



Cincinnatus Central School District

607-863-4069/fax 607-863-4109
shubbard@cc.cnyric.org

Student Learning Objectives (for teachers without a NYS assigned Score)

For teachers in subject areas that do not have a NYS assigned Growth Score, their growth score will be based on Student Learning Objectives. A Student Learning Objective ("SLO") is an academic goal for a teacher's students that is set at the start of a course. It represents the most important learning for the year (or, semester, where applicable). It must be specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, and aligned to Common Core, State, or national standards, as well as any other District priorities. See Appendix A for the SLO Template.

All SLO's shall include the following elements: Student population; Learning content; Interval of instructional time; Evidence; Baseline; Target and HEDI criteria; and Rationale.

The SLO process to be used shall consist of a pre-test administered at the beginning of the class or as soon as practicable and a post-assessment that will be administered at the end of the course.

After the pre-test is administered and scored, a class average using those currently on the class roster will be calculated and the range of scores and a class average will be determined. From this baseline data, the target score will be developed by the Principal in consultation with the teacher. Annual goal setting shall be required for teachers in setting Student Learning Objectives and/or for Local Assessments. The target score shall be developed no later than October 15th or within ten (10) school days of the completion of the ratification/approval process of this agreement.

After the post-assessment is administered and scored, the percentage of students meeting their target shall be determined. Where more than one SLO is applicable, each SLO shall be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO. The following will be used to determine points achieved by a teacher:

Highly Effective	85% - 100%	of students meet SLO target	18 - 20 points
Effective	65% - 84%	of students meet SLO target	9 - 17 points
Developing	50% - 64%	of students meet SLO target	3 - 8 points
Ineffective	Less than 49%	of students meet SLO target	0 - 2 points

Classroom teachers with fifteen (15) or fewer students will be granted the maximum number of points possible within the HEDI band in which s/he falls based on the percentage of students meeting the target. In no case will a teacher's HEIDI score be increased by more than 2 (two) points.

20 Point State Growth Measure

	% of Student Growth	Points For NYS Student Growth Measure
Highly Effective	96 - 100	20
	91 - 95	19
	85 - 90	18
Effective	82 - 84	17
	80 - 81	16
	78 - 79	15
	76 - 77	14
	74 - 75	13
	72 - 73	12
	70 - 71	11
	68 - 69	10
	65 - 67	9
Developing	63 - 64	8
	60 - 62	7
	57 - 59	6
	54 - 56	5
	52 - 53	4
	50 - 51	3
Ineffective	36 - 49	2
	21 - 35	1
	20 or less	0

**Or
25
State**

Point



Cincinnatus Central School District

607-863-4069/fax 607-863-4109

shubbard@cc.cnyric.org

APPR Table 3.3

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

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

The District wide local score will be based on the average percent of all state testing including 3 – 8 ELA and Math scores, along with the Regents testing Scores of students scoring proficient or better. The average for each year will be calculated by adding the average percent proficient in each of the areas tested and dividing that number by the number of tests administered. This average will be compared to the previous year average using the following formula;

(This year's average – last year's average = Growth Score Percentage)

Grade Levels

K – 12 All Subjects

Assessments

ELA 3, ELA 4, ELA 5, ELA6,
ELA 7, ELA 8, Math 3, Math 4,
Math 5, Math 6, Math 7, Math 8,
Science 4, Science 8, Chemistry,
Physics, English, Global Studies,
Living Environment, Earth Science,
US History, Integrated Algebra,
Algebra 2/Trigonometry, and
Geometry

The average shall then be converted to a HEDI score using the chart below.

20 Point Local Growth Measure

	% of Student Growth	Points For NYS Student Growth Measure
Highly Effective	7%	20
	6%	19
	5%	18
Effective	4%	17
	3%	16

	2%	15
	1%	14
	0%	13
	-1%	12
	-2%	11
	-3%	10
	-4%	9
Developing	-5%	8
	-6%	7
	-7%	6
	-8%	5
	-9%	4
	-10%	3
Ineffective	-11%	2
	-12%	1
	-13% or lower	0

Or

15 Point Local Growth Measure

	% of Student Growth	Points For NYS Student Growth Measure
Highly Effective	5%	15
	4%	14
Effective	3%	13
	2%	12
	1%	11
	0%	10
	-1%	9
	-2%	8
	-3%	6
Developing	-4%	6
	-5%	5
	-6%	4
	-7%	3
	-8%	2
Ineffective	-9%	1
	-10% or more	0

Scale to be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.



Cincinnatus Central School District

607-863-4069/fax 607-863-4109

shubbard@cc.cnyric.org

APPR Table 3.3

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement

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

The District wide local score will be based on the average percent of all state testing including 3 – 8 ELA and Math scores, along with the Regents testing Scores of students scoring proficient or better. The average for each year will be calculated by adding the average percent proficient in each of the areas tested and dividing that number by the number of tests administered. This average will be compared to the previous year average using the following formula;

(This year's average – last year's average = Growth Score Percentage)

Grade Levels

K – 12 All Subjects

Assessments

ELA 3, ELA 4, ELA 5, ELA6, ELA 7, ELA 8, Math 3, Math 4, Math 5, Math 6, Math 7, Math 8, Science 4, Science 8, Chemistry, Physics, English, Global Studies, Living Environment, Earth Science, US History, Integrated Algebra, Algebra 2/Trigonometry, and Geometry

The average shall then be converted to a HEDI score using the chart below.

20 Point Local Growth Measure

	% of Student Growth	Points For NYS Student Growth Measure
Highly Effective	7%	20
	6%	19
	5%	18
Effective	4%	17
	3%	16

	2%	15
	1%	14
	0%	13
	-1%	12
	-2%	11
	-3%	10
	-4%	9
Developing	-5%	8
	-6%	7
	-7%	6
	-8%	5
	-9%	4
	-10%	3
Ineffective	-11%	2
	-12%	1
	-13% or lower	0

Or

15 Point Local Growth Measure

	% of Student Growth	Points For NYS Student Growth Measure
Highly Effective	5%	15
	4%	14
Effective	3%	13
	2%	12
	1%	11
	0%	10
	-1%	9
	-2%	8
	-3%	6
Developing	-4%	6
	-5%	5
	-6%	4
	-7%	3
	-8%	2
Ineffective	-9%	1
	-10% or more	0

Scale to be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.



Cincinnatus Central School District

607-863-4069/fax 607-863-4109

shubbard@cc.cnyric.org

APPR 60%

C. Multiple Measures of Effectiveness

The remaining sixty percent (60%) (or sixty [60] out of the total one hundred [100] point composite score) of the composite effectiveness score is based on other measures of teacher effectiveness consistent with standards prescribed by the Commissioner in regulation. The District and the Association have agreed that the New York State United Teachers' Rubric will be utilized by the district to score this section of the evaluation. Converting points to a rating scale.

The teacher's rating will drive how many points the teacher will receive toward the composite score. In this subcomponent, the teacher should first be rated according to the rubric, that rating would determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied. For example, a teacher that scores 3.0 on the rubric would translate to a score in the "effective" range. The teacher would then receive 58 points toward the composite score.

Calculating Steps

- Taking into account the SED preset scales for the other two sub-components and the composite scores, NYSUT calculated the scale (point distribution) for each rating category (Highly Effective=59-60, Effective=57-58, Developing=50-56, Ineffective=0-49) for this sub-component.
- Once these sub-component scale scores were determined, NYSUT calculated how much each rubric score category of 1-4 would be worth, based on the number of points within each category. For example, a 1 on the rubric equates to an ineffective rating, the number of possible rubric points in the 1 range would need to equate to the 49 points of the ineffective subcomponent score. SED requires that all points 0-60 are reachable, so the rubric scores in the Ineffective range were expanded in order to accommodate all of the possible scores 0-49. Each category conversion was calculated based on the possible number of rubric scores and the number of sub-component points within each category.

Teacher Effects Conversion Scale

Level	Overall rubric average score	60 point distribution for composite
Ineffective	1-1.4	0-49
Developing	1.5-2.4	50-56
Effective	2.5-3.4	57-58
Highly Effective	3.5-4	59-60

The detailed conversion chart below allows districts to convert any average rubric score to a specific conversion score for that sub-component.

Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart

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

1.317		39
1.325		40
1.333		41
1.342		42
1.350		43
1.358		44
1.367		45
1.375		46
1.383		47
1.392		48
1.400		49
Developing 50-56		
1.5		50
1.6		50.7
1.7		51.4
1.8		52.1
1.9		52.8
2		53.5
2.1		54.2
2.2		54.9
2.3		55.6
2.4		56.3

Effective 57-58		
2.5		57
2.6		57.2
2.7		57.4
2.8		57.6
2.9		57.8
3		58
3.1		58.2
3.2		58.4
3.3		58.6
3.4		58.8
Highly Effective 59-60		
3.5		59
3.6		59.3
3.7		59.5
3.8		59.8
3.9		60
4		60.25 (round to 60)

Scoring Example - Tenured Teachers

Standard	Formal Observation 25 Pts	Unannounced Observation 10 Pts.	Summative Observation Conference 25 Pts.
1	3.5		3.5
2	3.5		
3	3		3
4		3	
5	2		4
6			3
7			2.5
Subtotal	12	3	16
Subtotal divided by number of standards evaluated (round to nearest tenth)	$12/4 = 3.0$	$3/1 = 3.0$	$16/5 = 3.2$
Weighting Value	$25/60 = .416$	$10/60 = .166$	$25/60 = .416$
Value of Weighted Scores	$3.0 \times .416 = 1.23$	$3.0 \times .166 = .50$	$3.2 \times .416 = 1.33$
Sum of Weighted Scores			$1.23 + .50 + 1.33 = 3.06$
Weighted Scores After Conversion			58.2
HEDI Rating (Other Measures of Effectiveness)			Effective

Level	Overall Rubric Average Score	60 Point Distribution for Composite
Ineffective	1 - 1.4	0 - 49
Developing	1.5 - 2.4	50 - 56
Effective	2.5 - 3.4	57 - 58
Highly Effective	3.5 - 4	59 - 60

*** Must be used with Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart**

*** Rubric Scoring will range between 1 and 4 in increments of .5 points.**

Scoring Example Probationary Teachers

Standard	1st Formal Observation	2nd Formal Observation	Unannounced Observation	Walk Through Observation	Walk Through Observation	Summative Observation Conference
	25 Pts (average of all three (3) observations)			10 Pts. (average of Walk Through Observations)		25 Pts.
1	3	4		3.5	2.5	4
2	4	4		3	3	
3	3	3		3.5	3	3
4			3			
5	2	3		2.5	4	4
6						3
7						2
Subtotal	12	14	3	12.5	12.5	16
Subtotal divided by number of standards evaluated (round to nearest tenth)	$12/4 = 3.0$	$14/4 = 3.5$	$3/1 = 3.0$	$12.5/4 = 3.1$	$12.5/4 = 3.1$	$16/5 = 3.2$
Average	$9.5/3 = 3.16$			$6.2/2 = 3.1$		3.2
Weighting Value	$25/60 = .416$			$10/60 = .166$		$25/60 = .416$
Value of Weighted Scores	$3.16 \times .416 = 1.31$			$3.1 \times .166 = .52$		$3.2 \times .416 = 1.33$
Sum of Weighted Scores						$1.31 + .52 + 1.33 = 3.16$
Weighted Scores After Conversion						58.4
HEDI Rating (Other Measures of Effectiveness)						Effective
Level	Overall Rubric Average Score	60 Point Distribution for Composite				
Ineffective	1 - 1.4	0 - 49				
Developing	1.5 - 2.4	50 - 56				
Effective	2.5 - 3.4	57 - 58				
Highly Effective	3.5 - 4	59 - 60				
* Must be used with Rubric Score to Sub-Component Conversion Chart						
* Rubric Scoring will range between 1 and 4 in increments of .5 points.						

Steven V. Hubbard
Superintendent of Schools



2809 Cincinnatus Rd.
Cincinnatus, NY 13040

Cincinnatus Central School District

607-863-4069/fax 607-863-4109

shubbard@cc.cnyric.org

APPR T.I.P

Appendix K

Cincinnatus Central School

**TEACHING IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) — TEACHER/ADMINISTRATOR
CONFERENCE FORM**

Name of Teacher _____ Tenure or Probationary

Area _____ School _____

Name of Evaluator _____ Subject/Grade

Level(s) _____ Date _____

As a result of unsatisfactory performance, the building principal has designated the above-named teacher for a TIP. The following category/component areas have been identified for intensive administrative support and professional development.

Category: _____ Criterion: _____

Goal(s): _____

ACTIVITIES/STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT SUPPORT/RESOURCES NEEDED EXPECTED OUTCOMES EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS TIMELINE

Category: _____ Criterion: _____

Goal(s): _____

ACTIVITIES/STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT SUPPORT/RESOURCES NEEDED EXPECTED OUTCOMES EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS TIMELINE

Category: _____ Criterion: _____

Goal(s): _____

ACTIVITIES/STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT SUPPORT/RESOURCES NEEDED EXPECTED OUTCOMES EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS TIMELINE

Category: _____ Criterion: _____

Goal(s): _____

ACTIVITIES/STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT SUPPORT/RESOURCES NEEDED EXPECTED OUTCOMES EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS TIMELINE

Evaluator's Signature/Date : _____

Teacher's Signature/Date: _____

The TIP agreement is to be reviewed by the end of the subsequent semester following its implementation. Please mark the appropriate box:

Plan Confirmed Date _____ Plan Complete Date _____



Cincinnatus Central School District
607-863-4069/fax 607-863-4109
shubbard@cc.cnyric.org

8.1 APPR Principals' Locally Selected 15%

Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

The District wide local score will be based on the average percent of all state testing including 3 – 8 ELA and Math scores, along with the Regents testing Scores of students scoring proficient or better. The average for each year will be calculated by adding the average percent proficient in each of the areas tested and dividing that number by the number of tests administered. This average will be compared to the previous year average using the following formula;

(This year's average – last year's average = Growth Score Percentage)

Grade Levels

K – 12 All Subjects

Assessments

**ELA 3, ELA 4, ELA 5, ELA6,
ELA 7, ELA 8, Math 3, Math 4,
Math 5, Math 6, Math 7, Math 8,
Science 4, Science 8, Chemistry,
Physics, English, Global Studies,
Living Environment, Earth Science,
US History, Integrated Algebra,
Algebra 2/Trigonometry, and
Geometry**

The average shall then be converted to a HEDI score using the chart below.

20 Point Local Growth Measure

	% of Student Growth	Points For NYS Student Growth Measure
Highly Effective	7%	20
	6%	19
	5%	18
Effective	4%	17
	3%	16

	2%	15
	1%	14
	0%	13
	-1%	12
	-2%	11
	-3%	10
	-4%	9
Developing	-5%	8
	-6%	7
	-7%	6
	-8%	5
	-9%	4
	-10%	3
Ineffective	-11%	2
	-12%	1
	-13% or lower	0

Or

15 Point Local Growth Measure

	% of Student Growth	Points For NYS Student Growth Measure
Highly Effective	5%	15
	4%	14
Effective	3%	13
	2%	12
	1%	11
	0%	10
	-1%	9
	-2%	8
Developing	-3%	6
	-4%	6
	-5%	5
	-6%	4
	-7%	3
Ineffective	-8%	2
	-9%	1
	-10% or more	0

Scale to be determined annually and may be further modified if significant adjustments are made at the State level to exam content, format or scales.

Steven V. Hubbard
Superintendent of Schools



2809 Cincinnatus Rd.
Cincinnatus, NY 13040

Cincinnatus Central School District
607-863-4069/fax 607-863-4109
shubbard@cc.cnyric.org

APPR Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Name: _____ (Tenure or Probationary)

Position: _____

Evaluator: _____ Date _____

As a result of unsatisfactory performance, the superintendent has designated the above-named principal for a PIP.

The following category/component areas have been identified for intensive support and professional development.

Domain: _____

Dimension: _____

Goal(s): _____

ACTIVITIES/STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT:

SUPPORT/RESOURCES NEEDED:

EXPECTED OUTCOMES:

EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS:

TIMELINE:

Evaluator's Signature/Date : _____

Principal's Signature/Date: _____

The PIP is to be reviewed by the end of the subsequent semester following its implementation. Please mark the appropriate box:

Plan Confirmed Date _____ Plan Complete Date _____