



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

Kenneth O. Cringle, Superintendent
Saranac Central School District
32 Emmons Street
Dannemora, NY 12929

Dear Superintendent Cringle:

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

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

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

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



John B. King, Jr.
Commissioner

Attachment

c: Craig L. King

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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Wednesday, November 21, 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 : 091402060000

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

091402060000

1.2) School District Name: SARANAC CSD

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

SARANAC 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.

(No response)

1.4) Award Classification

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

(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.

Annual (2012-13)

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

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Wednesday, December 12, 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	AIMSWEB K-assessment-ELA
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB Grade 1 assessment-ELA
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB Grade 2-assessment-ELA

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in	Building ELA and Math combined growth targets were determined based on historical student assessment
---	--

this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	performance scores. An ELA and Math combined baseline benchmark was calculated using the 2011-2012 AIMSweb student performance assessment results. All students in grades K-2 were included to determine this baseline growth target. To demonstrate student growth across all subject areas for students K-5, an aspirational target higher than the benchmark was established. Utilizing the building wide growth target set by the District, points will be assigned to each teacher based on the averaged scores of the student population , aligned to the HEDI scale in an equitably, weighted manner as follows in the proceeding charts.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85-100% of students meet building target = Highly Effective 95-100% = 20 90- 94 % = 19 85- 89 % = 18
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	40-84% of students meet building target = Effective 80- 84% = 17 75- 79 % = 16 70- 74 % = 15 65- 69% = 14 60- 64 % =13 55- 59 % =12 50- 54% = 11 45- 49 % =10 40- 44 % = 9
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	10-39% of students meet building target= Developing 35- 39% = 8 30- 34% = 7 25- 29 % =6 20- 24% = 5 15- 19 % =4 10- 14 % =3
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	0- 9% of students meet building target = Ineffective 5- 9% = 2 1- 4 % =1 0 % = 0

2.3) Grades K-3 Math

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

	Math	Assessment
K	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB Kindergarten Assessment-Math
1	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB Grade 1 Assessment-Math
2	State-approved 3rd party assessment	AIMSWEB Grade 2 Assessment-Math
	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>Building ELA and Math combined growth targets were determined based on historical student assessment performance scores. An ELA and Math combined baseline benchmark was calculated using the 2011-2012 AIMSweb student performance assessment results. All students in grades K-2 were included to determine this baseline growth target. To demonstrate student growth across all subject areas for students K-5, an aspirational target higher than the benchmark was established. Utilizing the building wide growth target set by the District, points will be assigned to each teacher based on the averaged scores of the student population, aligned to the HEDI scale in an equitably, weighted manner as follows in the proceeding charts.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>85-100% of students meet building target = Highly Effective 95-100% = 20 90- 94 % = 19 85- 89 % = 18</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>40-84% of students meet building target = Effective 80- 84% = 17 75- 79 % = 16 70- 74 % = 15 65- 69% = 14 60- 64 % =13 55- 59 % =12 50- 54% = 11 45- 49 % =10 40- 44 % = 9</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>10-39% of students meet building target= Developing 35- 39% = 8 30- 34% = 7 25- 29 % =6 20- 24% = 5 15- 19 % =4 10- 14 % =3</p>
<p>Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).</p>	<p>0- 9% of students meet building target = Ineffective 5- 9% = 2 1- 4 % =1 0 % = 0</p>

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	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 6 Assessment-Science
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 7 Assessment-Science

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

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

Students are given pretests at the beginning of courses that are aligned to the post test, which is either a State exam, a grade level State assessment, Regents Exam, a District developed summative exam or an exam from the list of NYSED approved assessments. For grade 8 Science, both the pre-test and post-test scores will be assigned 0-100 scores. The Northeastern Regional Information Center (NERIC) will provide 0-100 scores on the state exam for individual students. For grades 6 and 7 scores on both the pretest and the post test are between 0 and 100.

The "gap" between the pretest score and 100 is calculated by subtracting the pretest score from 100. A goal is set for each student to add 75% of this gap to his/her pretest score (their "growth"). Post test scores are used to measure their growth in comparison with their goal. See chart in 2.11.

Students' growth rates are calculated and adjusted for SWD and Econ Disadvantaged. The average of the students' rates for a teacher's course is calculated and converted to a HEDI rating and is then converted to a 20 point scale for inclusion into their composite rating. No performance results of a student of record will be omitted when calculating a teacher's adjusted growth score. Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.

Growth Formula

$[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$

Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\% \text{ Student Growth Score}$

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

$\text{Growth}/\text{SWD Adj}/\text{Pov Adj} = \text{Adjusted Growth Score}$

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not
Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5
SED Adj = 1.0
Pov Adj = 0.95

$87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92\%$ Adjusted Growth

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Highly Effective
84%-100% = 20
82%-83% = 19
80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Effective
79% = 17
78% = 16
77% = 15
76% = 14
75% = 13
74% = 12
73% = 11
72% = 10
71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Developing
68%- 70% = 8
64%-67% = 7
60%-63% = 6
56%-59% = 5
52%-55% = 4
48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student
Population = Ineffective
45%-47% = 2
40%-44% = 1
0% - 39% = 0

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

80-100% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

71-79% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

48-70% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

0-47% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 6 Assessment-Social Studies
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 7 Assessment-Social Studies
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 8 Assessment-Social Studies

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.

Students are given pretests at the beginning of courses that are aligned to the post test, which is either a Regents Exam, a District developed summative exam or an exam from the list of NYSED approved assessments. Scores on both the pretest and the post test are between 0 and 100. The "gap" between the pretest core and 100 is calculated by subtracting the pretest score from 100. A goal is set for each student to add 75% of this gap to his/her pretest score (their "growth"). Post test scores are used to measure their growth in comparison with their goal.

Students' growth rates are calculated and adjusted for SWD and Econ Disadvantaged. The average of the students' rates for a teacher's course is calculated and converted to a HEDI rating and is then converted to a 20 point scale for inclusion into their composite rating. No performance results of a student of record will be omitted when calculating a teacher's adjusted growth score. Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.

Growth Formula

$$[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$$

Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\%$ Student Growth Score

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

$$\text{Growth/SWD Adj/Pov Adj} = \text{Adjusted Growth Score}$$

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not
 Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with

disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5

SED Adj = 1.0

Pov Adj = 0.95

$87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92\%$ Adjusted Growth

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Highly Effective

84%-100%= 20

82%-83% = 19

80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Effective

79% = 17

78% = 16

77% = 15

76% = 14

75% = 13

74% = 12

73% = 11

72% = 10

71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Developing

68%- 70% = 8

64%-67% = 7

60%-63% = 6

56%-59% = 5

52%-55% = 4

48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student
Population = Ineffective

45%-47% = 2

40%-44% = 1

0% - 39% = 0

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

80-100% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

71-79% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

48-70% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

0-47% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 9 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.

Students are given pretests at the beginning of courses that are aligned to the post test, which is either a Regents Exam, a District developed summative exam or an exam from the list of NYSED approved assessments. Scores on both the pretest and the post test are between 0 and 100. The "gap" between the pretest score and 100 is calculated by subtracting the pretest score from 100. A goal is set for each student to add 75% of this gap to his/her pretest score (their "growth"). Post test scores are used to measure their growth in comparison with their goal.

Students' growth rates are calculated and adjusted for SWD and Econ Disadvantaged. The average of the students' rates for a teacher's course is calculated and converted to a HEDI rating and is then converted to a 20 point scale for inclusion into their composite rating. No performance results of a student of record will be omitted when calculating a teacher's adjusted growth score. Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.

Growth Formula

$$[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$$

Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\%$ Student Growth Score

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

$$\text{Growth/SWD Adj/Pov Adj} = \text{Adjusted Growth Score}$$

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not
Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5
SED Adj = 1.0
Pov Adj = 0.95

$87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92\%$ Adjusted Growth

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Highly Effective
84%-100% = 20
82%-83% = 19
80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Effective
79% = 17
78% = 16
77% = 15
76% = 14
75% = 13
74% = 12
73% = 11
72% = 10
71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Developing
68%-70% = 8
64%-67% = 7
60%-63% = 6
56%-59% = 5
52%-55% = 4
48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student
Population = Ineffective
45%-47% = 2
40%-44% = 1
0% - 39% = 0

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

80-100% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

71-79% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

48-70% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

0-47% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

2.7) High School Science Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

Students are given pretests at the beginning of courses that are aligned to the post test, which is either a Regents Exam, a District developed summative exam or an exam from the list of NYSED approved assessments. Scores on both the pretest and the post test are between 0 and 100. The "gap" between the pretest score and 100 is calculated by subtracting the pretest score from 100. A goal is set for each student to add 75% of this gap to his/her pretest score (their "growth"). Post test scores are used to measure their growth in comparison with their goal.

Students' growth rates are calculated and adjusted for SWD and Econ Disadvantaged. The average of the students' rates for a teacher's course is calculated and converted to a HEDI rating and is then converted to a 20 point scale for inclusion into their composite rating. No performance results of a student of record will be omitted when calculating a teacher's adjusted growth score. Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.

Growth Formula

$$[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$$

Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\%$ Student Growth Score

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

$$\text{Growth/SWD Adj/Pov Adj} = \text{Adjusted Growth Score}$$

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not
Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5
SED Adj = 1.0
Pov Adj = 0.95

$$87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92\% \text{ Adjusted Growth}$$

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Highly Effective

84%-100% = 20
82%-83% = 19
80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Effective

79% = 17
78% = 16
77% = 15
76% = 14
75% = 13
74% = 12
73% = 11
72% = 10
71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Developing

68%-70% = 8
64%-67% = 7
60%-63% = 6
56%-59% = 5
52%-55% = 4
48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Ineffective

45%-47% = 2
40%-44% = 1
0% - 39% = 0

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

80-100% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

71-79% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	48-70% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-47% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

2.8) High School Math Regents Courses

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

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

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

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

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

Students are given pretests at the beginning of courses that are aligned to the post test, which is either a Regents Exam, a District developed summative exam or an exam from the list of NYSED approved assessments. Scores on both the pretest and the post test are between 0 and 100. The "gap" between the pretest score and 100 is calculated by subtracting the pretest score from 100. A goal is set for each student to add 75% of this gap to his/her pretest score (their "growth"). Post test scores are used to measure their growth in comparison with their goal.

Students' growth rates are calculated and adjusted for SWD and Econ Disadvantaged. The average of the students' rates for a teacher's course is calculated and converted to a HEDI rating and is then converted to a 20 point scale for inclusion into their composite rating. No performance results of a student of record will be omitted when calculating a teacher's adjusted growth score. Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.

Growth Formula

$$[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$$

Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\%$ Student Growth Score

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

Growth/SWD Adj/Pov Adj = Adjusted Growth Score

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not

Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5

SED Adj = 1.0

Pov Adj = 0.95

$87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92\%$ Adjusted Growth

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Highly Effective

84%-100% = 20

82%-83% = 19

80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Effective

79% = 17

78% = 16

77% = 15

76% = 14

75% = 13

74% = 12

73% = 11

72% = 10

71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Developing

68%-70% = 8

64%-67% = 7

60%-63% = 6

56%-59% = 5

52%-55% = 4

48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Ineffective

45%-47% = 2

40%-44% = 1

0% - 39% = 0

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

80-100% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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

71-79% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	48-70% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	0-47% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

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	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 9 Assessment-ELA
Grade 10 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Saranac Central Locally Developed Grade 10 Assessment-ELA
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	ELA regents Grade 11

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>Students are given pretests at the beginning of courses that are aligned to the post test, which is either a Regents Exam, a District developed summative exam or an exam from the list of NYSED approved assessments. Scores on both the pretest and the post test are between 0 and 100. The "gap" between the pretest core and 100 is calculated by subtracting the pretest score from 100. A goal is set for each student to add 75% of this gap to his/her pretest score (their "growth"). Post test scores are used to measure their growth in comparison with their goal.</p> <p>Students' growth rates are calculated and adjusted for SWD and Econ Disadvantaged. The average of the students' rates for a teacher's course is calculated and converted to a HEDI rating and is then converted to a 20 point scale for inclusion into their composite rating. No performance results of a student of record will be omitted when calculating a teacher's adjusted growth score. Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.</p> <p>Growth Formula</p> $[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$ <p>Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\%$ Student Growth Score</p>
--	--

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

Growth/SWD Adj/Pov Adj = Adjusted Growth Score

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not

Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5

SED Adj = 1.0

Pov Adj = 0.95

$87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92\%$ Adjusted Growth

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Highly Effective

84%-100% = 20

82%-83% = 19

80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Effective

79% = 17

78% = 16

77% = 15

76% = 14

75% = 13

74% = 12

73% = 11

72% = 10

71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO
Student Population = Developing

68%-70% = 8

64%-67% = 7

60%-63% = 6

56%-59% = 5

52%-55% = 4

48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student
Population = Ineffective

45%-47% = 2

40%-44% = 1

0% - 39% = 0

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

80-100% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

Growth Formula

$[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$

Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\% \text{ Student Growth Score}$

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

$\text{Growth}/\text{SWD Adj}/\text{Pov Adj} = \text{Adjusted Growth Score}$

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not

Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5

SED Adj = 1.0

Pov Adj = 0.95

$87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92\% \text{ Adjusted Growth}$

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Highly Effective

84%-100% = 20

82%-83% = 19

80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Effective

79% = 17

78% = 16

77% = 15

76% = 14

75% = 13

74% = 12

73% = 11

72% = 10

71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population = Developing

68%-70% = 8

64%-67% = 7

60%-63% = 6

56%-59% = 5

52%-55% = 4

48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student

Population = Ineffective

45%-47% = 2

40%-44% = 1

0% - 39% = 0

Building ELA and Math combined growth targets were determined based on historical student assessment performance scores. An ELA and Math combined baseline benchmark was calculated using the 2011-2012 AIMSweb student performance assessment results. All students in grades K-2 were included to determine this baseline growth target. To demonstrate student growth across all subject areas for students K-5, an aspirational target higher than the benchmark was established. Utilizing the building wide growth target set by the District, points will be assigned to each teacher based on the averaged scores of the student population, aligned to the HEDI scale in an equitable, weighted manner as follows in the proceeding charts.

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

For 6-12:80-100% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

For K-5 =85%-100%

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

For 6-12:71-79% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

For K-5 = 40%-84%

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

For 6-12:48-70% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

For K-5= 10%-39%

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

For 6-12:0-47% growth(gap reduction) between pre-test and 100

For K-5= 0-9%

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/5364/128063-TXEttx9bQW/Saranac 2 11 HEDI.APPR Task2.10 K-5 etcdocx.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.

See process outlined above for grades 6-12

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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Friday, December 07, 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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 4 Assessments-ELA
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 5 Assessments-ELA

6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 6 Assessments-ELA
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 7 Assessments-ELA
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 8 Assessments-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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)</p> <p>Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.</p> <p>Calculating Steps</p> <p>Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.</p> <p>Using a 0-100 Point Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done. <p>Mixed Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment. <p>Converting to Subcomponent Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.
---	---

Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 4 Assessments-Math
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 5 Assessments-Math
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 6 Assessments-Math
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 7 Assessments-Math
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 8 Assessments-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.

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.	<p>Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)</p> <p>Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.</p> <p>Calculating Steps</p>
--	---

Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.

Using a 0-100 Point Scale

- When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done.

Mixed Model

- When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment.

Converting to Subcomponent Score

- Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.3 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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/5139/128064-rhJdBgDruP/Saranac 3.3 HEDI.doc

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed K Assessments-ELA
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 1 Assessments-ELA
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 2 Assessments-ELA
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 3 Assessments-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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)</p> <p>Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.</p> <p>Calculating Steps</p> <p>Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.</p> <p>Using a 0-100 Point Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done. <p>Mixed Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment. <p>Converting to Subcomponent Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once you have the averaging rating, it should be
--	--

converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade K Assessments-Math
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 1 Assessments-Math
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 2 Assessments-Math
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 3 Assessments-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.

Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)

Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.

Calculating Steps

Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.

Using a 0-100 Point Scale

- When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done.

Mixed Model

- When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment.

Converting to Subcomponent Score

- Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 6 Assessments-Science
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 7 Assessments-Science
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 8 Assessments-Science

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.

Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)

Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.

Calculating Steps

Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.

Using a 0-100 Point Scale

- When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done.

Mixed Model

- When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment.

Converting to Subcomponent Score

- Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 6 Assessments-Social Studies
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 7 Assessments-Social Studies
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 8 Assessments-Social Studies

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.

Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)

Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.

Calculating Steps

Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.

Using a 0-100 Point Scale

- When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done.

Mixed Model

- When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment.

Converting to Subcomponent Score
 • Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 9 Assessments-Global I
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 10 Assessments-Global II
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 11 Assessments-American History

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.

Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)

Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.

Calculating Steps

Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.

Using a 0-100 Point Scale

- When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done.

Mixed Model

- When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment.

Converting to Subcomponent Score

- Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 10 Assessments-Living Environment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 9 Assessments-Earth Science
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 11 Assessments-Chemistry
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 12 Assessments-Physics

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)</p> <p>Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.</p> <p>Calculating Steps</p> <p>Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.</p> <p>Using a 0-100 Point Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done. <p>Mixed Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment. <p>Converting to Subcomponent Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once you have the averaging rating, it should be
--	--

converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 9 Assessments-Algebra I
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 10 Assessments-Geometry
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Grade 11 Assessments-Algebra II

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.

Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)

Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will

determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.

Calculating Steps

Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.

Using a 0-100 Point Scale

- When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done.

Mixed Model

- When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment.

Converting to Subcomponent Score

- Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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	Saranac Central Locally developed Assessments-Grade 9 ELA

Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Assessments-Grade 10 ELA
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Saranac Central Locally developed Assessments-Grade 11 ELA

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.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.</p>	<p>Saranac CSD Scoring Methodology for the 20% local (15% when VAM in place)</p> <p>Scores on the locally-selected assessments are converted to HEDI categories. 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 on a 1-4 scale according to his or her average student scores on the assessments. The rating will determine where the teacher falls in the HEDI categories, and then the points are applied.</p> <p>Calculating Steps</p> <p>Taking into account the SED preset scales; the local negotiated the point distribution for each rating category. This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.</p> <p>Using a 0-100 Point Scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done. <p>Mixed Model</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment. <p>Converting to Subcomponent Score</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.
--	---

<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics</p>
--	---

This will be converted into a numerical effectiveness score using conversion charts. Depending on the assessments selected there are different methodologies that can be used for this conversion.

Using a 0-100 Point Scale

- When the local selects assessments scored on a 0-100 scale, they should be converted to a 1-4 scale to determine the rating category. The attached conversion shows how this can be done.

Mixed Model

- When the local selects assessments scored on 1-4 rubrics and 1-100 scales, convert the average scores for each assessment using locally negotiated conversion scales for each. Calculate the outcome based on negotiated weights of each assessment.

Converting to Subcomponent Score

- Once you have the averaging rating, it should be converted to a sub-component score using the attached chart.

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

See 3.13 HEDI Tables or Graphics

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/5139/128064-y92vNseFa4/SCSDAPPRHEDI conversion tables2012.docx](assets/survey-uploads/5139/128064-y92vNseFa4/SCSDAPPRHEDI%20conversion%20tables2012.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.

F. Local Assessment Distribution

1. The local assessment score of each student will include multiple measures and a teacher's final points for that course or grade will be the average of these local assessment scores.

2. Each teacher's local assessment score will be converted to a 1-4 rating using a method mutually agreed upon between the District and the Association. This score will be the HEDI rating. The HEDI rating categories are:

1.0 - 1.4 – Ineffective

1.5 – 2.4 – Developing

2.5 – 3.4 – Effective

3.5 – 4.0 - Highly Effective

The final HEDI rating will then be converted to a 20 point score using the chart in Appendix A. This converted score will be the teacher's score for the "local assessment" portion of the teacher's APPR.

3. Scores of students who miss more than 10% of classroom time may be pro-rated at the percentage of attendance at the discretion of the classroom teacher(s). The District closely monitors student attendance to promote regular attendance.

4. The superintendent will review all ineffective and developing ratings. In cases where there are extenuating circumstances (i.e. student mobility, large number of students with IEP's, students with attendance problems, et al), the superintendent may weigh individual student's scores or add points to the teacher's total score for the local assessment portion of their APPR, documentation of any such circumstances will be maintained by the District.

Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.

District Rationale for Selection of Control Factors

It is important to note that research shows that a strong predictor of a student's result on an assessment is his or her prior academic history. Prior academic history includes but is not limited to student attendance and intelligence/IQ scores. Research has shown a direct correlation between good attendance and student achievement (Dekalb, 1999). Poor attendance has been linked to poor academic achievement (Zeigler, 1972). Research also supports that intelligence/IQ can be a predictor of academic achievement. Therefore, the District included both of these achievement influences as adjustment factors.

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.

If more than one locally selected measure is used, each measure will be weighed equally to calculate one composite 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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Friday, December 07, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

NYSUT Teacher Practice Rubric

(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.

*Teacher performance will be assessed using multiple measures grounded in the New York State Teaching Standards. The NYSUT Teacher Rubric will be used to help assess a teacher's professional/instructional practice. Teacher observations and evidence collection provided by the teacher and/or principal may also be a component of the evaluation rating. Utilizing the Teacher Evaluation and Development document, indicators will be scored 1-4 and will be averaged to produce a standard score, standard scores will be averaged to calculate a total score of professional practice, a composite score will then be created using the tables below. Composite scores will be reported in whole numbers.
All observations will be conducted by a certified administrator who is a Board of Education approved certified evaluator.*

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/5091/128067-eka9yMJ855/SCSD605OTHER MEASURES CONVERSION CHART 2012.docx.docx

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	3.5-4.0 =59-60(SEE 4.5 Table)
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	2.5 -3.4 = 57-58(SEE 4.5 Table)
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1.5-2.4 = 50-56(SEE 4.5 Table)
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	1-1.4 = 0-49(SEE 4.5 Table)

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Formal/Long	2
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers Informal/Short	1
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?

-
- In Person
-

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Formal/Long	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	1
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Total	2

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- In Person
-

5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 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 Thursday, May 10, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

Page 1

6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5265/128070-Df0w3Xx5v6/STA_APPR_TIP9-12-12.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:

Appeals of Annual Professional Performance Reviews

APPEALS OF INEFFECTIVE AND DEVELOPING RATINGS

This appeals procedure will apply to tenured teachers who have received a composite score of ineffective or developing. This procedure will apply to probationary teachers who receive a rating of ineffective.

WHAT MAY BE CHALLENGED IN AN APPEAL

Appeal procedures in connection with an ineffective or developing rating will limit the scope of appeals under Education Law §3012-c to the following subjects:

- (1) the substance of the annual professional review*
- (2) the school district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;*
- (3) the adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;*
- (4) compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and*
- (5) the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan in connection with an ineffective or development rating under Education Law §3012-c.*

PROHIBITION AGAINST MORE THAN ONE APPEAL

A teacher may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review OR Teacher Improvement Plan. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within one appeal.

TIMEFRAME FOR FILING APPEAL

All appeals must be submitted to the evaluator, who issued the performance review, in writing no later than 15 calendar days from the date when the teacher acknowledges receipt of his/her annual professional performance review rating OR 15 calendar days from the issuance of the Teacher Improvement Plan.

All APPR's sent to teachers over the summer will be sent by certified mail to the teacher's home address. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned unless extended by mutual agreement. Any extension must be completed in a timely and expeditious manner.

When filing an appeal, the teacher must submit to the evaluator:

- (1) a detailed written description of the specific area(s) of his/her performance review which may include the terms of his/her teacher improvement plan that is being challenged; and*
- (2) any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal; and*
- (3) the performance review and the teacher improvement plan being challenged*

TIMEFRAME FOR EVALUATOR RESPONSE

Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the evaluator who issued the performance review must submit a detailed written response to the appeal.

The evaluator's response must include:

- (1) a detailed written response to the appeal addressing the specific area(s) being challenged; and*
- (2) any and all additional documents or written materials specific to the point(s) being challenged that support the evaluator's response and are relevant to the resolution of the appeal*
- (3) any modifications to the Teacher Improvement Plan*

The teacher initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the evaluator, and any and all additional information

submitted with the response.

PANEL APPEAL

If the teacher is not satisfied with the response from the evaluator and the matter has not been resolved to his/her satisfaction, within 15 calendar days of acknowledging the receipt of the decision of the evaluator, the teacher may request an appeal to a three person panel and submit such appeal as described herein.

The parties agree to formulate a three-person panel to hear the appeal.

The three-person panel will consist of:

(1) the Superintendent (or his/her designee)

(2) the STA President (or his/her designee)

(3) third panel member to be mutually chosen by the Association and the District.

The third party panel member must be chosen within three calendar days of the teacher requesting the appeal to the panel.

The decision/deliberations of the three-person panel shall be based on a written record which is comprised of:

(1) the teacher's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal;

(2) the evaluator's response to the appeal and any documentary evidence accompanying the response

A written recommendation of the three person panel shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the teacher's appeal. Within 5 calendar days of receipt of the appeal, the panel will issue a written recommendation for resolution to the Teachers' Association President and the Superintendent of Schools. The recommendation may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy: further, the reasoning for the recommendation, as well as dissenting opinions, if any, will be included with the recommendation.

For a Developing rating, the Panel's decision will be final and binding and not subject to any further appeal.

DECISION

A written decision from the Superintendent of Schools based on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 45 calendar days from the date upon which the teacher filed his/her appeal. The decision may be to deny the appeal, to sustain the appeal and grant remedy sought, or to sustain the appeal and modify the remedy

The determination of the appeal by the Superintendent pursuant to the above process is final and binding and not subject to any further appeal through the grievance process except as otherwise authorized by law.

Nothing in this appeals procedure will restrict the right of the district or the obligation of the teacher to proceed in accordance with otherwise standard practice, e.g., implementation of an improvement plan, while an appeal is pending consistent with Education Law 3012-c.

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 Board of Education will ensure that all evaluators are trained and certified in accordance with regulations. The district will utilize the Clinton-Essex-Franklin-Warren-Washington BOCES Network Team evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. The following check sheet will be completed by each lead evaluated, certified by Superintendent and approved by the Board of Education:

Teacher Evaluator Certification for Lead Evaluators

Lead Evaluator Name:

District:

Title:

Lead Evaluators must show evidence of training within all nine Lead Evaluator training criteria in order to receive district certification as a Lead Evaluator. Administrators must be certified by their district as a Lead Evaluator prior to concluding a teacher APPR and assigning a composite score.

New York State Education Department Regulations for training:

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

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 1

- NYS Teaching Standards – Wisdom of Practice*
- Connecting NYS Approved Rubrics to NYS Teaching Standards*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- Utilizing the NYSUT or Pearson rubric to connect evidence to the NYS Teaching Standards*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 4 5

- Unpacking the NYSUT or Pearson rubric*
- Overview of Teacher Evaluation and Development Handbook*

2. Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 2

- Evidence versus Opinion – Understanding your own bias*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- Teacher Evaluation Concepts and Gathering Evidence*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 4 5

- Evidence of Effective Teacher-Student Behaviors*
- Identifying the Evidence*
- Evidence Collection Tools*
- Evidence-Based Observation Practice*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 7

- Evidence Review with Exemplars and Analysis*
- Observation Practice*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 8

- Structured Review(Stage 1: Lesson Plan and Pre-Observation Conference, Stage 2: Classroom Observation, Stage 3: Reflection and Post-Observation Conference, Stage 4: Assessing Standards through a Structured Review)*
- Observation Practice*

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Growth Model 2011-12 Presentation

Presentation on this information will be provided in Summer 2012 and Fall 2012 through BOCES, however you may have attended

sessions elsewhere on student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model.

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 2

- *Connecting NYS Approved Rubrics to NYS Teaching Standards*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- *Continuous Improvement Map – Where you are and where you want to be on the NYSUT or Pearson rubric*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 4 5

- *Unpacking the Rubric*
- *Evidence-Based Observation Practice*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 7

- *Rubric Priorities*
- *Aligning the evidence to the indicators in the rubric*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 8

- *OAR (Objectivity, Alignment and Representativeness) Principles when evaluating teachers*
- *Lesson Observation*

5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilize 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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 1

- *Data Driven Instruction – Reporting Tools*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- *Documentation Review – Organizing and Analyzing Teacher Evaluation Data*

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 4

- *District Rules on SLOs*
- *District Assessment Chart*

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 6

- *Student Learning Objectives – Evidence (pre- and post-tests) baseline, targets, and HEDI)*

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Individuals may reference Data Council Meetings (CVES) or CIO Meetings with NERIC (FEH and CVES)

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 6

- NYS Teacher and Principal Evaluation 2012-13 and Beyond – Summary of Revised APPR Provisions - The Purple Memo
- SLO Overview – 20 points Growth and 20 Points Local

SLO Development Training

- Review of Purple Memo
- Teacher Evaluation Road Map
- SLO Elements and Template
- HEDI Ratings

SLO Overview Sessions as requested by districts

9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities. Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 8

- Observe and Collect Evidence of an ESL Lesson

10. Inter-rater reliability for both their teacher and principal evaluation systems.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

- Inter-Rater Reliability Training – NYSUT Rubric

The District Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The Clinton Essex Warren Washington(CEWW) BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations. The network team has established an ongoing professional development group with all of the Superintendents in the region and CEWW BOCES Directors this will help ensure inter-rater reliability across districts.

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	Checked
---	---------

teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.

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

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

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

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

Page 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please check the boxes below:

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

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

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

State assessments, *required if one exists*

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

List of State-approved 3rd party assessments

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

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

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

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

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

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

(No response)

7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

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

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

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

(No response)

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Friday, December 07, 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
9-12	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	4 year 2013 Graduation Rate
9-12	(f) % of students with advanced Regents or honors	ALL 2013 NYS Regents Examinations
6-8	(b) results for students in specific performance levels	NYS Grades 6, 7 8 ELA and Math Assessments
K-5	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	AIMSweb ELA and Math benchmarks

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.	See Charts in Task 8.1
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Charts in Task 8.1
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Charts in Task 8.1
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Charts in Task 8.1
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	See Charts in Task 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/5366/129393-qBFVOWF7fC/2012HSMSElementaryMeasures.pdf](#)

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

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

8.3) Locally Developed Controls

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

(No response)

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.

*Saranac Central High School Principal achievement will be measured utilizing two methods:
 Percentage of diplomas awarded at 2013 commencement that have the advanced designation
 Percentage of June 2013 Regents Exams that are scored at the Mastery level*

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Friday, December 07, 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.	(No response)
9.3) Assurances -- Goals Assure that any other goals, if applicable, shall address quantifiable and verifiable improvements in academic results or the school's learning environment (e.g. student or teacher attendance).	(No response)

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

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.

Each element of the Multidimensional domain shall be rated using the HEDI criteria which shall be converted to a four point scale: Highly Effective = 4 points; Effective = 3 points; Developing = 2 points; and Ineffective = 1 point. The element scores shall be averaged to determine a rubric score which shall be converted to a HEDI rating and points pursuant to the following chart below.

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

[assets/survey-uploads/5143/129394-pMADJ4gk6R/SAU Rubric Scoring.docx](#)

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Total Score of 59-60 is Highly Effective
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Total Score of 57-58 is effective
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Total Score of 55-56 is developing
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Total Score of 0-54 is ineffective

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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	4
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	4
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	4

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Friday, November 16, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

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

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	59-60
Effective	57-58
Developing	55-56
Ineffective	0-54

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

2012-13 where Value-Added growth measure applies

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

22-25

14-15

Ranges determined locally--see above

91-100

Effective

10-21

8-13

75-90

Developing

3-9

3-7

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

0-64

11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Monday, May 14, 2012

Updated Friday, December 07, 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/5276/129396-Df0w3Xx5v6/SAU APPR 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:

*The following is the Saranac Central Administrators' APPR procedure outlined for appeals:
Appeal Process*

Section 3012-c of the Education Law establishes a comprehensive annual evaluation system for principals, as well as the issuance and implementation of improvement plans for principals whose performance is assessed as either developing or ineffective.

To the extent that an administrator wishes to challenge a performance review and/or improvement plan under the new evaluation system, the law requires the establishment of an appeals procedure, the specifics of which are to be locally negotiated pursuant to article XIV of the Civil Service Law. This appeals procedure does not diminish the authority of the School Board to terminate probationary administrators during their probationary term for statutorily and constitutionally permissible reasons other than the principal's performance that is the subject of the appeal.

While the APPR shall be a "significant factor" in tenure and other employment decisions, nothing herein requires an appeal be exhausted before a tenure determination can be made. In addition, appeal procedures shall not cause an administrator to acquire tenure by estoppel when an evaluation appeal is pending.

In accordance with the law, for purposes of disciplinary proceedings under Education Law §3020-a, a "pattern" of ineffective performance shall be defined as two consecutive annual ineffective ratings received by an administrator through the APPR process.
APPEAL PROCEDURE FOR THE SARANAC CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS PURSUANT TO EDUCATION LAW §3012-C AND SUBPART 30-2 OF THE COMMISSIONER'S REGULATIONS REGARDING THE ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS OF ADMINISTRATORS

A. Appeals of Ratings

Appeals of annual professional performance reviews can be initiated for any rating status of Ineffective or Developing.

B. What May be Challenged in an Appeal

An appeal under this provision should limit the scope of appeals under Education Law §3012-c to the following subjects:

- 1. The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;*
- 2. The District's adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;*
- 3. Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans and the substance of the annual professional review; and*
- 4. The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.*

C. Prohibition Against More Than One Appeal

An administrator may not file multiple appeals regarding the same performance review. The issuance of an improvement plan may prompt an appeal independent of the performance review. The implementation of an improvement plan may be appealed upon each alleged breach thereof. All grounds for appeal must be raised with specificity within such appeal. Any grounds not raised shall be deemed waived.

D. Burden of Proof

The burden of proof regarding the grounds of the appeal rests on the individual filing the appeal.

E. Timeframe for Filing Appeals

All appeals must be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools in writing no later than 15 scheduled work days after the administrator acknowledges receipt of their annual professional performance review. If an administrator is challenging the issuance of an improvement plan, appeals must be filed within 15 calendar days of issuance of such plan. The failure to file an appeal within these timeframes shall be deemed a waiver of the right to appeal and the appeal shall be deemed abandoned. An extension of the time in which to appeal may be granted by the Superintendent upon request. Such an extension must be completed in a timely and expeditious manner consistent with Education Law 3012-c.

When filing an appeal, the administrator must submit a detailed written description of the specific areas of disagreement over their performance review, or the issuance and/or implementation of their improvement plan and any additional documents or materials relevant to the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the

appeal. Any additional documentation or materials relevant to the appeal must be provided by the district upon written request for same.

F. Timeframe for Superintendent Response

The date on the receipt form (Appendix G) shall be considered the initial date upon which this timeframe will be based. Within 15 calendar days of receipt of an appeal, the Superintendent must submit a written response to the appeal. The response must include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point(s) of disagreement that support the Superintendent's response. Any such information that is not submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the Superintendent in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal. The administrator initiating the appeal shall receive a copy of the response filed by the Superintendent, and all additional information submitted with the response, at the same time the Superintendent files his/her response. Additional material in response to the Superintendent's decision may be submitted by the administrator up to the date of the hearing.

G. Decision Process for Appeal

In the event the administrator is unsatisfied with the results of the Superintendent's decision, the administrator may request an impartial hearing from a list of NYS certified APPR lead evaluator hearing officers mutually agreed upon by the district and the Saranac Administrative Unit. The request must occur within 5 scheduled work days of the receipt of the superintendent's decision. The selection of a hearing officer must occur within 3 work days following such request. The cost for conducting the hearing, including compensation for the individual conducting the hearing will be shared equally by the Saranac Administrative Unit and the school district. The Superintendent shall contact the agreed upon hearing officer to schedule the hearing.

The parties agree that:

- a. The hearing officer shall hear appeals in a timely manner after the appeal is made, but in no event shall it be less than five (5) days or more than fifteen (15) calendar days after the hearing officer is selected;*
- b. The hearing shall be conducted in no more than one business day unless extenuating circumstances are present and the hearing officer agrees to a second day;*
- c. The parties shall have the ability to be represented by legal counsel, union representative, or appear pro se;*
- d. The parties shall exchange documentary evidence and an anticipated witness list no less than two (2) business days before the scheduled hearing date;*
- e. The appeal may be open to the public only if mutually agreed upon by the district and the administrator.*
- f. The administrator shall have the opportunity to present his/her case which may include the presentation of witnesses and/or affidavits in lieu of testimony. The school district may refute the presentation. If the school district does present a case, the administrator will have the right to present a rebuttal case, including direct and cross examination of all witnesses.*

H. Decision

A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than 15 calendar days from the close of the hearing. The decision shall be based on a written record, comprised of the appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the Superintendent's response.

The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the administrator's appeal. The reviewer must affirm, set aside or modify a superintendent's rating or improvement plan or order a new evaluation if procedures have been violated. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the administrator and the Superintendent.

In the case of an appeal by an administrator regarding their first rating of ineffective, the decision of the hearing officer will be final and binding. In the case of a second consecutive rating of ineffective or any rating of developing, the superintendent will take the decision of the hearing officer under advisement before delivering his final and binding decision within 5 scheduled work days of receipt of hearing officer decision.

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 Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools will ensure that all evaluators are trained and certified in accordance with regulations. The district will utilize the Clinton-Essex-Franklin-Warren-Washington BOCES Network Team evaluator training in accordance with SED procedures and processes. The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The Clinton Essex Warren Washington(CEWW) BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations. The network team has established an ongoing professional development group with all of the Superintendents in the region and CEWW BOCES Directors this will help ensure inter-rater reliability across districts. The following check sheet will be completed by each lead evaluator, certified by Superintendent and approved by the Board of Education:

Teacher Evaluator Certification for Lead Evaluators

Lead Evaluator Name:

District:

Title:

Lead Evaluators must show evidence of training within all nine Lead Evaluator training criteria in order to receive district certification as a Lead Evaluator. Administrators must be certified by their district as a Lead Evaluator prior to concluding a teacher APPR and assigning a composite score.

New York State Education Department Regulations for training:

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

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 1

- NYS Teaching Standards – Wisdom of Practice
- Connecting NYS Approved Rubrics to NYS Teaching Standards

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- Utilizing the NYSUT or Pearson rubric to connect evidence to the NYS Teaching Standards

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 4 5

- Unpacking the NYSUT or Pearson rubric
- Overview of Teacher Evaluation and Development Handbook

2. Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 2

- Evidence versus Opinion – Understanding your own bias

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- Teacher Evaluation Concepts and Gathering Evidence

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 4 5

- Evidence of Effective Teacher-Student Behaviors
- Identifying the Evidence
- Evidence Collection Tools
- Evidence-Based Observation Practice

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 7

- Evidence Review with Exemplars and Analysis
- Observation Practice

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 8

- Structured Review(Stage 1: Lesson Plan and Pre-Observation Conference, Stage 2: Classroom Observation, Stage 3: Reflection and Post-Observation Conference, Stage 4: Assessing Standards through a Structured Review)
- Observation Practice

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.

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours
Growth Model 2011-12 Presentation*

Presentation on this information will be provided in Summer 2012 and Fall 2012 through BOCES, however you may have attended sessions elsewhere on student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model.

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.

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours
Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 2*

- Connecting NYS Approved Rubrics to NYS Teaching Standards

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- Continuous Improvement Map – Where you are and where you want to be on the NYSUT or Pearson rubric

Teacher Evaluator Training – Days 4 5

- Unpacking the Rubric
- Evidence-Based Observation Practice

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 7

- Rubric Priorities
- Aligning the evidence to the indicators in the rubric

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 8

- OAR (Objectivity, Alignment and Representativeness) Principles when evaluating teachers
- Lesson Observation

5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilize 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.

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours
Teacher Evaluator Training – Day1*

- Data Driven Instruction – Reporting Tools

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 3

- Documentation Review – Organizing and Analyzing Teacher Evaluation Data

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.

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours
Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 4*

- District Rules on SLOs
- District Assessment Chart

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 6

•*Student Learning Objectives – Evidence (pre- and post-tests) baseline, targets, and HEDI)*

7. *Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System.*

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Individuals may reference Data Council Meetings (CVES) or CIO Meetings with NERIC (FEH and CVES)

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.*

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 6

•*NYS Teacher and Principal Evaluation 2012-13 and Beyond – Summary of Revised APPR Provisions - The Purple Memo*

•*SLO Overview – 20 points Growth and 20 Points Local*

SLO Development Training

•*Review of Purple Memo*

•*Teacher Evaluation Road Map*

•*SLO Elements and Template*

•*HEDI Ratings*

SLO Overview Sessions as requested by districts

9. *Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.*

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

Teacher Evaluator Training – Day 8

•*Observe and Collect Evidence of an ESL Lesson*

10. *Inter-rater reliability for both their teacher and principal evaluation systems.*

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional Development Hours

•*Inter-Rater Reliability Training – NYSUT Rubric*

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

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

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

(3) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;

(4) Application and use of the teacher rubric, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's practice;

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

(6) Application and use of any locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers;

(7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;

(8) The scoring methodology including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and

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

The Superintendent will ensure that lead evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations. All Clinton- Essex –Warren- Washington(CEWW) BOCES administrators have been participating in ongoing inter-rater reliability training as provided by the CEWW BOCES network team and schedules are already in place for continued training throughout the 2012-13 school year.

Principal Evaluator Training

The Superintendent will ensure that all evaluators have been trained and that all lead evaluators have been trained and certified in accordance with regulation. The District will utilize the CEWW BOCES Network Team evaluator training and lead evaluator training and certification in accordance with SED procedures and processes. Lead evaluator training will include training on:

- (1) The New York State Teaching Standards, the ISLLC Learning Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators and their related functions, as applicable;
- (2) Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research;
- (3) Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
- (4) Application and use of the teacher or principal rubric(s), including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher or principal's practice;
- (5) Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.;
- (6) Application and use of any locally selected measures of student achievement used by the district evaluate its teachers or principals;
- (7) Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
- (8) The scoring methodology including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principal's overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
- (9) Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.

Principal Evaluator Certification Checklist

Principal Evaluator Name: _____

District: _____

Title: _____

Principal Evaluators must show evidence of training within all nine Evaluator training criteria in order to receive district certification as a Principal Evaluator. Administrators must be certified by their district as a Principal Evaluator prior to concluding a principal APPR and assigning a composite score.

New York State Education Department Regulations for training:

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

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours*

2. *Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research.*

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours*

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours

5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilize 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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours

7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours

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.

Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development

Hours

9. *Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.*

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours*

*** While not listed as a training component, districts will need to ensure inter-rater reliability for both their teacher and principal evaluation systems.*

*Aligned Professional Development Date Professional
Development
Hours*

My signature acknowledges that I have attended the trainings and professional development as outlined in this document.

Signature Date

The Superintendent in conjunction with the Board of Education will ensure that all teacher and/or principal evaluators participate in annual training and are re-certified on an annual basis. The Clinton Essex Warren Washington(CEWW) BOCES Network Team will be utilized to provide the training and recertification. Any individual who fails to achieve required training or certification or re-certification, as applicable, shall not conduct or complete evaluations. The network team has established an ongoing professional development group with all of the Superintendents in the region and CEWW BOCES Directors this will help ensure inter-rater reliability across districts.

11.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

11.6) Assurances -- Principals

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure that principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.	Checked
11.6) Assurances -- Principals Assure the district has appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.	Checked

11.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

12. Joint Certification of APPR Plan

Created Monday, May 14, 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/5581/129397-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR certification12-12-12.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/5581/129397-3Uqgn5g9Iu/APPR%20certification12-12-12.pdf)

File types supported for uploads

PDF (preferred)

Microsoft Office (.doc, .ppt, .xls)

Microsoft Office 2007: Supported but not recommended (.docx, .pptx, .xlsx)

Open Office (.odt, .ott)

Images (.jpg, .gif)

Other Formats (.html, .xhtml, .txt, .rtf, .latex)

Please note that .docx, .pptx, and .xlsx formats are not entirely supported.

Please save your file types as .doc, .ppt or .xls respectively before uploading.

Grades K-5 HEDI Scoring Process

Building ELA and Math combined growth targets were determined based on historical student assessment performance scores. An ELA and Math combined baseline benchmark was calculated using the 2011-2012 AIMSweb student performance assessment results. All students in grades K-2 were included to determine this baseline growth target. To demonstrate student growth across all subject areas for students K-5, an aspirational target higher than the benchmark was established. Utilizing the building wide growth target, points will be assigned to each teacher based on the averaged scores of the student population, aligned to the HEDI scale in an equitably, weighted manner as follows in the proceeding charts.

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by a K-5 teacher according to the following chart:

85%-100% of students meet performance target = Highly Effective

95%-100% = 20

90%-94% = 19

85%-89% = 18

40%-84% of students meet performance target = Effective

80%-84% = 17

75%-79% = 16

70%-74% = 15

65%-69% = 14

60%-64% = 13

55%-59% = 12

50%-54% = 11

45%-49% = 10

40%-44% = 9

10%-39% of students meet performance target = Developing

35%-39% = 8

30%-34% = 7

25%-29% = 6

20%-24% = 5

15%-19% = 4

10%-14% = 3

0%-9% of students meet performance target = Ineffective

5%-9% = 2

1%-4% = 1

0% = 0

Grades 6-12 HEDI Scoring Process

Students are given pretests at the beginning of courses that are aligned to the post test, which is either a Regents Exam, a District developed summative exam or an exam from the list of NYSED approved assessments. Scores on both the pretest and the post test are between 0 and 100. The "gap" between the pretest score and 100 is calculated by subtracting the pretest score from 100. A goal is set for each student to add 75% of this gap to his/her pretest score (their "growth"). Post test scores are used to measure their growth in comparison with their goal.

Students' growth rates are calculated and adjusted for SWD and Econ Disadvantaged. The average of the students' rates for a teacher's course is calculated and converted to a HEDI rating and is then converted to a 20 point scale for inclusion into their composite rating. No performance results of a student of record will be omitted when calculating a teacher's adjusted growth score. *Adjusted scores using controls will not increase a teacher's HEDI score in excess of two points.*

Growth Formula

$[(\text{Post Test Score} - \text{Pretest Score})] \times 100 = \text{Student Growth Score}$

Ex.: $[(90 - 20)/(100 - 20)] \times 100 = 87.5\% \text{ Student Growth Score}$

This illustrates that the student has closed 87.5% of the "gap" between his pretest score and 100.

Adjusted Growth formula

$\text{Growth/SWD Adj/Pov Adj} = \text{Adjusted Growth Score}$

SWD Adj = 0.95 If Student is SWD, 1.0 If not

Pov Adj = 0.95 If Student is Econ Disadv, 1.0 If not

Ex: for the above student who is in the Economically disadvantaged subgroup and is not a student with disability:

Student Growth Score = 87.5

SED Adj = 1.0

Pov Adj = 0.95

87.5/1.0/0.95 = 92.11 = 92% Adjusted Growth

0-20 HEDI points can be earned by Grade 6-12 teachers according to the following Adjusted Growth Score chart:

80%-100% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population or Percent of target met(Grade 8 Science) = Highly Effective

84%-100%= 20

82%-83% = 19

80%-81% = 18

71%-79% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population or Percent of target met(Grade 8 Science)= Effective

79% = 17

78% = 16

77% = 15

76% = 14

75% = 13

74% = 12

73% = 11

72% = 10

71% = 9

48%-70% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population or Percent of target met(Grade 8 Science) = Developing

68%- 70% = 8

64%-67% = 7

60%-63% = 6

56%-59% = 5

52%-55% = 4

48%-51% = 3

0%-47% Average Adjusted Growth Score for SLO Student Population or Percent of target met(Grade 8 Science) = Ineffective

45%-47% = 2

40%-44% = 1

0% - 39% = 0

**SRANAC CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
LOCAL ACHIEVMENT SCORING CHARTS**

0-100 Point Scale Conversion Chart*	
Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating
Ineffective	
0-14	1
15-27	1.1
28-40	1.2
41-53	1.3
54	1.4
Developing	
55	1.5
56	1.6
57	1.7
58	1.8
59	1.9
60	2
61	2.1
62	2.2
63	2.3
64	2.4
Effective	
65-66	2.5
67-68	2.6
69-70	2.7
71-72	2.8
73-74	2.9
75-76	3
77-78	3.1
79-81	3.2
82-83	3.3
84	3.4
Highly Effective	
85-87	3.5
88-90	3.6
91-93	3.7
94-96	3.8
97-99	3.9
100	4

***Can be used with any assessment scored on a 100 point scale**

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale	
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion
Ineffective	
1	0
1.2	1
1.4	2
Developing	
1.5	3
1.7	4
2.0	5
2.2	6
2.4	7
Effective	
2.5	8
2.7	9
2.9	10
3.0	11
3.2	12
3.4	13
Highly Effective	
3.5	14
4	15

**SRANAC CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
LOCAL ACHIEVMENT SCORING CHARTS**

0-100 Point Scale Conversion Chart*	
Based on a 100 Point Scale	Converted to 1-4 Rating
Ineffective	
0-14	1
15-27	1.1
28-40	1.2
41-53	1.3
54	1.4
Developing	
55	1.5
56	1.6
57	1.7
58	1.8
59	1.9
60	2
61	2.1
62	2.2
63	2.3
64	2.4
Effective	
65-66	2.5
67-68	2.6
69-70	2.7
71-72	2.8
73-74	2.9
75-76	3
77-78	3.1
79-81	3.2
82-83	3.3
84	3.4
Highly Effective	
85-87	3.5
88-90	3.6
91-93	3.7
94-96	3.8
97-99	3.9
100	4

***Can be used with any assessment scored on a 100 point scale**

APPENDIX A
HEDI Conversion Chart – 20% Local Measures

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale	
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	20 Point Conversion
Ineffective	
1	0
1.1	1
1.2	1
1.3	2
1.4	2
Developing	
1.5	3
1.6	4
1.7	5
1.8	5
1.9	6
2	6
2.1	7
2.2	7
2.3	8
2.4	8
Effective	
2.5	9
2.6	10
2.7	11
2.8	12
2.9	13
3	14
3.1	15
3.2	16
3.3	17
3.4	17
Highly Effective	
3.5	18
3.6	18
3.7	19
3.8	19
3.9	20
4	20

1-4 Rubric Conversion Scale	
Based on a 1-4 Rubric Rating	15 Point Conversion
Ineffective	
1	0
1.2	1
1.4	2
Developing	
1.5	3
1.7	4
2.0	5
2.2	6
2.4	7
Effective	
2.5	8
2.7	9
2.9	10
3.0	11
3.2	12
3.4	13
Highly Effective	
3.5	14
4	15

SARANAC CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT

APPENDIX B CONVERSION CHART - 60% OTHER MEASURES

Total Average Rubric Score	Category	Conversion score for composite
Ineffective 0-49		
1		0
1.1		12
1.2		25
1.3		37
1.4		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)

Jonathan Parks – Saranac High School

School Year 2012

Population	The students covered by this measure are all students taking Regents Exams during the June 2013 testing period and all students receiving diplomas at June 2013 commencement exercises
Learning Content	Common Core and NYS learning standards are followed for all courses leading to NYS Regents exams and NYS learning standards apply to all other classes for which credit is awarded
Interval of Instructional Time	One academic year
Evidence	Principal achievement will be measured utilizing two methods: Percentage of diplomas awarded at 2013 commencement that have the advanced designation Percentage of June 2013 Regents Exams that are scored at the Mastery level
Baseline	Advanced diploma percentages for the past three years: 2010 – 36%, 2011 – 40%, 2012 – 44% Regents exam mastery percentages for the past three years: 2010 – 39%, 2011 – 40%, 2012 – 41%

Target(s)	<p>The target for 2013 advanced diploma percentage is 46%</p> <p>The target for 2013 mastery percentage is 42%</p> <p>The percentage listed is the minimum necessary to achieve the corresponding HEDI point value.</p>															
	Scoring bands for % of 2013 advanced diplomas awarded								Scoring bands for 2013 mastery percentages							
	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	50	47	44	42	40	38	36	34	44	42	41	40	39	38	37	0
	Combined scores from above															
	Highly Effective		Effective						Developing					Ineffective		
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
Rationale	<p>Both targets are related to the goals of NYSED in their ESEA waiver application in identifying students who are likely to be college and career ready. Students who earn advanced diplomas have a higher probability of success in post-secondary programs and students who score 85 or higher on Regents exams are shown to have higher probabilities of success in those college courses.</p>															

Jeffrey M. Durant – Saranac Middle School Principal / Athletic Director

School Year 2012 - 2013

Population	The students covered by this measure are all students taking NYS 6 th , 7 th and 8 th Grade Exams during the April/May 2013 testing period.
Learning Content	Common Core and NYS learning standards are followed for all courses leading to NYS 6 th , 7 th and 8 th Grade Exams.
Interval of Instructional Time	One academic year for students who are taking the 6 th , 7 th and 8 th grade assessments.
Evidence	MS Principal achievement will be measured utilizing one method: Percentage of student scores that are levels 3 and 4 on the NYS 6 th , 7 th and 8 th Grade Exams given during the April/May Exam Period
Baseline	Percentages of students who received 3s and 4s on the NYS 6 th , 7 th and 8 th Grade Assessments in ELA and Math: 2010 – 63%, 2011 – 61%, 2012 – 64%
Target	The target for 2013 scores of 3s and 4s on the 6 th , 7 th and 8 th Grade Assessments is 65%

	Scoring bands for % of 3s and 4s on the NYS Exams in E.L.A. and Math for grades 6, 7, and 8															
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
	94-100%	85-93%	80-84%	75-79%	70-74%	65-69%	60-64%	55-59%	50-54%	45-49%	40-44%	35-39%	30-34%	25-29%	20-24%	0-19%
	Highly Effective		Effective					Developing					Ineffective			
Rationale	Target is related to the area in need of improvement per our district becoming identified as “focused” for ELA and Math achievement. Achieving this benchmark will enable the district to make progress toward goals associated with the improvement planning process.															

Tracy Manor – Saranac Elementary School

School Year 2012-2013

Population	The population will be all K-2 students enrolled in Saranac Elementary School, grades K-2, who participate in AIMSweb Benchmarking.
Learning Content	The learning content for this measure includes all of the Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy and Mathematics at the K-2 grade level(s).
Interval of Instructional Time	September 2012 – June 2013
Evidence	Principal achievement will be measured utilizing the following method: Pre-Assessments are based on AIMSweb K-2 benchmark scores in the Fall, 2012 and AIMSweb historical data was utilized from the 2011-2012 school year. Summative assessments will include the Spring 2013 K-2 benchmark scores from AIMSweb.
Baseline	AIMSweb has been utilized for one year at Saranac Elementary School. Based on the Spring of 2012's target data, Saranac Elementary School had 53% of students meeting the targets in AIMSweb benchmark testing.
Target(s)	The target for Spring 2013 AIMSweb Benchmarking is 55%.

HEDI Scoring	Scoring bands for % of 2013 AIMSweb Benchmarking															
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
	59	57	55	53	51	49	47	45	43	41	39	37	35	33	31	
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING				INEFFECTIVE			
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Rationale	AIMSweb is a scientifically researched 3 rd party approved assessment tool that is utilized as a predictor for student success on state assessments. In Grades K-2, AIMSweb benchmarking and progress monitoring is used to determine student strengths as well as deficits. Instructional modifications are then made to ensure student success in meeting proficiency standards in Grade 3-5 Testing.															

Kathleen Maroney-Moore – Morrisonville Elementary School

School Year 2012-2013

Population	The population will be all K-2 students enrolled in Morrisonville Elementary School, grades K-2, who participate in AIMSweb Benchmarking.
Learning Content	The learning content for this measure includes all of the Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy and Mathematics at the K-2 grade level(s).
Interval of Instructional Time	September 2012 – June 2013
Evidence	Principal achievement will be measured utilizing the following method: Pre-Assessments are based on AIMSweb K-2 benchmark scores in the Fall, 2012 and AIMSweb historical data was utilized from the 2011-2012 school year. Summative assessments will include the Spring 2013 K-2 benchmark scores from AIMSweb.
Baseline	AIMSweb has been utilized for one year at Morrisonville Elementary School. Based on the Spring of 2012's target data, Morrisonville Elementary School had 49% of students meeting the targets in AIMSweb benchmark testing.
Target(s)	The target for Spring 2013 AIMSweb Benchmarking is 51%.

HEDI Scoring	Scoring bands for % of 2013 AIMSweb Benchmarking															
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
	55	53	51	49	47	45	43	41	39	37	35	33	31	29	27	
	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE		EFFECTIVE						DEVELOPING					INEFFECTIVE		
	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Rationale	AIMSweb is a scientifically researched 3 rd party approved assessment tool that is utilized as a predictor for student success on state assessments. In Grades K-2, AIMSweb benchmarking and progress monitoring is used to determine student strengths as well as deficits. Instructional modifications are then made to ensure student success in meeting proficiency standards in Grade 3-5 Testing.															

Saranac Central School District
Saranac Administrative Unit
MATHEMATICAL RUBRIC SCORING METHODOLOGY

Other Measures

1. The parties agree that Principals shall be evaluated using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric for the Other Measures subcomponent. The assessment of Other Measures on the rubric shall account for 60% of a Principal's HEDI rating.

2. Each element of the Multidimensional domain shall be rated using the HEDI criteria which shall be converted to a four point scale: Highly Effective = 4 points; Effective = 3 points; Developing = 2 points; and Ineffective = 1 point. The element scores shall be averaged to determine a rubric score which shall be converted to a HEDI rating and points pursuant to the following chart.

Rubric Score (Average)	Subcomponent Points
Ineffective	
1.00	0
1.01	1
1.02	2
1.03	3
1.04	4
1.05	5
1.06	6
1.07	7
1.08	8
1.09	9
1.10	10
1.11	11
1.12	12
1.13	13
1.14	14
1.15	15
1.16	16
1.17	17
1.18	18
1.19	19
1.20	20
1.21	21
1.22	22
1.23	23
1.24	24
1.25	25
1.26	26
1.27	27
1.28	28
1.29	29
1.30	30
1.31	31

1.32	32
1.33	33
1.34	34
1.35	35
1.36	36
1.37	37
1.38	38
1.39	39
1.40	40
1.41	41
1.42	42
1.43	43
1.44	44
1.45	45
1.46	46
1.47	47
1.48	48
1.49	49
1.50	50
1.51	51
1.52	52
1.53	53
1.54	54
Developing	
1.55-2.00	55
2.01-2.50	56
Effective	
2.51-3.00	57
3.01-3.50	58
Highly Effective	
3.51-3.74	59
3.75-4.00	60

**Memorandum of Agreement
Between
Saranac Teachers' Association
And
Saranac Central School District
Regarding Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR)**

In compliance with Chapter 103 of the Laws of 2010 as modified by the NYS budget of 2012-2013, the parties agree to modify their Collective Bargaining Agreement regarding the mandatory topics of negotiation in accordance with a revised teacher evaluation procedure, the components of which are outlined below. This MOA represents the parties' mutual understanding regarding both mandatory and non-mandatory topics of negotiation. It is expressly agreed to by the parties that the District maintains the right to change/modify/add/delete any provision of this agreement that is determined by the NYS Public Employment Relations Board or a court to be a non-mandatory topic of bargaining. Both parties agree to meet annually in June for the purposes of ongoing review and possible adjustment of this MOA.

I. Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

1. The Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is designed to provide support through communication, discussion, and collaboration in identified areas of significant concern. When a teacher receives a rating of "developing" or "ineffective" through an annual professional performance review, a Teacher Improvement Plan will be developed and implemented by the district with input from the teacher and the Association.

2. A TIP must be issued as soon as possible after receipt by the teacher of an APPR rating of developing or ineffective, but NO later than 10 days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to opening of classes for the school year.

3. The TIP will define specific standards-based goals that a teacher must make progress toward attaining within a specific period of time.

The TIP will include:

- The identification of areas that need improvement
- Differentiated activities to support improvements in these areas
- A timeline for achieving improvement
- The manner in which achievement will be assessed

The plan will clearly describe the professional learning activities that the teacher must complete. These activities should be connected directly to the areas needing improvement.

The artifacts that the teacher must produce that can serve as benchmarks of

their improvement and as evidence for the final stage of their improvement plan will be described and will include items such as lessons, student work, or unit plans.

The additional assistance and support that the teacher will receive will be clearly stated in the TIP.

During the final stage of the improvement plan, the teacher will meet with their supervisor to review the plan alongside any artifacts and evidence from evaluations in order to provide a final, summative rating for the teacher.

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN - *Issuance*
 (To be completed jointly by teacher and administrator)

Name _____ School _____

School year plan is based on _____ Assignment Grade/Subject _____

Ensuing School Year _____ Grade/Subject _____

Date of related APPR _____ Date of TIP Conference _____

AREA(S) NEEDING IMPROVEMENT	ACTION PLAN (Detail Steps to be taken)	TIMELINE FOR COMPLETION	EVIDENCE

Teacher's Comments:

Administrator's Comments:

Date outcome plan is to be evaluated by: _____

Teacher's Signature _____

Date _____

Administrator's signature _____

Date _____

Union Rep Signature _____

Date _____

Teacher Waiver of Union Representation _____

Date _____

**Saranac Central School District
Annual Professional Performance Review Plan**

APPENDIX E

ADMINISTRATOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Successful professional development takes time and resources. Administrators benefit from professional development that examines best practices, provides coaching/mentoring support, encourages risk-taking designed to improve student learning, cultivates team relationships and provides quality time for reflection and renewal. The Saranac Central School District, in collaboration with the Saranac Administrator Unit, will coordinate and provide an ongoing professional development program according to the following:

Guidelines (SAANYS):

- Supervisors should provide specific and timely feedback through regularly scheduled meetings and ongoing communication.
- Evidence of impact of professional growth efforts should be demonstrated.
- The educational leader should engage in personal and collegial reflective practice that promotes professional growth.
- The educational leader's professional development and support should be differentiated based on need.
- Professional development for the educational leader should be identified through collaborative discussion with his/her supervisor.
- Professional growth should be tied to ISLLC Standards and built upon the state's professional development standards.

Content (excerpt from *Professional Development of School Principals for Leadership of High Performance Learning Communities* by Hunter Moorman):

Professional development should:

- Be grounded in principles of effective staff development.
- Be tailored to the administrator's learning and competency profile developed through a range of formal and informal assessments by self and the superintendent.
- Draw upon all resources that can be used to supplement local funding.
- Provide participants with opportunities to learn alone, in small groups, and in larger organizational settings.
- Draw upon the skills and competencies of effective school leadership.

Process (SAANYS):

- Review self-assessment
- Review prior professional development goals, student achievement data/other feedback.
- Collaborate with supervisor and determine professional growth area(s).
- Complete the following professional growth plan.
- Meet with supervisor at least twice during the year to discuss progress.
- Meet with supervisor at the end of the school year to discuss and document growth.

APPENDIX F

ADMINISTRATOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Upon rating a principal as "ineffective" or "developing," an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced no later than ten (10) days after the start of a school year. The Superintendent, in cooperation with the administrator, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that promulgated 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 the goal.
6. A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress.
7. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
8. A formal, written summative assessment delineating progress made.

ADMINISTRATOR IMPROVEMENT PLAN FORMAT

Name of Administrator _____

School Building _____ Academic Year _____

Deficiency that promulgated the "ineffective" or "developing" performance rating:

Improvement Goal/Outcome:

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline:

Required and Accessible Resources:

Date(s) of formative evaluation:

Evidence of goal achievement:

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

Denith O. Cringle

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

Ralph A. [unclear] 12-12-12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 12-12-12

[Signature]

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

Larry Allen - Waiter