable at this time.

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/slo/home.html .	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, August 14, 2012

Updated Friday, July 19, 2013

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (a) student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 (e.g., percentage of students in the school whose performance levels on State assessments are proficient or advanced)
- (b) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level (e.g., Level 1, Level 2)
- (c) student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and/or Math in Grades 4-8 for students with disabilities and English Language Learners in Grades 4-8
- (d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures approved for use in teacher evaluations
- (e) four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rates for principals employed in a school with high school grades

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
9-12	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Regents English Language Arts (grade 11)
5-8	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Grade 5-8 ELA & Math state assessments

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.	For grades 5-8 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 5-8 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 1520 x 15 (or 20 with no value added). A score of 1520 or more will receive a maximum score of 15 (or 20 with no value added). In the high school the HEDI score will be based on the ELA Regents Performance Index divided by 200 x 15 (or 20 with no value added). The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score. Where value added does not apply the scale be as follows 0-2 - ineffective; 3-8 developing; 9-17 - effective and 18-20 highly effective. ELA Regents scores are converted to a 1-4 rating as follows: ELA 90-100 = 4; 75-89 = 3; 65-74 = 2; 0-64 = 1. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{[(\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4})] \div [\text{Count of Cohort Members}] \times 100.$
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective 14-15 points Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective 8-13 points Results meet district goals.

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

Developing 3-7 points
Results slightly below district goals.

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

Ineffective 0-2 points
Results significantly below district goals.

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

in a school with high school grades

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-4	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	3 & 4 ELA & Math State Assessments

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.	For grades 3 & 4 the HEDI score will be the sum of the grades 3 & 4 ELA and Math Performance Index divided by 760 x 20. Points are assigned by building including two separate elementary buildings. The final value will be rounded following normal rounding rules to get the final composite score which is capped at 20. A PI of 0-200 points is calculated using the levels and the following equation: $\frac{((\text{Count at Level 2}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 3}) + 2(\text{Count at Level 4}))}{[\text{Count of Cohort Members}]} \times 100$.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Highly Effective (18-20 points) = Innovative Results far exceed district goals.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Effective (9-17 points) = Applying Results meet district goals.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Developing (3-8 points) = Beginning and Developing Results slightly below district goals.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Ineffective (0-2 points) = Not Using Results significantly below district goals.

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.

Not applicable at this time.

8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

Not applicable at this time.

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 Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Marzano's School Administrator Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Marzano's Principal Evaluation contains five domains:

Recognition of a Leader

Trust of Faculty and Staff

Faculty and Staff Perceptions of School Environment

Parent and Student Perception of School Environment

Resource Management

Acknowledging Success

To assure that all of the six 2008 ISLLC Standards are evaluated each year, we will use Marzano's rubric. The Superintendent will visit each principals building twice, and principals will submit other evidence to address the standards that were not covered by the school visit.

Each element will be scored on a scale of 1-4 for each of the five Marzano domains. The average of the elements for each domain will be calculated to generate a domain score. The sum of the domain scores will be divided by the number of domains (5) to get your final rubric score (1-4). The total score will be then applied to the conversion table (0-60) HEDI score. The rubric value listed on the chart is the minimum value necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.

"We understand that the final 0-60 composite score must be a whole number." Normal rounding rules will apply but in no event will the rounding of the HEDI score result in movement within the HEDI bands.

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/5143/124270-pMADJ4gk6R/Marzano HEDI Conversion.pdf>

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Highly Effective (59-60): (3.5-4.0 points) Principals will receive a rating of Highly Effective for the "other measures" sub-component when they earn a final average rubric score between (3.5- 4.0), as identified in the conversion chart.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Effective (57-58): (2.5 -3.4 points) Principals will receive a rating of Effective for the "other measures" sub component when they earn a final average rubric score between (2.5-3.4) as identified on the conversion chart.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Developing (50-56): (1.5-2.4 points) Principals will receive a rating of Developing for the "other measures" sub-component when they earn a final average rubric score between (1.5-2.4) as identified on the conversion chart.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Ineffective (0-49): (1.0-1.4 points) Principals will receive a rating of Ineffective for the "other measures" sub-component when they earn a final average rubric score between (1.0-1.4) as identified on the conversion chart.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

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

9.8) School Visits

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

Probationary Principals

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

Tenured Principals

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

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, August 13, 2012

Updated Friday, November 02, 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	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	50-56
Ineffective	0-49

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Monday, August 13, 2012

Updated Monday, November 26, 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/5276/162510-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP.pdf>

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

This appeal provision is limited to unit members who are covered by N.Y.S Education Law 3012. To the extent a principal wishes to challenge his/her performance review and or implemented improvement plan, under the new APPR regulations, the District has developed an appeal process. This appeal process/procedure does not diminish the authority of the School Board to terminate probationary principals during their probationary term for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons, including but not limited to misconduct; consistent with Education Law 3012-c. While the plan shall be a "significant factor" in tenure and other employment decisions, nothing therein shall be construed to alter or diminish the authority of the board of education to grant or deny

tenure or to terminate probationary principals during the pendency of an appeal for statutorily constitutionally permissible reasons other than the principal's performance that is the subject of the appeal.

A Covered Unit Member may challenge only the substance of the APPR, the District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such review, the District's compliance with its procedures and timelines for conducting the APPR, and the issuance and the regulations of the Commissioner and/or implementation of a principal improvement plan. Such challenge must be submitted in writing to the Superintendent, together with any supporting documentation. The challenge must explain in detail the specific reason(s) for the matter which is the subject of the challenge. A principal may not file multiple appeals regarding the same APPR or PIP. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived. All supporting information must also be submitted at the time the appeal is filed. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. In an appeal, the principal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which he or she seeks relief. The challenge must be submitted within fifteen calendar days of the issuance of the Annual Professional Performance Review which is the subject of the challenge. For purposes of this Memorandum of Agreement, calendar days shall exclude the period of Christmas, February, and April recess. Within fifteen calendar days, the Superintendent shall submit to the principal a detailed written response of the Appeal. The response must include any additional documents or written materials specific to the point (s) of disagreement that support the District's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal. Failure to submit a response within fifteen calendar days shall be deemed a denial of the appeal. For a tenured principal who received a rating of highly effective, effective, or developing, or a non-tenured principal who received any rating the Superintendent's determination shall be final; if that principal disagrees with the response, the principal may submit a written statement outlining the basis for that disagreement to be included in his or her file along with the disputed Annual Professional Performance Review.

b. If a tenured principal received a rating of ineffective and disagrees with the Superintendent's response to the challenge, the principal may submit a written statement explaining in detail the reason (s) for disagreement with the response to the Superintendent of Schools within seven calendar days of receipt of the Superintendent's initial response. A meeting will be scheduled to discuss the appeal within 10 calendar days of receipt of the written statement. A principal may select an Association representative to participate in the meeting. The Superintendent shall render a final determination of the challenge within 10 calendar days thereafter.

c. Any PIP that was implemented as a result of APPR that is subsequently modified as a result of the challenge process in this Memorandum of Agreement shall be modified to reflect any change in the APPR as a result of that process.

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.

Lead evaluators will be trained in evaluation processes by the Network Team members that are employed by CABOCES. Training began in August of 2009 with the Danielson group. This was followed up in the fall of 2010 by the same group. During the school year of 2010 and 2011 the lead evaluators were trained by the BOCES team aligned with the Nine Dimensions. In addition, in the summer of 2012 administrators began their training on evaluation with the Thoughtful Education Rubric. The training was completed by Thoughtful Education Associates. The training for the rubric will continue throughout the 2012-2013 school year to support administrators and ensure inter-rater reliability. Additional training is scheduled for November 2012, January 2013 and May of 2013. Administrators are certified and will be recertified in the same manner as certified annually. New administrators will be certified in accordance with regulations through our BOCES network team providers. In order to ensure inter rater reliability over time, administrators will participate in on-going professional staff development/training BOCES provided by network trainers and Thoughtful Education Associates.

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 Monday, August 27, 2012

Updated Monday, August 12, 2013

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

<assets/survey-uploads/5581/168735-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR81113.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.

APPENDIX D

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46

APPENDIX D

1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

**Rubrics for Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching
Danielson Rubric**

Danielson Performance Level	SED Performance Level	Rating
Unsatisfactory	Ineffective	1
Basic	Developing	2
Proficient	Effective	3
Distinguished	Highly Effective	4

Assessment of teacher effectiveness	Observation #1	Observation #2
Domain Scores	Average	Weighting
Domain 1 Planning and Preparation	2.4	13% = 0.3
Domain 2 The Classroom Environment	3.1	21% = 0.6
Domain 3 Instruction	2.6	21% = 0.5
Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities	2.1	13% = 0.3
Other Evidence	3.4	32% = 1.1
Subtotal	13.6	2.9
Divide by the number of Domains/evidence	$13.6/5 = 2.7$	
Final score	2.7	2.9
	Not Weighted	Weighted
HEDI Rating	Effective	Effective
Sub-component score (using conversion chart)	57.4	57.8

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement is made by and between the Pioneer Central School District (“District”) and the Pioneer Administrators 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:

1. Where and to the extent applicable as determined by the District, the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) shall be a factor for employment decisions and principal development. All decisions regarding selection of persons for hire, promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, and supplemental compensation are reserved to the discretion of the District, and any such decisions, and any decisions or actions made or taken under this paragraph shall be exempt from and not subject to the grievance and arbitration provisions of the Collective Negotiations Agreement (“Agreement”) between the District and the Association, and nothing herein shall be construed to affect the statutory right of the District to terminate a probationary principal or to restrict the District’s discretion in making a tenure determination pursuant to the law.

2. The District and Association hereby approve the APPR documents attached hereto (portal and appeal process). The parties agree that they will enter into negotiations for successor APPR documents no later than February 1, 2013, but the language in paragraph 1, above, shall not be subject to renegotiation by the Association. The attached APPR documents shall remain in place until it is replaced by successor APPR documents.

Accepted for the Pioneer Central
School District

By: Sharon Huff
Sharon Huff,
Superintendent of Schools

Accepted for the Pioneer Administrators
Association

By: Kevin P. Munro
Association Representative

Dated: 9-10-12

Dated: 9/10/12

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This Agreement is made by and between the Pioneer Central School District (“District”) and the Pioneer Administrators 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:

1. The District shall adopt a plan for the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) of its building principals. The APPR plan shall address how APPRs shall be a factor in principal development. The plan shall establish the elements comprising the composite effectiveness score (other than the student growth measures which are established by the State). For the portion of the APPR score based upon locally selected measures of student achievement, the plan shall identify such measures that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms. For the portion of the APPR score not based upon student performance data, the plan shall identify the evaluations, ratings and effectiveness scores that shall be relied upon in establishing this subcomponent of the composite effectiveness score. The plan shall also identify the process under which the District will formulate and implement an improvement plan for a principal (PIP) rated as developing or ineffective.

2. Where and to the extent applicable as determined by the District, the APPR shall be a factor for employment decisions and principal development. All decisions regarding selection of persons for hire, promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, and supplemental compensation are reserved to the discretion of the District, and any such decisions, and any decisions or actions made or taken under this section, shall be exempt from and not subject to the grievance and arbitration provisions of the Collective Negotiations Agreement (“Agreement”) between the District and the Association, and nothing herein shall be construed to affect the statutory right of the District to terminate a probationary principal or to restrict the District’s discretion in making a tenure determination pursuant to the law.

3. This appeal provision is limited to unit members who are covered by N.Y. Education Law § 3012 (“Covered Unit Members” or “principal”).

PIONEER CENTRAL PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

NAME _____

SCHOOL _____

SCHOOL YEAR _____

Area(s) in Need of Improvement	Desired Outcomes	Timeline for achieving Desired Outcomes	Activities to Support the Achievement of the Desired Outcomes	Resources to be provided by the District	Evidence to Support Achievement of Desired Outcomes	Was Desired Outcome Achieved (Y/N date)

Duplicate as necessary

PIONEER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)

Upon receiving a rating of “developing” or “ineffective” a teacher shall be provided with a TIP. The TIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year. The Parties understand and agree that the sole and exclusive purpose of the TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher. Union representation shall be afforded at the teacher’s request. The Association President shall be informed within twenty-four hours, whenever a teacher is placed on a TIP and, with the agreement of the teacher, shall be provided with a copy of the TIP.

A TIP shall clearly specify: (i) the area(s) in need of improvement; (ii) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timelines the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating; (iii) how improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress; and (iv) the appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher

The teacher, the building administrator, mentor (if one has been assigned) and an Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet, according to the schedule identified in the TIP, to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP, for the purpose of assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. A teacher who believes that the terms of a TIP are arbitrary, unreasonable, inappropriate or defective, or that the District has failed to meet its obligation to properly implement the terms of the TIP, may seek relief through an appeal to the Superintendent. The decision of the Superintendent on the merits of the TIP shall be final. Based on the outcome of the Superintendent’s decision, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

All costs associated with the implementation of a TIP including, but not limited to, tuition, fees, books, and travel, shall be borne by the District in their entirety.

PIONEER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Staff Member _____ Evaluator Name _____

Building _____ Assignment _____ Date _____

Association Representative (if applicable) _____

Areas in Need of Improvement

Activities to Support Improvement

Timeline for Achieving Improvement

Manner in Which Improvement Will be Assessed

Signature of Staff Member _____ Date _____

Signature of Evaluator _____ Date _____

Marzano Rubric HEDI Conversion Table (60 pts.)

Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite
Ineffective 0-49	
1.000	0
1.008	1
1.017	2
1.025	3
1.033	4
1.042	5
1.050	6
1.058	7
1.067	8
1.075	9
1.083	10
1.092	11
1.100	12
1.108	13
1.115	14
1.123	15
1.131	16
1.138	17
1.146	18
1.154	19
1.162	20
1.169	21
1.177	22
1.185	23
1.192	24
1.200	25
1.208	26
1.217	27
1.225	28
1.233	29
1.242	30
1.250	31
1.258	32
1.267	33
1.275	34
1.283	35
1.292	36
1.300	37
1.308	38
1.317	39
1.325	40
1.333	41
1.342	42
1.350	43
1.358	44
1.367	45
1.375	46
1.383	47
1.392	48
1.400	49

Total Average Rubric Score	Conversion Score for Composite
Developing 50-56	
1.50	50
1.60	50.7
1.70	51.4
1.80	52.1
1.90	52.8
2.00	53.5
2.10	54.2
2.20	54.9
2.30	55.6
2.40	56.3
Effective 57-58	
2.50	57
2.60	57.2
2.70	57.4
2.80	57.6
2.90	57.8
3.00	58
3.10	58.2
3.20	58.4
3.30	58.6
3.40	58.8
Highly Effective 59-60	
3.50	59
3.60	59.3
3.70	59.5
3.80	59.8
3.90	60
4.00	60.25 (round to 60)

Thoughtful Education Teacher Effectiveness Framework Chart

Thoughtful Ed. HEDI Score Conversion

Dimensions	Score 1-4
1 Organization, Rules, and Procedures	4.0
2 Positive Relationships	4.0
3 Engagement and Enjoyment	4.0
4 A Culture of Thinking and Learning	4.0
5 Preparing Students for New Learning	4.0
6 Presenting New Learning	4.0
7 Deepening Learning	4.0
8 Applying Learning	4.0
9 Helping Students Reflect on and Celebrate Learning	4.0
10 Commitment to Professional Growth	4.0
11 Commitment to School Community	4.0
12 Commitment to Professionalism	4.0

48.0 Total Points

4.0 Total Points/12

60 HEDI Score Per Conversion Chart

APPENDIX D

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1.000		0
1.008		1
1.017		2
1.025		3
1.033		4
1.042		5
1.050		6
1.058		7
1.067		8
1.075		9
1.083		10
1.092		11
1.100		12
1.108		13
1.115		14
1.123		15
1.131		16
1.138		17
1.146		18
1.154		19
1.162		20
1.169		21
1.177		22
1.185		23
1.192		24
1.200		25
1.208		26
1.217		27
1.225		28
1.233		29
1.242		30
1.250		31
1.258		32
1.267		33
1.275		34
1.283		35
1.292		36
1.300		37
1.308		38
1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46

APPENDIX D

1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3
Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

PIONEER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)

Upon receiving a rating of “developing” or “ineffective” a teacher shall be provided with a TIP. The TIP shall be provided as soon as practicable, but in no case later than ten days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year. The Parties understand and agree that the sole and exclusive purpose of the TIP is the improvement of teaching practice and that issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher. Union representation shall be afforded at the teacher’s request. The Association President shall be informed within twenty-four hours, whenever a teacher is placed on a TIP and, with the agreement of the teacher, shall be provided with a copy of the TIP.

A TIP shall clearly specify: (i) the area(s) in need of improvement; (ii) the performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timelines the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating; (iii) how improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress; and (iv) the appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the District will make available to assist the teacher including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher

The teacher, the building administrator, mentor (if one has been assigned) and an Association representative (if requested by the teacher) shall meet, according to the schedule identified in the TIP, to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP, for the purpose of assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. A teacher who believes that the terms of a TIP are arbitrary, unreasonable, inappropriate or

defective, or that the District has failed to meet its obligation to properly implement the terms of the TIP, may seek relief through an appeal to the Superintendent. The decision of the Superintendent on the merits of the TIP shall be final. Based on the outcome of the Superintendent's decision, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

All costs associated with the implementation of a TIP including, but not limited to, tuition, fees, books, and travel, shall be borne by the District in their entirety.

PIONEER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Staff Member Evaluator Name

Building Assignment Date

Association Representative (if applicable)

Areas in Need of Improvement

Activities to Support Improvement

Timeline for Achieving Improvement

Manner in Which Improvement Will be Assessed

Signature of Staff Member Date

Signature of Evaluator Date

PIONEER CENTRAL PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

NAME _____

SCHOOL _____

SCHOOL YEAR _____

Area(s) in Need of Improvement	Desired Outcomes	Timeline for achieving Desired Outcomes	Activities to Support the Achievement of the Desired Outcomes	Resources to be provided by the District	Evidence to Support Achievement of Desired Outcomes	Was Desired Outcome Achieved (Y/N date)

Duplicate as necessary

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:

 8/1/13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 8/1/13



Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 8/1/13



Board of Education President Signature: Date:

 8/1/13