



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

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

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

December 12, 2012

Dr. Marie Wiles, Superintendent
Guilderland Central School District
8 School Road, P.O. Box 18
Guilderland Center, NY 12085-0018

Dear Superintendent Wiles:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your multi-year (2012-2015) Annual Professional Performance Review Plan (APPR) meets the criteria outlined in Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2 of the Commissioner's Regulations and has been approved. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your APPR form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved APPR. If any material changes are made to your approved APPR plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Charles Dedrick

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 Tuesday, May 29, 2012

Updated Monday, December 03, 2012

1

Disclaimers

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

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

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

1. SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION

1.1) School District's BEDS Number : 010802060000

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

010802060000

1.2) School District Name: GUILDERLAND CSD

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

GUILDERLAND CSD

1.3) School Improvement Grant (SIG) Districts Only

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

Not applicable

1.4) Award Classification

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

(No response)

1.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Re-submission to address deficiencies

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

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

2012-2015

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

Created Monday, June 04, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 2012

Page 1

STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

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

2.1) Assurances

Please check the boxes below:

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

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES (20 points)

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

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

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

If no State assessment or Regents exam exists:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

2.2) Grades K-3 ELA

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

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

	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	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	baseline data received by Measures of Academic Progress. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment baseline data received by Measures of Academic Progress. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

2.4) Grades 6-8 Science

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

	Science	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Guilderland CSD developed grade level science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Guilderland CSD developed grade level science assessment
	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment baseline data received by the Guilderland CSD developed grade level science assessment. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

2.5) Grades 6-8 Social Studies

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

	Social Studies	Assessment
6	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Guilderland CSD developed grade level Social Studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Guilderland CSD developed grade level Social Studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Guilderland CSD developed grade level Social Studies assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment baseline data received by the Guilderland CSD developed grade level social studies assessment. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

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	Guilderland CSD developed Global I assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment baseline data received by the Guilderland CSD developed grade level social studies assessment. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth based on Regents exam performance, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment baseline data received by the Guilderland CSD developed grade level science assessment. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth based on Regents exam performance, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment baseline data received by the Guilderland CSD developed grade level math assessment. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth based on Regents exam performance, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

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	Guilderland CSD developed English Language Arts assessment
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Guilderland CSD developed English Language Arts assessment
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Guilderland CSD developed English Language Arts assessment

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	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment
---	---

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	baseline data received by the Guilderland CSD developed grade level English assessments. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth based on Regents exam (grade 11) or Guilderland CSD developed English assessments, performance, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
K-12 Art	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Art assessment
5-12 Health	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Health assessment
6-12 LOTE	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific LOTE assessments
9-12 English Non-Reg/Electices	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific English assessment
9-12 Soc. Stud Non-reg.Elective	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Social Studies assessment
9-12 Science Non-Reg/Elective	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Science assessment
9-12 Math Non-Reg/Elective	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Math assessment
9-12 Business	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Business assessment
6-12 Tech ed.	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Tech. Ed. assessment
6-12 FACS	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific FACS assessment
K-12 Music	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific Music assessment
K-12 P.E.	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific P.E. assessment
ESL Grade 11	State Assessment	NYS ELA Regents
ESL 3-8	State Assessment	NYS Grade specific ELA Assessments

ESL K-2 and 9,10	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed grade specific assessment
All other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Guilderland CSD developed course specific assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	The teacher, in collaboration with the principal, will establish class growth targets using preassessment baseline data received by the Guilderland CSD developed course specific assessments. Based on overall percentage of students who exhibited growth based on Regents exam (grade 11 ESL) or Guilderland CSD developed course-specific assessments, performance, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using uploaded 20 point conversion chart.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	See uploaded conversion chart from 2.11.

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

(No response)

2.11) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5364/138678-TXEttx9bQW/HEDI scores for SED Submission.docx

2.12) Locally Developed Controls

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

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

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

Evaluators and teachers will set targets for Comparable Growth Measures as previously described. Evaluators and teachers will use controls for adjustments for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty. Adjusting targets based on these allowable controls will be based on pre-assessment and/or baseline data to set differentiated growth targets.

2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, August 14, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 2012

Page 1

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.1) Grades 4-8 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)
---	---	-------------------------------------

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	The Guilderland CSD will establish individual achievement targets based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual achievement target (determined by the NWEA statistical model), a corresponding 0-15 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 15 point conversion chart in 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.

3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
5	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
6	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
7	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)
8	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

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.	The Guilderland CSD will establish individual achievement targets based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual achievement target (determined by the NWEA statistical model), a corresponding 0-15 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 15 point conversion chart in 3.3.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded attachment in 3.3.

3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5139/162763-rhJdBgDruP/local assessment NWEA 15 point Hedi table for SED Submission_1.docx](#)

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

Growth or achievement measure(s) from these options.

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

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

Measures based on:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3.4) Grades K-3 ELA

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary)
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary)
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Primary)
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (ELA)

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.	The Guilderland CSD will establish individual achievement targets based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual achievement target (determined by the NWEA statistical model), a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
1	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
2	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress for Primary Grades
3	4) State-approved 3rd party assessments	Measures of Academic Progress (Math)

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	The Guilderland CSD will establish individual achievement targets based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed their individual achievement target (determined by the NWEA statistical model), a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 15 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District -or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guilderland CSD developed Grade 6 science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guilderland CSD developed Grade 7 science assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guilderland CSD developed Grade 8 science assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI scores will be assigned to teachers based on the percentage of students in a class that met or exceeded proficiency targets of 65% or higher on Guilderland CSD developed science assessments. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmarks, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guilderland CSD developed Grade 6 social studies assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guilderland CSD developed Grade 7 social studies assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guilderland CSD developed Grade 8 social studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI scores will be assigned to teachers based on the percentage of students in a class that met or exceeded proficiency targets of 65% or higher on Guilderland CSD developed social studies assessments. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmarks, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Global 1 assessments
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Global 2 assessments
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed American History 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.	HEDI scores will be assigned to teachers based on the percentage of students in a class that met or exceeded proficiency targets of 65% or higher on Guiderland CSD developed social studies assessments. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmarks, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Living Environment assessments
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Earth Science assessments

Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Chemistry assessments
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Physics course-specific science 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.	HEDI scores will be assigned to teachers based on the percentage of students in a class that met or exceeded proficiency targets of 65% or higher on Guiderland CSD developed science assessments. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmarks, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9 - 17points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Algebra 1 assessments
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Geometry assessments
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Algebra 2 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.	HEDI scores will be assigned to teachers based on the percentage of students in a class that met or exceeded proficiency targets of 65% or higher on Guilderland CSD developed math assessments. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmarks, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Grade 9 ELA assessments
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Grade 10 ELA assessments
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Guiderland CSD developed Grade 11 ELA Assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI scores will be assigned to teachers based on the percentage of students in a class that met or exceeded proficiency targets of 65% or higher on Guilderland CSD developed ELA assessments. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmarks, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-12 Art	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Guilderland CSD course specific Art assessment
5-12 Health	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Guilderland CSD course specific Health assessment
6-12 LOTE	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Guilderland CSD course specific LOTE assessment
9-12 English Non Reg/Elective	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Guilderland CSD course specific English assessmentveloped assessment
9-12 Soc Stud Non Reg/Elective	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Guilderland CSD course specific Social Studies assessmentveloped assessment
9-12 Science Non Reg/Elective	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Guilderland CSD course specific Science assessment
9-12 Math Non Reg/ Elective	5) District/regional/BOCES–developed	Guilderland CSD course specific Math assessment

9-12 Business	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Guilderland CSD course specific Business assessment
6-12 Tech. Ed	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Guilderland CSD course specific Tech.ed. assessment
6-12 FACS	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Guilderland CSD course specific FACS assessment
K-12 Music	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Guilderland CSD course specific music assessment
K-12 P.E. and Health	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Guilderland CSD course specific P.E. and Health assessment
K-12 ESL	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Guilderland CSD course specific ELA assessment
All others not named above	5) District/regional/BOCES—developed	Guilderland CSD course specific assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	HEDI scores will be assigned to teachers based on the percentage of students in a class that met or exceeded proficiency targets of 65% or higher on Guilderland CSD developed course specific assessments. Based on the overall percentage of students who meet or exceed the proficiency benchmarks, a corresponding 0-20 HEDI score will be determined using the uploaded 20 point conversion chart in 3.13.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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

See uploaded conversion chart for 3.13

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

(No response)

3.13) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

assets/survey-uploads/5139/162763-y92vNseFa4/local assessment NWEA 20 point Hedi table for SED Submission.docx

3.14) Locally Developed Controls

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

Evaluators and teachers will set targets for individual achievement measures as previously described. Evaluators and teachers will use controls for adjustments for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty. Adjusting targets based on these allowable controls will be based on pre-assessment and/or baseline data to set differentiated individual achievement targets.

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.

For those teachers teaching multiple courses, the percentage will be proportionally calculated based upon the teacher's class roster to determine one final component score.

3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

3.16) Assurances Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for the locally-selected measures subcomponent.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that locally-selected measures are rigorous and comparable across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district.	Checked
3.16) Assurances If more than one type of locally-selected measure is used for different groups of teachers within a grade/subject, certify that the measures are comparable based on the Standards of Educational and Psychological Testing.	Checked
3.16) Assurances Assure that all locally-selected measures for a teacher are different than any measures used for the State assessment or other comparable measures subcomponent.	Checked

4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, August 14, 2012

Updated Tuesday, December 11, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

(No response)

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

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

(No response)

4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Teachers will be rated for all domains and components included in the Danielson 2011 rubric. For each domain teachers will receive a domain rating score between one and four. This will be the mean of the ratings earned for all indicators within a domain. A weighted score will then be calculated for each domain. The weighted score considers domains two and three to be weighted 2x and domains one and four to be weighted one time. A sub-component score between zero and sixty will then be calculated. The sub-component score will then be translated into a HEDI rating as described below.

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

assets/survey-uploads/5091/162813-eka9yMJ855/Copy of 60 point conversion chart wout decimals.xlsx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	Refer to uploaded conversion chart for 4.5.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Refer to uploaded conversion chart for 4.5.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Refer to uploaded conversion chart for 4.5.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Refer to uploaded conversion chart for 4.5.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
-------------	---

Informal/Short	0
----------------	---

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	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?

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- Not Applicable
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, August 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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 Tuesday, August 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

assets/survey-uploads/5265/162823-Df0w3Xx5v6/TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN for submission to SED_1.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:

Appeal procedures

1. Only tenured teachers who receive a rating of "ineffective" and "developing" on their Annual Professional Performance Review ("APPR") may appeal their APPR through the procedure herein. Ratings of "effective" and "highly effective" may not be appealed. A teacher may file only one appeal from a single APPR. Those eligible for an appeal shall simply be referred to as "teacher" below.

Probationary teachers may not file appeals through the procedure herein or any other procedure but may submit a written response which shall be filed with the APPR.

“APPR” and “evaluation” are used interchangeably herein. “Business days” as used herein shall be defined as those days other than weekends and declared holidays, that the District’s Central Office is open.

2. Within three (3) business days of the receipt of a teacher’s APPR, the teacher may request in writing to meet with the evaluating administrator. This meeting shall occur within three (3) business days of the teacher’s request. The purpose of such meeting is for the teacher and evaluating administrator to discuss possible changes to the evaluation based upon information provided by the teacher. The evaluating administrator shall advise the teacher in writing whether there will be any change in the evaluation either at the meeting or within two (2) business days of the meeting.

3. A teacher has ten (10) business days from receipt of the APPR or, if applicable, five (5) business days from receipt of the evaluating administrator’s response in paragraph “2” above, to submit a written appeal to the Superintendent setting forth any and all objections to the APPR. An appeal of an APPR must be based only upon one or more of the following grounds:

a. the substance of the annual professional performance review;

b. the school district’s adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Section 3012-c of the Education Law;

c. the school district’s adherence to the regulations of the commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures; and,

d. the school district’s failure to issue and/or implement the terms of a Teacher Improvement Plan, where required under Education Law Section 3012-c.

The written appeal document must clearly identify the grounds for appeal, and shall explain, in detail, why and how the APPR should be modified. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. The burden of establishing that the APPR should be modified shall rest with the teacher.

4. The Superintendent, or his or her designee, will inform the evaluating administrator and the GTA President that the teacher has initiated the appeals process. The Superintendent will provide a copy of the appeal and the evaluation to the evaluating administrator, GTA President, and Appeals Committee (“Committee”, see below) within three (3) business days of receipt of the appeal from the evaluated teacher.

The evaluating administrator may, at his/her option, provide a written response to the appeal within three (3) business days of receipt of the Superintendent’s notification that an appeal has been filed. If a response is submitted, it must be submitted to the Superintendent, appealing teacher, GTA President, and to the Appeals Committee for its consideration of the appeal.

5. Appeals shall be referred for consideration to an APPR Appeal Committee (“Committee”), a standing committee made up of two tenured administrators from within the District appointed by the Superintendent of Schools, and two tenured teachers from within the District appointed by the President of the GTA. Members shall be appointed for a term of three years and all members shall be required to complete the training required of lead evaluators under the APPR regulations. All APPR training expenses shall be paid by the District. Appointments and/or replacements to the Committee will be completed by the GTA and the District, no later than ten (10) school days after the start of the school year. Any Committee vacancies shall be filled under the above procedure. The Committee shall determine its own rules and operating procedures, which may be altered as the Committee may deem necessary to hear any appeal.

6. An individual teacher or administrator personally involved in an evaluation shall be ineligible to serve as a Committee member for that specific appeal. Should this occur, the appealing teacher shall have the option of:

a. having the appeal considered by one administrator and one teacher from the Committee; or,

b. having a substitute appointed to replace the ineligible Committee member for that specific appeal only. If necessary, a substitute administrator shall be appointed by the Superintendent. If necessary, a substitute teacher shall be appointed by the GTA President. Substitutes to the Committee shall be appointed within three (3) business days. Lead evaluator training shall not be required for any substitute(s) appointed.

7. The Committee will convene within ten (10) calendar days of receipt from the Superintendent of the written appeal. The teacher’s written appeal, APPR, and evaluating administrator’s response (if any) shall comprise the record on appeal. Members of the Committee will receive the appeal record at least 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting.

8. All Committee deliberations will be conducted privately and remain confidential except as is required below to further process an appeal.

a. The Committee will evaluate the merits of the appeal based on review of submitted written documentation.

b. If the Committee comes to consensus and is in agreement on whether the appeal should be denied or granted, a single written determination shall be prepared and issued. This determination shall be provided to the appealing teacher, evaluating administrator, GTA president, and the Superintendent of Schools within two (2) calendar days of the meeting of the Committee.

c. If the Committee cannot reach consensus, the matter shall be referred to the Superintendent of Schools immediately following the meeting of the Committee. Each member of the Committee (individually or jointly with another member) may submit to the Superintendent within three (3) calendar days of the meeting of the Committee a written statement describing his or her conclusions, justifications, and recommendation for disposition of the appeal. Any Committee Member statements submitted shall not be disclosed to either the appealing teacher or evaluating administrator. The Superintendent of Schools will review all statements and the record on appeal and will make the final determination. The Superintendent's final determination shall be in writing and shall be issued within ten (10) business days of the Committee's notice that it could not reach a determination or, if applicable, within ten (10) calendar days of the Superintendent's receipt of any written Committee statements referenced above. Copies of the Superintendent's determination shall be provided to the appealing teacher, evaluating administrator and GTA president.

d. A copy of the APPR, the teacher's appeal, and the final written determination (Superintendent or Committee) shall be placed in the teacher's personnel file. A complete copy of the record on appeal, including any Committee Member statements, shall be separately maintained in a file in the Superintendent's office.

9. The determination (by either the Committee or Superintendent) shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal. If the appeal is sustained in whole or in part, the Committee or the Superintendent may modify a rating or, order the rating vacated solely for the purpose of not having the rating count for possible disciplinary action pursuant to the expedited hearing process of Education Law Section 3020-a. Notwithstanding the above, a composite score shall be reported for each teacher.

10. The determination of the appeal pursuant to the above process is final and binding. It is not subject to any further appeal pursuant to the contractual grievance procedure, or to any administrative or judicial tribunal. However, the failure of either the District or the GTA to abide by the above agreed upon process shall be subject to the grievance procedure set forth in the parties' collective bargaining agreement.

11. The parties agree that the Appeal process described herein shall be subject to review upon the mutual agreement of the parties. In the event of such agreement, parties agree to convene a committee comprised of three representatives of the Association and three representatives of the District to conduct such review. If during such review the parties agree upon changes to the appeal process, such changes shall be incorporated into this review process language. If the parties cannot agree upon changes proposed by either party, then the review process described herein shall remain unchanged. If the appeals process is amended it will comply with education law 3012-c.

12. Notwithstanding the above general review process, if the issue of final arbiter has not otherwise been addressed in paragraph "11" above, the designation of the Superintendent of Schools as the final arbiter of the appeals process in paragraph "8c" above shall sunset and expire on June 30, 2015, and shall not be continued after that date for any reason unless said designation is extended by written mutual agreement of the District and GTA or in accordance with the following procedure. In the event the parties have not previously reached any agreement by January 15, 2015 concerning this single matter, the parties agree that effective January 15, 2015, or as soon thereafter as the parties can convene, the parties shall meet to negotiate this single item. In the event the parties are unable to reach agreement on this item by March 1, 2015, the parties agree to have Ira Lobel, or if he is unavailable, some other mutually agreed upon individual, mediate the dispute between the parties in an effort to reach final agreement. If the parties have not reached final agreement with the assistance of the mediator by May 1, 2015, the parties agree that the mediator shall act as the arbitrator and shall issue a written determination on this sole issue of final arbiter of appeals, which decision shall be final and binding on the parties until such time as they negotiate otherwise. The fees of Ira Lobel (or other mutually selected individual) for services as a mediator and, if necessary, arbitrator, shall be shared equally by the parties.

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.

The District will ensure that all lead evaluators/evaluators are properly trained and certified, as required by Education Law §3012-c and the implementing Regulations of the Commissioner of State Education prior to conducting any teacher evaluation.

A. Nature of Training Provided to Certify Evaluators of Teachers:

For the 2011-2012 school year, evaluator training was conducted by Capital Region BOCES. It is anticipated that trained administrators will continue to turn-key all training information to new evaluators as well as yearly retraining for all.

Additional trainings also conducted by Capital Region BOCES will be conducted prior to the start of the 2012-13 school year. This training shall include training on 9 minimum requirements outlined in the Commissioner's Regulations in section 30-2.9(b) and will also include but is not limited to the following:

- New York State Teaching Standards*
- Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research*
- Application and use of the Student Growth Percentile model and the Value-Added Growth Model*
- Application and use of the state-approved Framework for Teaching rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice*
- Application and use of any assessment tools that the district uses to evaluate teachers*
- Development and Application of any locally selected measures of student achievement*
- Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System*
- Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers*

B. Certification of Evaluators

The Superintendent or her/his designee will certify lead evaluators upon confirmation of participation. The Superintendent will maintain records of certification of evaluators.

C. Recertification and Inter-rater Reliability

The Superintendent or her/his designee will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are recertified as appropriate. Capital Region BOCES has been utilized to provide the initial training during the 2011-2012 school year. The Superintendent and/or his designee (who have completed the BOCES training) shall provide turnkey training and recertification, as appropriate.

In order to ensure that evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and appropriate certification, each evaluator will be required to be re-certified annually. Re-certification shall be achieved by completion of district and/or BOCES provided refresher programs.

D. Elimination of Examiner Bias

Evaluators will make good faith efforts to provide accurate evaluations, aligned to the Framework for Teaching 2011, based on evidence, without bias.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Tuesday, August 14, 2012
Updated Tuesday, December 11, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	18-20 points per SED
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	9-17 points per SED
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	3-8 points per SED
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0-2 points per SED

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.

Evaluators will use controls for adjustments for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty. Adjusting targets based on these allowable controls will be based on pre-assessment and/or baseline data to set differentiated individual achievement targets.

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 Tuesday, December 11, 2012

Page 1

Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-5	(a) achievement on State assessments	Grades 4-5 ELA and Math State Assessment
6-8	(a) achievement on State assessments	Grades 6-8 ELA and Math State Assessment
9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	All NYS Regents Examinations

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The district will establish a proficiency benchmark for student performance in K-5 and 6-8 buildings of a Level 2 or higher on state assessments and a proficiency level of 65% or higher on Regents exams. Based on the overall percentage of students who achieve the applicable proficiency benchmark, a corresponding HEDI score of 0-15 will be determined using the 15 point conversion chart uploaded for 8.1.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart in 8.1
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart in 8.1

Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. see chart in 8.1

Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject. see chart in 8.1

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/5366/162852-qBFVOWF7fC/local assessment NWEA 15 point Hedi table for SED Submission.docx

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

least a 3 on an Advanced Placement examination since entry into the ninth grade)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	(No response)
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	see chart

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.

Evaluators will use controls for adjustments for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty. Adjusting targets based on these allowable controls will be based on pre-assessment and/or baseline data to set differentiated individual achievement targets.

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.

(No response)

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, August 14, 2012
Updated Tuesday, December 11, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	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.	Checked
9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	Checked

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from teachers using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from students using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) Structured feedback from families using a State-approved tool	(No response)
9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable) School visits by other trained evaluators	(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)

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.

Process for Determination of 60 Points for Principal Effectiveness

1. The district shall utilize the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric for principal evaluation as the basis for the 60 "Other" points allocated to measures of leadership and management. This shall be according to the attached instrument.

2. Procedures for collecting evidence for use on the Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric

- The superintendent's assessment shall be based on upon at least two (2) visits of 30 minutes or more to the school while school is in session. At least one of the visits shall be unannounced. Principals shall provide a complete list of all scheduled building level activities, including but not limited to building cabinet, leadership team meetings, PTA meeting, TALC, open house, etc., involving the principal no later than September 15 of each school year. Principals will have the opportunity to update this list of activities to include those scheduled after September 15th. Visits are to be completed no later than May 31. Non-tenured principals shall have at least one formal evaluation visit prior to January 31st of each year.
- Ongoing collection of supporting evidence related to components of the rubric shall be provided to and collected by the Superintendent throughout the year. Evidence should be submitted during monthly meetings; all evidence should be gathered by May 31st, with the exception of evidence generated by activities that can only occur during the month of June (e.g. Moving Up Ceremonies, Graduation, etc.).
- The principal's self-analysis on the rubric for the superintendent's consideration and discussion and shall be completed no later than May 1st of each year.

3. Distribution of the Local 60 Points

The Principal's Association and the District agree to calculate HEDI ratings and scores using the conversion chart shown in Appendix A

HEDI Rating Overall Rubric Average Score 60 Point Distribution for "Other Measure" Score

Ineffective 1 – 1.4 0 – 49

Developing 1.5 – 2.3 50 - 55

Effective 2.4– 3.4 56 - 58

Highly Effective 3.5 – 4 59 - 60

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

assets/survey-uploads/5143/162861-pMADJ4gk6R/Copy of 60 point conversion chart wout decimals.xlsx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	An overall Rubric average score between 3.5-4.0 will equate to a score of 59-60
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	An overall Rubric average score between 2.4-3.4 will equate to a score of 56-58
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	An overall Rubric average score between 1.5-2.3 will equate to a score of 50-55
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	An overall Rubric average score between 1.0-1.4 will equate to a score of 0-49

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	56-58
Developing	50-55
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 Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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	56-58
Developing	50-55
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 Tuesday, August 14, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 05, 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/5276/162862-Df0w3Xx5v6/Principal Improvement Plan.docx](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Principal APPR Appeal Process

The District's Annual Professional Performance Review Plan shall include an appeal process enabling tenured principals to appeal evaluation decisions in accordance with the following procedure:

1. Only a tenured principal (hereinafter simply "principal") may appeal an APPR and only APPR with ratings on a composite score of

“ineffective” or “developing” may be appealed. Principals who receive a rating of “highly effective” or “effective” shall not be permitted to appeal their rating. Probationary principals may not file appeals through the procedure herein or any other procedure but may submit a written response which shall be filed with the APPR.

2. Before an appeal is filed, the principal may request an informal meeting with the superintendent to discuss his or her concerns regarding the composite score. Such meeting shall occur within 5 (five) school days after the composite score is received; the superintendent shall provide a written response to the concerns raised by the principal within 5 (five) school days of the meeting. If the concern is not resolved in a manner that is satisfactory to the principal, he or she may initiate the formal appeal process as described below:

3. CHALLENGES IN AN APPEAL:

Principals may only appeal their rating based on the following grounds:

- the substance of the annual professional performance review;*
- the school district’s adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews pursuant to Section 3012-c of the Education Law;*
- the school district’s adherence to the regulations of the commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures; and*
- the school district’s failure to issue and/or implement the terms of a Principal Improvement Plan, where required under Education Law Section 3012-c.*

4. APPEAL PROCESS

Within ten (10) school days of the receipt of an APPR with a composite score of “ineffective” or “developing” the Principal may submit a written appeal to the superintendent setting forth any and all objections to the APPR. If the Principal and Superintendent informally met to discuss the APPR rating as described above, and the principal chooses to submit a formal appeal, he or she must do so within five (5) days of his/her receipt of the superintendent’s written response as noted above.

The Principal’s written appeal must clearly identify the grounds for appeal and shall explain in detail, why and how the APPR should be modified. No new evidence may be submitted after submission of the appeal. Failure to articulate a particular basis for the appeal shall be deemed a waiver of that claim. A principal can file only one appeal from a single APPR.

The burden of establishing that the APPR should be modified shall rest with the principal.

Upon receipt of the written appeal, the superintendent must (within 5 business days) provide a written response to the appeal.

A Principal reserves the right to withdraw his/her appeal at any time during the process. This withdrawal shall be made in writing.

5. APPEAL COMMITTEE

Appeals shall be referred for consideration to a Principal APPR Appeal Committee (“committee”). The committee shall consist of one administrator from the district office (selected by the Superintendent), one principal from the Principals’ Association (selected by the president of the Association) and one administrator/superintendent from outside the district mutually agreed upon by the parties (i.e. neighboring or retired administrator, etc.) By July 15 of each year, the District and Principals’ Association will agree upon a list of potential independent administrators from which the third member of the committee will be selected. The appealing principal may not be appointed to the committee for his/her own appeal.

The Appeal Committee shall meet within fifteen (15) school days from the date of the Superintendent’s response (to the Principal’s formal appeal) to review the appeal. The appeal will consist of the written record (original APPR, original supporting documentation, the Principal’s appeal, superintendent’s response to the appeal). The committee will decide whether the appeal should be denied or sustained and, if sustained, how the APPR should be amended. The committee must reach consensus (defined as an agreement that all members of the committee can support). The committee retains the right to seek clarifying information from the Principal and the Superintendent regarding the materials provided as part of the appeal. However, no new materials may be submitted by either party. All committee deliberations will be conducted privately and remain confidential except as required to further process the appeal as outlined below. The committee is to provide its determination in writing within 10 school days of its meeting. The decision shall be submitted to the superintendent and appealing principal.

6. APPEAL DECISION:

If the committee cannot reach consensus, the appeal will go to a mutually agreed upon third party hearing officer, who will review the written record, including the findings of the committee. The hearing officer shall receive the record of the appeal within 5 days of the

committee's submission of its determination. The hearing officer shall be selected from a list of mutually agreed upon hearing officers agreed upon between the Superintendent and Association President no later than July 15th of each year. The list shall continue unless and until modified by mutual agreement. Each member of the committee (individually or jointly with another member) may submit to the hearing officer, as part of the appeal a written statement describing his/her conclusions, justifications and a recommendation for the disposition of the appeal. The hearing officer may proceed on the submitted record alone to make a determination or, at his/her discretion, convene the parties for any clarifying questions. This process is specifically not designed to be a hearing process. Rather, it is intended to be an independent, expeditious, and qualified determination. Cost of the hearing officer shall be borne equally by the district and the principal. The hearing officer must render a decision within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the record. The decision of the hearing officer shall be final and binding.

7. FILE COPY

A copy of the APPR, the principal's appeal, and the final written determination shall be placed in the principal's personnel file. A complete copy of the record on appeal shall be kept separately in the Superintendent's Office.

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.

The District will ensure that all lead evaluators/evaluators are properly trained and certified, as required by Education Law §3012-c and the implementing Regulations of the Commissioner of State Education prior to conducting any teacher evaluation.

A. Nature of Training Provided to Certify Evaluators of Teachers:

For the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school year, evaluator training was conducted by Capital Region BOCES. Training was also provided by the New York State Council of School Superintendents

Additional trainings also conducted by Capital Region BOCES will be conducted prior to the start of the 2012-13 school year. This training which shall address the nine minimum requirements outlined in Regents Rules 30.9 shall include, but not be limited to the following:

- *ISLLC Leadership Standards*
- *Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research*
- *Application and use of the state-approved Multi-Dimensional Principal Performance Rubric , including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal's practice*
- *Application and use of any assessment tools that the district uses to evaluate teachers*
- *Development and Application of any locally selected measures of student achievement*
- *Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System*
- *Scoring methodology used to evaluate teachers*

B. Certification of Evaluators

The Board of Education will certify lead evaluators upon confirmation of participation. The Superintendent will maintain records of certification of evaluators.

C. Recertification and Inter-rater Reliability

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are recertified as appropriate. Capital Region BOCES has been utilized to provide the initial training during the 2011-2012 school year.

In order to ensure that evaluators maintain inter-rater reliability over time and appropriate certification, each evaluator will be required to be re-certified annually. Re-certification shall be achieved by completion of district and/or BOCES provided refresher programs.

D. Elimination of Examiner Bias

Evaluators will make good faith efforts to provide accurate evaluations, aligned to the Multidimensional Principal Performance

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 Wednesday, October 24, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 2012

Page 1

12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5581/205793-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Guilderland CSD Signed Certification Form - APPR.\(12 12 12\).pdf.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/205793-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Guilderland CSD Signed Certification Form - APPR.(12 12 12).pdf.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.

Component Score	Range of Student Performance
20	95%-100% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
19	90%-94% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
18	85%-89% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
17	84% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
16	83% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
15	82% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
14	81% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
13	80% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
12	79% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
11	78% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
10	77% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
9	76% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
8	75% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
7	73%-74% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
6	71%-72% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
5	69%-70% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
4	67%-68% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
3	65%-66% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
2	60%-64% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
1	55%-59% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).
0	<55% of students exhibit growth from pre-assessment (start of course) to post-assessment (end of course/summative).

Component Score	Range of Student Performance
15	100.00% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
14	96-99.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
13	92-95.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
12	88-91.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
11	84-87.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
10	80-83.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
9	76-79.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
8	72-75.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
7	63-71.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
6	54-62.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
5	45-53.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
4	36-44.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
3	27-35.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
2	18-26.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
1	9-17.99% of students meet or exceed individual target (MAP) or proficiency (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
0	0-8.99% of students meet or exceed individual target (MAP) or

	proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
--	--

Component Score	Range of Student Performance
20	95%-100% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
19	90%-94% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
18	85%-89% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
17	84% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
16	83% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
15	82% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
14	81% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
13	80% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
12	79% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
11	78% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
10	77% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
9	76% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
8	75% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
7	73%-74% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
6	71%-72% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
5	69%-70% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or

	proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
4	67%-68% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
3	65%-66% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
2	60%-64% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
1	55%-59% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
0	<55% of students meet or exceed target (MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)

Total Average Score Conversion Score

1	0
1.016	1
1.017	2
1.025	3
1.033	4
1.042	5
1.05	6
1.058	7
1.067	8
1.075	9
1.083	10
1.092	11
1.1	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
1.2	25
1.208	26
1.217	27
1.225	28
1.233	29
1.242	30
1.25	31
1.258	32
1.267	33
1.275	34
1.283	35
1.292	36
1.3	37
1.308	38
1.317	39
1.325	40
1.333	41
1.342	42
1.35	43
1.358	44

1.367	45
1.375	46
1.383	47
1.392	48
1.4	49
1.5	50
1.6	51
1.7	51
1.8	52
1.9	53
2	54
2.1	54
2.2	55
2.3	56
2.4	56
2.5	57
2.6	57
2.7	57
2.8	58
2.9	58
3	58
3.1	58
3.2	58
3.3	59
3.4	59
3.5	59
3.6	59
3.7	60
3.8	60
3.9	60
4	60

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN

<i>Domains/ Practices in Need of Improvement</i>	<i>Expected outcomes/performance and Recommended Action Steps</i>	<i>Available supports and resources</i>	<i>Responsibilities</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Evidence of Achievement</i>

Date of conference: _____

Teacher signature: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator signature _____

Date: _____

Component Score	Range of Student Performance
15	100.00% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
14	96-99.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
13	92-95.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
12	88-91.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
11	84-87.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
10	80-83.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
9	76-79.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
8	72-75.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
7	63-71.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
6	54-62.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
5	45-53.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
4	36-44.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
3	27-35.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
2	18-26.99% of students meet or exceed individual target(MAP) or proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
1	9-17.99% of students meet or exceed individual target (MAP) or proficiency (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
0	0-8.99% of students meet or exceed individual target (MAP) or

	proficiency benchmark (65% on Guilderland CSD developed assessments)
--	--

Total Average Score Conversion Score

1	0
1.016	1
1.017	2
1.025	3
1.033	4
1.042	5
1.05	6
1.058	7
1.067	8
1.075	9
1.083	10
1.092	11
1.1	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
1.2	25
1.208	26
1.217	27
1.225	28
1.233	29
1.242	30
1.25	31
1.258	32
1.267	33
1.275	34
1.283	35
1.292	36
1.3	37
1.308	38
1.317	39
1.325	40
1.333	41
1.342	42
1.35	43
1.358	44

1.367	45
1.375	46
1.383	47
1.392	48
1.4	49
1.5	50
1.6	51
1.7	51
1.8	52
1.9	53
2	54
2.1	54
2.2	55
2.3	56
2.4	56
2.5	57
2.6	57
2.7	57
2.8	58
2.9	58
3	58
3.1	58
3.2	58
3.3	59
3.4	59
3.5	59
3.6	59
3.7	60
3.8	60
3.9	60
4	60

1. Principal Improvement Plan

A Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) is designed to provide support for the principal through communication, discussion and collaboration in identified areas in need of growth or improvement. A Principal Improvement Plan may be implemented for a principal at any time during the year to address concerns identified by the Superintendent.

However, when a principal receives a composite rating on the APPR of “ineffective” or “developing”, the principal must be placed on a Principal Improvement Plan that is designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies. The improvement plan must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) school days after the start of a school year. The superintendent, in conjunction with the principal, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the “ineffective” or “developing” “assessment.”
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable time line for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve goal.
6. A formative evaluation process including meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress. Dates of those meeting will be mutually agreed upon and included in the timeline of the plan. The superintendent will provide written feedback on progress within 5 school days of those scheduled meetings.
7. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.

If at the conclusion of the improvement plan timeline, the plan’s goals are met, the improvement plan will terminate. The superintendent shall determine if, and to what extent, the goals are met; this information will be communicated in writing to the principal and signed by both parties.

Principal Improvement Plan Template

Areas(s) in Need of Improvement/Domains	Expected Goals/ Outcomes	Action Steps and Supports	Person(s) Responsible	Timeline	Evidence of Achievement of Goals

Date of Conference _____

Principal Signature _____

Date _____

Evaluator Signature _____

Date _____

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

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

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

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

- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions and teacher and principal development
- Assure that the entire APPR plan will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured
- Assure that the district or BOCES will provide the teacher's or principal's score and rating on the locally selected measures subcomponent, if available, and on the other measures of teacher and principal effectiveness subcomponent for a teacher's or principal's annual professional performance review, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured
- Assure that the APPR plan will be posted on the district's or BOCES' website by September 10 or within 10 days after it is approved by the Commissioner, whichever is later
- Assure that accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner
- Assure that the district or BOCES will report the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner
- Certify that the district provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English Language Learners and students with disabilities
- Assure that educators who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating will receive a TIP or PIP plan, in accordance with the regulations, as soon as practicable but in no case later than 10 school days from the opening of classes in the school year following the performance year
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with the regulations
- Assure that the district or BOCES has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal
- Assure that, for teachers, all NYS Teaching Standards are assessed at least once per year, and, for principals, all Leadership Standards are assessed at least once per year
- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0 for each subcomponent and 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: 12-12-12

Lauri Wells

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Maceo Dubore Jr. 12-12-12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

Mary K. Summerette 12/12/12

Board of Education President Signature: Date: 12-12-12

Colleen M. O'Connell