



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

October 22, 2012

William Donohue, Superintendent
Byram Hills Central School District
10 Tripp Ln.
Armonk, NY 10504

Dear Superintendent Donohue:

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: James T. Langlois

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 Monday, May 07, 2012

Updated Friday, October 12, 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 :

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

661201060000

1.2) School District Name:

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

BYRAM HILLS 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 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 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 and teachers with 0 – 49% of students covered by State-provided growth measures. 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	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Kgn. ELA assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Grade 1 ELA assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Grade 2 ELA assessment

	ELA	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Kgn. Math assessment
1	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Grade 1 Math assessment
2	District, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Grade 2 Math assessment

	Math	Assessment
3	State assessment	3rd Grade State Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at	First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such
--	---

2.11, below.	information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Science assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Science assessment

	Science	Assessment
8	State assessment	8th Grade State Science Assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be
---	--

developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.

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

If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of their annual evaluation.

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

If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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

If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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

If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Social Studies assessment
7	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Social Studies assessment
8	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Grade 8-developed Social Studies assessment

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

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

First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building

	principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/ her annual evaluation.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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	Byram Hills-developed Global 1 assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building
---	--

principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.

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

If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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

If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/ her annual evaluation.

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

If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation

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

If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.

First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs

	throughout the District.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/ her annual evaluation.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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	Not applicable	Not applicable

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.	First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/ her annual evaluation.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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.

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	Byram Hills developed Grade 9 ELA assesment
Grade 10 ELA	Regents assessment	English Regents Exam
Grade 11 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills Grade 11 ELA assessment

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.	First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weakensses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.	If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District goals for similar students.	If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/ her annual evaluation.

Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District goals for similar students.	If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well-below District goals for similar students.	If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

2.10) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Option	Assessment
Art K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Grades K-12 Art assessments
Music K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Grades K-12 Music assessments
Physical Education K-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Grades K-12 Physical Education assessments
Math - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Math assessments
Science - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Science assessments
Social Studies - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Social Studies assessments
English - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed English assessments
World Languages Grades 7 - 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Language assessments
All other teachers not named above (i.e., Health, computer science)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed assessments
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)

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

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

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

First a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom. Information from the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 will be reviewed whenever such information is available. (The district has purchased additional reports from the LHRIC to assist all teachers in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.) A pre assessment will be developed and the student results recorded. Teachers will not score the papers of the students in their classes. The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined, the building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the accomplishment of meeting the target set in the SLO. The SLO will be approved by the building principal or his/her designee administrator (eg. assistant principal) . The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will over see the SLO development process and review SLOs throughout the District.

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

If 85% of students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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

If 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his/ her annual evaluation.

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

If 60% -74% of the students on a class roster achieve the defined target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his/her annual evaluation

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

If less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not achieve the target as defined by the SLO, the teacher will be deemed Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his/her annual evaluation.

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/5364/124600-TXEttx9bQW/SLO 2.11.doc

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.

The school district has purchased Level 1 reporting from the Lower Hudson Regional Information Center which provides a variety of reports, including, individual results for students, grade or school level results, and analysis of district results compared to regional results. Reports also include a student-by-student analysis of strengths and weaknesses related to standards and performance indicators. These reports also indicate if the student is a student with a disability, an English language Learner, or is a student in poverty. In addition, students who have 504 plans with specific accommodations and students with IEP'S with specific accommodations will be reviewed by the teacher. These controls will be reviewed by the administrator with the teacher when writing a SLO. These controls will be considered in the development of targets after the pre assessment data is recorded.

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/rtt/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 03, 2012

Updated Monday, October 01, 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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 4 ELA assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 5 ELA assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 ELA assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 ELA assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.

The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.

The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.

Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.

Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.

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

Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal:
15 points for over 4% of target
14 points for 0% to 4% above target

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

Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 11% below target goal:
13 points for 1% - 2% below target
12 points for 3% - 4% below target
11 points for 5% - 6% below target
10 points for 7% - 8% below target
9 points for 9% - 10% below target
8 points for 11% below target

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

Teacher falls below achievement goal from 12% to 26% below target goal:

grade/subject.	7 points for 12% - 14% below target 6 points for 15% - 17% below target 5 points for 18% - 20% below target 4 points for 21% - 23% below target 3 points for 24% - 26% below target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 27% or more below target: 2 points for 27% to 28% below target 1 point for 29% to 30% below target 0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 4 Math assessment
5	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 5 Math assessment
6	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Math assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Math assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 8 Math assessment

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>The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.</p> <p>Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus</p>
--	---

administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.

Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.

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

Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal:
15 points for over 4% of target
14 points for 0% to 4% above target

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

Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 11% below target goal:
13 points for 1% - 2% below target
12 points for 3% - 4% below target
11 points for 5% - 6% below target
10 points for 7% - 8% below target
9 points for 9% - 10% below target
8 points for 11% below target

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

Teacher falls below achievement goal from 12% to 26% below target goal:
7 points for 12% - 14% below target
6 points for 15% - 17% below target
5 points for 18% - 20% below target
4 points for 21% - 23% below target
3 points for 24% - 26% below target

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

Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 27% or more below target:
2 points for 27% to 28% below target
1 point for 29% to 30% below target
0 points for more than 30% below target

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/5139/124649-rhJdBgDruP/Local 20% FINAL - NEW V2 Sept 2012.pdf](#)

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	Byram Hills-developed Kindergarten ELA assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 1 ELA assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 2 ELA assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 3 ELA assessment

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>The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.</p> <p>Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.</p> <p>Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18-20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal: 20 points for over 5% of target 19 points for 3% to 5% above target 18 points for 0% to 2% above target</p>
<p>Effective (9-17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal: 17 points for 1% - 2% below target 16 points for 3% below target</p>

15 points for 4% below target
 14 points for 5% below target
 13 points for 6% below target
 12 points for 7% below target
 11 points for 8% below target
 10 points for 9% below target
 9 points for 10% below target

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

Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal:
 8 points for 11% - 12 % below target
 7 points for 13% - 14% below target
 6 points for 15% - 16% below target
 5 points for 17% - 18% below target
 4 points for 19% - 20% below target
 3 points for 21% - 22% below target

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

Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target.
 2 points for 23% to 26% below target
 1 point for 27% to 30% below target
 0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills-developed Kindergarten Math assessment
1	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 1 Math assessment
2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 2 Math assessment
3	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 3 Math assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.

The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.

Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.

Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.

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

Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal:
 20 points for over 5% of target
 19 points for 3% to 5% above target
 18 points for 0% to 2% above target

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

Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal:
 17 points for 1% - 2% below target
 16 points for 3% below target
 15 points for 4% below target
 14 points for 5% below target
 13 points for 6% below target
 12 points for 7% below target
 11 points for 8% below target
 10 points for 9% below target
 9 points for 10% below target

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

Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal:
 8 points for 11% - 12 % below target
 7 points for 13% - 14% below target
 6 points for 15% - 16% below target
 5 points for 17% - 18% below target
 4 points for 19% - 20% below target
 3 points for 21% - 22% below target

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

Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target.
 2 points for 23% to 26% below target
 1 point for 27% to 30% below target
 0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Science assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Science assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 8 Science assessment

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

<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>The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.</p> <p>Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.</p> <p>Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal: 20 points for over 5% of target 19 points for 3% to 5% above target 18 points for 0% to 2% above target</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal: 17 points for 1% - 2% below target 16 points for 3% below target 15 points for 4% below target 14 points for 5% below target 13 points for 6% below target 12 points for 7% below target 11 points for 8% below target</p>

	10 points for 9% below target 9 points for 10% below target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal: 8 points for 11% - 12 % below target 7 points for 13% - 14% below target 6 points for 15% - 16% below target 5 points for 17% - 18% below target 4 points for 19% - 20% below target 3 points for 21% - 22% below target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target. 2 points for 23% to 26% below target 1 point for 27% to 30% below target 0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Social Studies assessment
7	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Social Studies assessment
8	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 8 Social Studies assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.	<p>The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness</p>
---	---

skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.

Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.

Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.

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

Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal:
20 points for over 5% of target
19 points for 3% to 5% above target
18 points for 0% to 2% above target

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

Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal:
17 points for 1% - 2% below target
16 points for 3% below target
15 points for 4% below target
14 points for 5% below target
13 points for 6% below target
12 points for 7% below target
11 points for 8% below target
10 points for 9% below target
9 points for 10% below target

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

Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal:
8 points for 11% - 12% below target
7 points for 13% - 14% below target
6 points for 15% - 16% below target
5 points for 17% - 18% below target
4 points for 19% - 20% below target
3 points for 21% - 22% below target

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

Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target.
2 points for 23% to 26% below target
1 point for 27% to 30% below target
0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills-developed Global 1 assessment
Global 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Global 2 assessment
American History	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed American History assessment

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.

<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>The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.</p> <p>Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.</p> <p>Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal: 20 points for over 5% of target 19 points for 3% to 5% above target 18 points for 0% to 2% above target</p>

Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal: 17 points for 1% - 2% below target 16 points for 3% below target 15 points for 4% below target 14 points for 5% below target 13 points for 6% below target 12 points for 7% below target 11 points for 8% below target 10 points for 9% below target 9 points for 10% below target
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal: 8 points for 11% - 12 % below target 7 points for 13% - 14% below target 6 points for 15% - 16% below target 5 points for 17% - 18% below target 4 points for 19% - 20% below target 3 points for 21% - 22% below target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target. 2 points for 23% to 26% below target 1 point for 27% to 30% below target 0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills–developed Living Environment assessment
Earth Science	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills–developed Earth Science assessment
Chemistry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills–developed Chemistry assessment
Physics	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills–developed Physics assessment

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.13, below.

The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.

The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.

Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.

Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.

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

Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal:
 20 points for over 5% of target
 19 points for 3% to 5% above target
 18 points for 0% to 2% above target

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

Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal:
 8 points for 11% - 12 % below target
 7 points for 13% - 14% below target
 6 points for 15% - 16% below target
 5 points for 17% - 18% below target
 4 points for 19% - 20% below target
 3 points for 21% - 22% below target

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

Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal:
 17 points for 1% - 2% below target
 16 points for 3% below target
 15 points for 4% below target
 14 points for 5% below target
 13 points for 6% below target
 12 points for 7% below target
 11 points for 8% below target
 10 points for 9% below target
 9 points for 10% below target

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

Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target.

grade/subject.

2 points for 23% to 26% below target
1 point for 27% to 30% below target
0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills-developed Algebra 1 assessment
Geometry	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Geometry assessment
Algebra 2	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Algebra 2 assessment

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.

The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.

The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.

Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional

conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.

Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.

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

Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal:
 20 points for over 5% of target
 19 points for 3% to 5% above target
 18 points for 0% to 2% above target

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

Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal:
 17 points for 1% - 2% below target
 16 points for 3% below target
 15 points for 4% below target
 14 points for 5% below target
 13 points for 6% below target
 12 points for 7% below target
 11 points for 8% below target
 10 points for 9% below target
 9 points for 10% below target

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

Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal:
 8 points for 11% - 12 % below target
 7 points for 13% - 14% below target
 6 points for 15% - 16% below target
 5 points for 17% - 18% below target
 4 points for 19% - 20% below target
 3 points for 21% - 22% below target

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

Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target.
 2 points for 23% to 26% below target
 1 point for 27% to 30% below target
 0 points for more than 30% below target

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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 10 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	5) District, regional, or BOCES–developed assessments	Byram Hills-developed Grade 11 ELA assessment

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

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

<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>The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.</p> <p>Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.</p> <p>Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal: 20 points for over 5% of target 19 points for 3% to 5% above target 18 points for 0% to 2% above target</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal: 17 points for 1% - 2% below target 16 points for 3% below target 15 points for 4% below target 14 points for 5% below target 13 points for 6% below target 12 points for 7% below target 11 points for 8% below target 10 points for 9% below target 9 points for 10% below target</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for</p>	<p>Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal:</p>

grade/subject.	8 points for 11% - 12 % below target 7 points for 13% - 14% below target 6 points for 15% - 16% below target 5 points for 17% - 18% below target 4 points for 19% - 20% below target 3 points for 21% - 22% below target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target. 2 points for 23% to 26% below target 1 point for 27% to 30% below target 0 points for more than 30% below target

3.12) All Other Courses

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

Course(s) or Subject(s)	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Art K - 12	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed K-12 Art assessments
Music K - 12	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed K-12 Music assessments
Physical Education	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed K-12 Physical Education assessments
Math - all other teachers not covered above	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Math assessments
Science - all other teachers not covered above	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Science assessments
Social Studies - all other teachers not covered above	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Social Studies assessments
English - all other teachers not covered above	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed English assessments
World Languages grades 7 - 12	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed World Languages assessments
All other teachers not covered above (i.e., Health, science research, electives, etc.)	5) District/regional/BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed assessments

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

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

<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>The Byram Hills School District faculty has been working on locally-developed performance assessments for several years prior to the required APPR plan. The District developed a local assessment data chart (refer to the uploaded materials) to assure that the assessments are valid and of high quality. All students in the same grade or course will be administered the local assessment for comparability. The assessments will be scored using a rubric and anchor papers, and will be used to review for reliability over time. Teachers will not be permitted to score their own assessments to the extent practicable.</p> <p>The local assessment initiative is designed for college and career readiness of knowledge and skill development as defined in the Understanding University Success Project (2003) from the University of Oregon. Some examples of the college readiness skills required include critical thinking, analytical thinking, and problem solving.</p> <p>Review of Byram Hills longitudinal data on NYS assessments shows that our students consistently exceed the regional averages. Our local assessment process continues to focus administrator and teacher conversations on student performance by setting target goals for achievement. Teachers will be evaluated and rated on the extent to which they reach their achievement targets on the district-developed assessments, according to the point distribution requirements below. Additionally, teachers are expected to participate in professional conversations, data review, and goal setting with their administrator using the local assessment student performance data.</p> <p>Student achievement results will be used for the assignment of points for the HEDI ratings.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES -adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher meets or exceeds achievement goal: 20 points for over 5% of target 19 points for 3% to 5% above target 18 points for 0% to 2% above target</p>
<p>Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>Teacher falls slightly below achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal: 17 points for 1% - 2% below target 16 points for 3% below target 15 points for 4% below target 14 points for 5% below target 13 points for 6% below target 12 points for 7% below target 11 points for 8% below target 10 points for 9% below target 9 points for 10% below target</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for</p>	<p>Teacher falls below achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal:</p>

grade/subject.	8 points for 11% - 12 % below target 7 points for 13% - 14% below target 6 points for 15% - 16% below target 5 points for 17% - 18% below target 4 points for 19% - 20% below target 3 points for 21% - 22% below target
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Teacher falls well below achievement goal from 23% or more below target. 2 points for 23% to 26% below target 1 point for 27% to 30% below target 0 points for more than 30% below target

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/5139/124649-y92vNseFa4/Local 20% FINAL - NEW V2 Sept 2012.pdf

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.

The District will use the past performance of the students in setting local targets for local assessments. This may include past formative assessment results, summative assessment results, and state assessment results. To mitigate any potentially problematic incentives, to the extent practicable, teachers will not score the local assessments of the students on their roster for the purposes of their annual evaluation.

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.

The scores for teachers who have more than one locally selected measure of student achievement will be weighted proportionately based on the number of students in the local assessments for each subject.

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 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

Not Applicable

4.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment applicable to all teachers?

Yes

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

(No response)

Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced [at least 31 points]	31
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	29

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)

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

(No response)

(No response)

4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Teachers in Byram Hills follow a comprehensive process that produces evidence for the evaluation system. Probationary teachers receive three formal observations by a trained administrator, complete a portfolio project to show continuous improvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices, and collaborate with their administrator and colleagues on many district initiatives. Tenured teachers receive receive two observations each year, with a formal observation every three years, write a professional growth plan approved by their administrator, and collaborate with their administrator and colleageus on many district initiatives.

Administrators will evaluate teacher evidence in the processes above using the Danielson (2011) teacher practice rubric. Administrators provide feedback to teachers using observation forms (see attached documents), complete a midyear evaluation for probationary teachers, and meet regularly with tenured teachers to discuss progress toward meeting the goals of their professional growth plans.

Each Domain and component is evaluated on the rubric (see the attached document for detailed description and formula for assigning

the points from each domain and component using a weighting formula.) The administrator will conference with the teacher at the end of the year to provide feedback on the evidence using the teacher practice rubric.

In The Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2011), the four domains upon which teachers are evaluated include:

Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation (demonstrating content knowledge; demonstrating knowledge of students; setting instructional outcomes; demonstrating knowledge of resources; designing coherent instruction; designing student assessments)

Domain 2 - The Classroom Environment (creating an environment of respect and rapport; establishing a culture for learning; managing classroom procedures; managing student behavior; organizing physical space)

Domain 3 - Instruction (communicating with students; using questioning and discussion techniques; engaging students in learning; using assessment in instruction; demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness)

Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities (reflecting on teaching; maintaining accurate records; communicating with families; participating in professional community; growing and developing professionally; showing professionalism)

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/5091/124672-eka9yMJ855/Other Measures 4.5_1.doc

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.	Teachers must demonstrate evidence of teaching practice at the "distinguished" level on the Danielson 2011 rubric. Administrators will evaluate the evidence from the processes outlined above and assign a score for each component of each domain using the weighting system as outlined in the attached document.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers must demonstrate evidence of teaching practice at the "proficient" level on the Danielson 2011 rubric. Administrators will evaluate the evidence from the processes outlined above and assign a score for each component of each domain using the weighting system as outlined in the attached document.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers must demonstrate evidence of teaching practice at the "basic" level on the Danielson 2011 rubric. Administrators will evaluate the evidence from the processes outlined above and assign a score for each component of each domain using the weighting system as outlined in the attached document.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet NYS Teaching Standards.	Teachers must demonstrate evidence of teaching practice at the "unsatisfactory" level on the Danielson 2011 rubric. Administrators will evaluate the evidence from the processes outlined above and assign a score for each component of each domain using the weighting system as outlined in the attached document.

Provide the ranges for the 60-point scoring bands.

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

4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers

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

By building principals or other trained administrators

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

By trained in-school peer teachers or other trained reviewers

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

Independent evaluators

Formal/Long	0
Informal/Short	0

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

-
- In Person
-

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

-
- 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 every 3 years
4.7) Observations of Tenured Teachers Informal/Short	2
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 03, 2012

Updated Wednesday, June 27, 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 03, 2012

Updated Monday, October 01, 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/5265/124676-Df0w3Xx5v6/6.2 TIP_1.doc](#)

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:

The Byram Hills Evaluation Committee, comprised of the Teachers Association president, teachers appointed by the president, the Administrators Association president, and administrators appointed by the president, oversee the evaluation process and the appeals process. The District's appeals process is explicitly outlined below.

APPEALS PROCESS

A teacher may appeal only the substance of an annual professional performance review and/or adherence to the procedures for the review upon receiving a final rating of Ineffective or Developing. The teacher must indicate in writing which specific parts of the evaluation are being appealed. Any documentation/evidence that the teacher wants considered in the appeal should be attached to the appeals letter. The appeal must be filed with the building principal within 10 school days of receiving the final evaluation. The teacher must follow the steps outlined below.

A. PROBATIONARY TEACHERS

- 1. The probationary teacher meets with the building principal to review their written appeal document. The principal renders a decision within 10 school days.*
- 2. The teacher may submit a second and final appeal to the superintendent with a written statement indicating their basis for appeal of the principal's decision. The superintendent will respond within 5 school days.*

B. TENURED TEACHERS

- 1. The tenured teacher meets with the building principal to review the written appeal document. The principal renders a decision on the appeal within 10 school days.*
- 2. The teacher may submit a second appeal in writing to the Evaluation Committee for peer review within 10 school days from principal's decision. The peer review process includes the following:*
 - a. Teacher presents his or her written appeal to the Evaluation Committee at the next scheduled meeting not to exceed 6 weeks.*
 - b. The Evaluator reviews his or her final evaluation of teacher's performance to the Evaluation Committee.*
 - c. The Evaluation Committee reviews and comments on the written appeal.*
 - d. A final report and recommendation is written by the assistant superintendent, the BHAA leadership, and the BHTA leadership to the superintendent within 10 school days. A copy of this recommendation will be provided to the teacher. The teacher has 5 school days to withdrawal the appeal. The superintendent will make a final decision within 10 school days.*

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.

Lead Evaluator Training for Teachers

A. Certification of Lead Evaluators for Teachers.

- 1. The Superintendent and other administrators designated by the superintendent will attend a 2-day training session at BOCES to be certified to conduct teacher evaluations.*
- 2. The Superintendent and administrators will attend training (2 days) on using the Charlotte Danielson rubric, The Framework for Teaching, to be used in teacher evaluation.*
- 3. The Superintendent and administrators will attend 1-day training session on data driven inquiry, assessment design, and Student Learning Objectives.*
- 3. The Superintendent and administrators will spend at least two additional days reviewing the training procedures, reviewing local assessment design and data analysis, and engaging in a process to analyze the teacher rubric to ensure inter-rater reliability.*
- 4. The Superintendent and designated administrators will conduct a four-day workshop training session with all administrators to cover the following topics:*
 - a. NYS teaching standards and their related elements;*
 - b. Evidence based observations that are grounded in research, using the Charlotte Danielson Rubric;*
 - c. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value added growth model;*
 - d. Application and use of the State approved teacher rubrics, including training on the effective application of such rubrics; classroom videos will be observed, rated by administrators, and discussed to ensure inter-rater reliability;*
 - e. Application and use of any assessments tools that the district utilizes to evaluate its classroom teacher;*
 - f. Application and use of any State approved locally selected measures of student achievement used by the school district to evaluate its teachers;*
 - g. The scoring methodology utilized by the district to evaluate a teacher, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent*

and the composite effectiveness score; and

h. Specific consideration in evaluating teachers of ELL and students with disabilities.

5. Upon completion of the four-day certification program, the administrators will review a Teacher Case Study to ensure inter-rater reliability. The participants will rate the teacher in the Case Study and discuss any difference in ratings to assure inter-rater reliability over time. Two additional meetings during the school year will be devoted to watching and rating teacher videos.

6. The Superintendent and other District administrators will randomly review and evaluate 15% of teacher observations and evaluation reports conducted by administrators. Feedback on the quality of reports will be given to the administrators, and the data collected from this review will be used in the re-certification training program.

B. Re-certification of Lead Evaluators for Teachers

1. The Superintendent and other designated administrators will attend re-certification training at BOCES.

2. The Superintendent and other designated administrators will attend the Charlotte Danielson rubric training at BOCES for two days.

3. The Superintendent will conduct a three-day training session to cover the topics mentioned in part A above.

4. The Superintendent and administrators will participate in the Teacher Case Study to rate a teacher and discuss the ratings. This process will ensure inter-rater reliability.

5. Additionally training days will be scheduled as needed based on the review of random observation and evaluation reports.

6.5) Assurances -- Evaluators

Please check the boxes below:

-
- Checked
-

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

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

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

• Checked

6.6) Assurances -- Teachers

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

6.7) Assurances -- Data

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

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

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 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):

	3-5 Wampus School Principal
	6-8 HCC Middle School Principal
	9-12 BHHS Principal
	(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
k-2 Coman Hill Elementary School	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Grades K,1, and 2 ELA assessments
K-2 Coman Hill Elementary School	District, regional, or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Grades K,1 and 2 Math assessments
9-12 Byram Hills High School	State assessment	Regents assessments
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)
(No response)	(No response)	(No response)

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.	The K-2 principal will receive HEDI points based on the student achievement of the K-2 Math and ELA assessments for her school using the targets defined. The 9-12 principal will receive HEDI points based on the students' Regents results for his school using the targets defined.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	85% of the students will achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.
Effective (9 - 17 points) Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	75%-84% of the students will achieve the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60% -74% of the students will achieve the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test).	60% or less of the students will achieve the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.

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.

The achievement of students with disabilities on pre assessments will be considered when setting targets.

7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Friday, October 12, 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
3-5	(c) results for swd and ELLs	State ELA assessments for grades 4 and 5
6-8	(c) results for swd and ELLs	State ELA assessments for grades 6-8
9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	Regents assessments in ELA

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The local assessment portion of the APPR for Principals will include two options: (A) artifacts or evidence of local assessment study with student results or, (B) artifacts or evidence that will help to inform improved instruction and student results in a particular subgroup of the school's student population. The data analysis study of artifacts or evidence will be collaboratively agreed upon between the Principal and the Superintendent each year. The principal rating is based upon the degree to which students meet the achievement target set by the superintendent and the principal.
Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	15 points allotted for over 4% above target goal. 14 points allotted for 0% to 4% above target goal.
Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for	13 points allotted for 1% to 2% below target goal. 12 points allotted for 3% to 4% below target goal.

grade/subject.	11 points allotted for 5% to 6% below target goal. 10 points allotted for 7% to 8% below target goal. 9 points allotted for 9% to 10% below target goal. 8 points allotted for 11% to 12% below target goal.
Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	7 points allotted for 13% to 15% below target goal. 6 points allotted for 16% to 18% below target goal. 5 points allotted for 19% to 21% below target goal. 4 points allotted for 22% to 24% below target goal. 3 points allotted for 25% to 27% below target goal.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points allotted for 28% below target goal. 1 point allotted for 29% to 30% below target goal. 0 points allotted for more than 30% below target goal.

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grade Configuration	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K-2	(d) measures used by district for teacher evaluation	Byram Hills K-2 ELA and Math local assessments

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

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

Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.	The local assessment portion of the APPR for Principals will include two options: (A) artifacts or evidence of local assessment study with student results or, (B) artifacts or evidence that will help to inform improved instruction and student results in a particular subgroup of the school's student population. The data analysis study of artifacts or evidence will be collaboratively agreed upon between the Principal and the Superintendent each year. The principal rating is based upon the degree to which students meet the achievement target set by the superintendent and the principal.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or	20 points allotted for over 5% above target goal. 19 points allotted for 3% to 5% above target goal.

achievement for grade/subject.	18 points allotted for 0% to 2% above target goal.
Effective (9- 17 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	17 points allotted for 1% to 2% below target goal. 16 points allotted for 3% below target goal. 15 points allotted for 4% below target goal. 14 points allotted for 5% below target goal. 13 points allotted for 6% below target goal. 12 points allotted for 7% below target goal. 11 points allotted for 8% below target goal. 10 points allotted for 9% below target goal. 9 points allotted for 10% below target goal.
Developing (3 - 8 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	8 points allotted for 11% to 12% below target goal. 7 points allotted for 13% to 14% below target goal. 6 points allotted for 15% to 16% below target goal. 5 points allotted for 17% to 18% below target goal. 4 points allotted for 19% to 20% below target goal. 3 points allotted for 21% to 22% below target goal.
Ineffective (0 - 2 points) Results are well below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	2 points allotted for 23% to 26% below target goal. 1 point allotted for 27% to 30% below target goal. 0 points allotted for more than 30% below target goal.

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.

assets/survey-uploads/5366/124680-T8MIGWUVm1/Principal Evaluation - Local Assessments.pdf

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.

The district will use the past performance of the students in setting local targets for local assessments. This may include past formative assessment results, summative assessment results, state assessment results.

To mitigate any potentially problematic incentives, to the extent practicable teachers will not score the local assessments of the students on their roster for purposes of their annual evaluation.

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.

The local assessment scores will be derived individually for each subgroup studied.. e.g. 6th graders, 7th graders and 8th graders. Then the scores will be pro rated based on the percentage of students in each subgroup.

8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric

(No response)

9.2) Points Within Other Measures

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

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

Is the following points assignment for all principals?

Yes

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

(No response)

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

Broad assessment of principal leadership and management actions based on the practice rubric by the supervisor, a trained administrator or a trained independent evaluator. This must incorporate multiple school visits by supervisor, trained administrator, or trained independent evaluator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced. [At least 31 points]	60
Any remaining points shall be assigned based on results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents.	0

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

(No response)

9.3) Assurances -- Goals

Please check the boxes below (if applicable):

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

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

9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

(No response)

(No response)

(No response)

9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The points will be assigned based on tyhe following Domains:

Domain 1 - maximum 8 points

Domain 2 - maximum 20 points

Domain 3 - maximum 10 points

Domain 4 - maximum 6 points

Domain 5 - maximum 12 points

Domain 6 - maximum 4 points

In each Domain, there are elements, for example Domain 1 - culture and sustainability, a conversion score has been negotiated for the assignment of points to equal 60. This will be uploaded to this document.

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/5143/124681-pMADJ4gk6R/9. Other Measures - Principals_1.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed standards.	Principals must meet the criteria defined in the MPPR rubric at the level 4 in the Domain and the elements within the Domain.
Effective: Overall performance and results meet standards.	Principals must meet the criteria defined in the MPPR rubric at the level 3 in the Domain and the elements within the Domain.
Developing: Overall performance and results need improvement in order to meet standards.	Principals must meet the criteria defined in the MPPR rubric at the level 2 in the Domain and the elements within the Domain.
Ineffective: Overall performance and results do not meet standards.	Principals must meet the criteria defined in the MPPR rubric at the level 1 in the Domain and the elements within the Domain.

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

Highly Effective	45-60
Effective	31-44
Developing	16-30

Ineffective	0-15
-------------	------

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	10
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	10

Tenured Principals

By supervisor	10
By trained administrator	0
By trained independent evaluator	0
Enter Total	10

10. Composite Scoring (Principals)

Created Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Thursday, June 28, 2012

Page 1

Standards for Rating Categories

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(Teacher and Leader standards)

Highly

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results exceed ISLLC leadership standards.

Effective

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

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

Overall performance and results meet ISLLC leadership standards.

Developing

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

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

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

Ineffective

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

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

Overall performance and results do not meet ISLLC leadership standards.

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

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

2012-13 where there is no Value-Added measure

Growth or Comparable Measures

Locally-selected Measures of

growth or achievement

Other Measures of Effectiveness

(60 points)

Overall

Composite Score

Highly Effective

18-20

18-20

Ranges determined locally--see below

91-100

Effective

9-17

9-17

75-90

Developing

3-8

3-8

65-74

Ineffective

0-2

0-2

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

Highly Effective	45-60
Effective	31-44
Developing	16-30
Ineffective	0-15

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 Thursday, May 03, 2012

Updated Monday, October 01, 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/5276/124714-Df0w3Xx5v6/PIP - BLANK TEMPLATE.pdf](#)

11.3) Appeals Process

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

(1) the substance of the annual professional performance review

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

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

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

Principal Evaluation – Appeals Process

Principals receiving a rating of Ineffective or Developing shall have the right to appeal their rating following the procedures outlined below:

- a. The principal shall file the appeal in writing to the Superintendent no later than ten (10) school days following receipt of the final rating notice.*
- b. Failure to file the appeal within the ten (10) school days shall be considered as a waiver of this appeal process.*

- c. The Lead Evaluator, if someone other than the superintendent, shall have the opportunity to submit any written documentation in support of the evaluation within ten (10) days of notification of appeal by the principal.
- d. At the Superintendent's discretion, the Superintendent may interview the Lead Evaluator and/or the principal. The principal shall be entitled to representation from the Byram Hills Administrators Association at such interview.
- e. The Superintendent will issue a final decision in writing within thirty (30) calendar days following receipt of the appeal. The determination of the Superintendent with regard to the evaluation appeal shall be final.

11.4) Training and Certification of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators

Describe the process by which evaluators will be trained and the process for how the district will certify and re-certify lead evaluators. Describe the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability. Describe the duration and nature of such training.

Lead Evaluator Training for Principals

A. Certification of Lead Evaluators for Principals.

1. The Superintendent and other administrators designated by the superintendent will attend training at BOCES to be certified to conduct principal evaluations.
2. The Superintendent, administrators, and building principals will attend the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric training (2 days) on the rubric to be used in principal evaluation.
3. The Superintendent and administrators will spend at least two additional days reviewing the training procedures during, reviewing local assessment design and data analysis, and engaging in a process to analyze the principal rubric to ensure inter-rater reliability.
4. An Additional three workshops will be conducted to cover the following topics:
 - a. NYS teaching standards and their related elements and the Leadership standards;
 - b. Evidence based observations that are grounded in research;
 - c. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value added growth model;
 - d. Application and use of the State approved teacher or principal rubrics, including training on the effective application of such rubrics;
 - e. Application and use of any assessments tools that school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teacher or building principals;
 - f. 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;
 - g. The scoring methodology utilized by the Department and / or district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher or principal, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score; and
 - h. Specific consideration in evaluating teacher and principals of ELL and students with disabilities.
5. Upon completion of the certification program, the administrators will review a Principal Case Study to ensure inter-rater reliability. The participants will rate the principal in the Case Study and discuss any difference in ratings to assure inter-rater reliability over time.

B. Re-certification of Lead Evaluators for Principals

1. The Superintendent and other designated administrators will attend re-certification training at BOCES.
2. The Superintendent and other designated administrators and principals will attend the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric training at BOCES for two days.
3. The Superintendent will conduct three additional training sessions to cover the topics mentioned in part A above.
4. The Superintendent and designated administrators will participate in the Principal Case Study to rate a principal and discuss the ratings. This process will ensure inter-rater reliability.

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 Sunday, September 30, 2012

Updated Friday, October 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/5581/184397-3Uqgn5g9Iu/Assurances - signed-v2.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.

V. STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES AS COMPARABLE GROWTH MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Teachers who do **not** receive a score from NYSED for the Student Growth Measure must develop Student Learning Objectives as required in the Commissioner's regulations and use the prescribed scoring bands noted below. Teachers will develop Student Learning Objectives with their administrator by November 1 by completing the NYSED determined template. Baseline date must be used to determine the target for student growth. The scoring bands, prescribed by the Commissioner's regulations, are used to determine the teacher's score based upon the results of the target.

A. DEFINITION OF STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

A Student Learning Objective is an academic goal for a teacher's students that is set at the start of a course. It represents the most important learning for the year (or, semester, where applicable). It must be specific and measurable, based on available prior student learning data, and aligned to Common Core, State, or national standards, as well as any other school and District priorities. Teachers' scores are based upon the degree to which their goals were attained. Student Learning Objectives must include the following basic elements:

Student Population: Which students are being addressed? Each SLO will address all students in the teacher's course (or across multiple course sections) who take the same final assessment.

Learning Content: What is being taught? CCSS/national/State standards? Will specific standards be focused on in this goal or all standards applicable to the course?

Interval of Instructional Time: What is the instructional period covered (semester; full year, etc.)?

Evidence: What assessment(s) or student work product(s) will be used to measure this goal?

Baseline: What is the starting level of learning for students in the class?

Target and HEDI Criteria: What is the expected outcome (target) by the end of the instructional period?

HEDI Criteria: How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal or not? These ranges translate into HEDI categories and are described in the section below.

Rationale: Why choose this learning content, evidence and target?

B. HEDI SCORING BANDS

The point values for the HEDI bands are different for teachers in grades or subjects with a *value-added measure* and for those using *comparable growth measures* with Student Learning Objectives. When a value-added growth measure applies, the local assessment component is reduced to 15 points. The chart below shows the point values for the effectiveness ratings for the Comparable Growth Measure (20%) and for the Value-Added Measure (25%).

<i>2012-2013 Growth Subcomponent Scoring Bands</i>	Comparable Growth Measure (SLOs) 20%	Value-Added Measure 25%
Highly Effective	18 - 20	22 - 25
Effective	9 - 17	10 - 21
Developing	3 - 8	3 - 9
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2

C. HEDI CRITERIA

The District criteria for scoring Student Learning Objectives are as follows:

Highly Effective <i>18 – 20 points</i>	Effective <i>9 – 17 points</i>	Developing <i>3 – 8 points</i>	Ineffective <i>0 – 2 points</i>
85% of the students achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	75% - 84% of the students achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	60% - 74% of the students achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	Below 60% of the students achieve or exceed the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.
<i>The points within each category are distributed as follows:</i>			
18 points: 85% - 89% 19 points: 90% - 94% 20 points: 95% - 100%	9 points: 75% 10 points: 76% 11 points: 77% 12 points: 78% 13 points: 79% 14 points: 80% 15 points: 81% 16 points: 82% 17 points: 83% - 84%	3 points: 60% - 61% 4 points: 62% - 63% 5 points: 64% - 66% 6 points: 67% - 69% 7 points: 70% - 72% 8 points: 73% - 74%	0 points: 0% - 49% 1 point: 50% - 54% 2 points: 55% - 59%

D. USE OF DATA FOR SLO DEVELOPMENT

First, a review of available data will be conducted for the students in a classroom or course. For example, student work samples if available, course grades, etc. Data Reports from the Lower Hudson Regional Information Center data base for Level I data will be reviewed whenever such information is available for the course or classroom of students. The purpose of this is to establish baseline data.

The Byram Hills School District has purchased access to additional reports from the Lower Hudson Regional Information Center to assist all teachers in data analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of students regarding state standards and performance indicators.

A pre-assessment will be administered at the beginning of the interval time defined in the Student Learning Objective. The student results will be recorded at the building level; teachers will not score the papers of the students in the Student Learning Objective population to the extent this is practicable. In some courses online, pre-assessments will be utilized to support non-vested interest scoring.

Byram Hills' students have demonstrated a 97%-100% graduation rate for the past three years and the district exceeds regional norms on state assessments. (For example, Byram Hills High School Aspirational Performance Measure was 95.) Therefore, the district has promoted priorities for student success by studying the work of David T. Conley, Director of a project of the American Universities. Through our regional Tri-State Consortium and our Putnam/Northern Westchester BOCES programs we have promoted critical thinking, analytic thinking and problem solving, the willingness to accept critical feedback and to make adjustments, based on such feedback, to draw inference and reach conclusions independently and to use technology as a tool. (Understanding University Success; 2003, University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy Research.)

Therefore, when a state assessment is not the post assessment, the Student Learning Objective will be developed with a goal towards college readiness. In the K-8 schools when Student Learning Objectives are required, the pre and post assessment will support skills and content leading to these cognitive skills.

The post assessment will be administered within the interval determined. The building administrator will assign the HEDI points based on the student results and the achievement of meeting the target set in the Student Learning Objective which will be approved by the principal according to the district criteria defined below.

The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum will oversee the Student Learning Objective development process.

E. REVIEW AND MONITORING

The District will review and monitor the development and quality of Student Learning Objectives using the following process:

- I. The District will establish guidelines for writing Student Learning Objectives using the criteria outlined in the Commissioner's regulations.

2. All administrators in the District will receive training on the rules and regulations for Student Learning Objectives and review and discuss the District guidelines for establishing and developing Student Learning Objectives. The HEDI criteria will be reviewed and explained.
3. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will collaborate with administrators on the review of Student Learning Objectives during the development process.
4. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will collect samples of Student Learning Objectives from each building to review the use of baseline data and targets set for the teachers. Feedback will be provided to administrators upon review.

III. MULTIPLE MEASURES OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

The purpose of teacher observation and evaluation in the Byram Hills School District is to promote continuous improvement for teacher effectiveness. To achieve this goal, the District will implement an evaluation system that is designed improve the instruction of all students and strengthen the skills of teachers in a collaborative and supportive environment. The teacher evaluation system provides a process and structure for ongoing dialogue between teacher and evaluator concerning teacher professional growth, classroom practices, and teacher effectiveness.

The District shall assess teacher effectiveness using multiple measures aligned to the New York Teaching Standards as specified in the NYS Commissioner's regulations. This component of a teacher's evaluation comprises 60% of the composite score. The requirements and the procedures outlined below provide an overview of the teacher evaluation system for probationary and tenured teachers that produce evidence for the multiple measures of teacher effectiveness component.

A. TEACHER PRACTICE RUBRIC

The District shall use the approved teacher rubric, *The Framework for Teaching*, Charlotte Danielson, (2011 Revised Edition), to measure teacher effectiveness aligned to the NYS Teaching Standards.

B. TEACHER OBSERVATIONS

Multiple observations, with at least one unannounced visit, shall account for 52% (31.2 points out of the 60 points) of a teacher's score in this subcomponent. Teacher observations and evaluations will be conducted by trained administrators in the District.

1. Probationary Teachers

Probationary teachers will be observed at least three (3) times during the school year using a clinical observation model. The observation process conducted by the administrator includes: a pre observation conference; the observation; and a post observation conference. The observation process is followed by a final report using the Report of Classroom Observation form.

The probationary teacher will receive at least one (1) unannounced observation during the school year.

2. Tenured Teachers will be observed at least two (2) times during the school year. At least one (1) observation will be announced.

C. SCORING METHODOLOGY

The Commissioner’s regulation requires that each teacher is evaluated annually on the NYS Teaching Standards using an approved rubric as part of the Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness component. This portion of a teacher’s evaluation is worth 60% of the composite score, and the District will utilize a weighting methodology in distributing the 60 points for this category. Each Domain will be weighted accordingly:

DOMAIN 1: Planning and Preparation	24%
DOMAIN 2: The Classroom Environment	26%
DOMAIN 3: Instruction	26%
DOMAIN 4: Professional Responsibilities	24%

Each Domain in *The Framework for Teaching* rubric contains several Components. The Components will be weighted according to the following proportions totaling 100% within each Domain:

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION (24%)	
a. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	20%
b. Knowledge of Students	20%
c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	15%
d. Knowledge of Resources	15%
e. Designing Coherent Instruction	15%
f. Designing Student Assessments	15%
DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT (26%)	
a. Respect and Rapport	25%
b. Culture for Learning	25%
c. Managing Classroom Procedures	20%
d. Managing Student Behavior	20%
e. Organizing Physical Spaces	10%
DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION (26%)	
a. Communicating with Students	20%
b. Questioning/Prompts and Discussion	20%
c. Engaging Students in Learning	20%
d. Using Assessment in Instruction	20%
e. Using Flexibility and Responsiveness	20%
DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES (24%)	
a. Reflecting on Teaching	20%
b. Maintaining Accurate Records	10%
c. Communicating with Families	20%
d. Participating in a Professional Community	20%
e. Growing and Developing Professionally	20%
f. Showing Professionalism	10%

At the end of the evaluation cycle, the evaluator will rate each component using *The Framework for Teaching* rubric on a scale from 1 to 4 in the following manner:

- 4 – Highly Effective (equates to Danielson “Distinguished”)
- 3 – Effective (equates to Danielson “Proficient”)
- 2 – Developing (equates to Danielson “Basic”)
- 1 – Ineffective (equates to Danielson “Unsatisfactory”)

The evaluator will calculate the Total Rubric Score using the weighting formulas above. The Total Rubric Score is converted to a point value for the Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness component using the following conversion scale:

Rubric Score	Conversion Score	Rubric Score	Conversion Score	Rubric Score	Conversion Score
1.0	0	2.0	52	3.0	58
1.1	5	2.1	53	3.1	58.1
1.2	7.5	2.2	54	3.2	58.2
1.3	10	2.3	55	3.3	58.3
1.4	17.5	2.4	56	3.4	58.4
1.5	25	2.5	57	3.5	59
1.6	35	2.6	57.1	3.6	59.2
1.7	45	2.7	57.2	3.7	59.4
1.8	50	2.8	57.3	3.8	59.6
1.9	51	2.9	57.4	3.9	59.8
				4.0	60

The following scoring bands apply to the Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness component of the evaluation system:

Rating Category	Teacher Effectiveness Score
Highly Effective	59 – 60
Effective	57 – 58
Developing	50 – 56
Ineffective	0 – 49

D. COMPOSITE SCORE

The teacher’s final evaluation rating is the total of the three subcomponents of the evaluation system: 1) growth or comparable measures; 2) locally selected measures; and 3) multiple measures of teacher effectiveness. The NYS Commissioner sets the scoring bands for the growth/comparable measures, the locally selected measures, and the overall composite score; the multiple measures category is negotiated locally.

The following scoring bands will be applied to determine the teachers’ ratings for the school year.

For 2012-2013 for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth:

<i>2012-13 with no approved Value-Added measure</i>	Growth or Comparable Measures 20%	Locally Selected Measures 20%	Multiple Measures of Effectiveness 60%	Overall Composite Score 100%
Highly Effective	18 - 20	18 - 20	59 - 60	91 - 100
Effective	9 - 17	9 - 17	57 - 58	75 - 90
Developing	3 - 8	3 - 8	50 - 56	65 - 74
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2	0 - 49	0 - 64

For 2012-2013 for educators for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure of student growth:

<i>2012-13 with an approved Value-Added measure</i>	Value-Added Measures 25%	Locally Selected Measures 15%	Multiple Measures of Effectiveness 60%	Overall Composite Score 100%
Highly Effective	22 - 25	14 - 15	59 - 60	91 - 100
Effective	10 - 21	8 - 13	57 - 58	75 - 90
Developing	3 - 9	3 - 7	50 - 56	65 - 74
Ineffective	0 - 2	0 - 2	0 - 49	0 - 64

E. PROCEDURES FOR PROBATIONARY TEACHER EVALUATION

I. REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation process for probationary teachers places emphasis on the new teacher's ability to carry out three fundamental phases of teaching:

- a) Knowledge of curriculum and standards;
- b) Knowledge and skills in instructional design and implementation; and
- c) Understanding various forms of student assessment to measure student learning.

In addition, probationary teachers are expected to demonstrate knowledge of NYS Teaching Standards as measured by *The Framework for Teaching* rubric (Danielson, 2011).

For probationary teachers in years 1, 2 & 3 in Byram Hills, the following is required:

- a) Three formal observations
 - The observations will be performed by the building or district administration, and/or the appropriate department chairperson/director.

- At least two observations will be performed by December 1.
 - The third observation will be performed by April 1.
- b) At least one unannounced observation
- The unannounced observation will be performed by the building or district administration, and/or the appropriate department chairperson/director.
 - The administrator will provide written feedback to the teacher following the unannounced observation.
 - The unannounced observation may be one of the required 3 formal observations or an additional observation.
- c) Student Learning Objectives (SLO), where applicable
- Teachers will submit required SLOs by November 1.
 - Pre assessments will be completed before the submission of the SLOs.
- d) Local measures of student achievement
- Teachers will participate in the team Local Measures of Student Achievement process.
 - The local assessment will be administered between October 1 and March 31.
 - The teacher submits the Local Assessment Data Chart Phase I by November 1, or before the administration of the local assessment if prior to November 1.
 - The teacher submits the completed Local Assessment Data Chart by May 15.
- e) Midyear summary of performance
- The midyear evaluation will identify strengths, areas that need continued attention, and suggestions for improvement.
 - The midyear evaluation will be completed prior to the December vacation.
- f) Portfolio Project
- Due to principal/director/chairperson by February 15.
 - Requirements outlined in the *Probationary Teacher Portfolio Project* guidelines.
 - The Evaluation Committee will conduct information sessions in the fall for each probationary year.
- g) Commendations form
- Due by February 15.
 - Provides an opportunity for teachers to provide additional information to be included in evaluation.

j) Annual Evaluation

- The annual evaluation components completed by Byram Hills administrators will be completed by June 1.
- Summarizes overall performance aligned to *The Framework for Teaching* rubric.
- Includes a summary of portfolio project.
- Includes recommendations for improvement.
- Rates overall performance using the scoring bands as outlined in the Commissioner's regulations.
- Provides a recommendation for continued employment.
- Teachers receiving a score from SED or who have SLOs requiring state assessments may have incomplete evaluations prior to June 1 and will receive completed evaluations as soon as practicable. All other available ratings and subcomponents will be provided to teacher by June 1.

2. OBSERVATION PROCESS FOR PROBATIONARY TEACHERS

The heart of the probationary evaluation system is the observation process. Through observations, assessments can be made regarding teacher effectiveness and student learning. In addition, professional growth can be fostered through mutual sharing of ideas, concepts and diversified teaching methods. The process is effective when both the observer and the teacher communicate their ideas and expectations to one another. The evaluation system encourages this dialogue by establishing a process that includes a pre-observation conference, the observation, and a post-observation conference.

Pre-Observation Conference

The pre-observation conference shall occur between the teacher and observer prior to the observation. A notice is to be sent to each teacher requesting the scheduling of a pre-observation conference. It is recommended that the observation take place within three days of the pre-observation conference.

The subject of the pre-observation conference may be determined by the curriculum, recommendations from previous observations and evaluations, current or previous objectives, information discussed with teachers, and activities generated by professional growth endeavors (coursework, readings, in-service, etc.) This may mean, in some instances, that the observer will request to see a particular type of lesson. Both teachers and observers should use this pre-observation conference as a means of sharing and exploring ideas and thoughts regarding the specific lesson to be observed, including teaching strategies, assessments to be used, and other issues relating to the lesson.

The Pre-observation Conference Form should be filled out by the teacher prior to the pre-observation conference. The architect and designer of the lesson is the teacher. This means that the order of elements presented, the time frame for activities, and the methodology is the responsibility of the teacher. When necessary, the observer will discuss the teacher's rationale for the teaching strategy and lend a guiding hand to its final form.

The content of the Pre-observation Conference Form should be so clear, succinct, and serviceable that it becomes in effect the skeletal structure of the lesson plan. It is the obligation of the administrator to make the teacher aware of any inconsistencies in the lesson plan. Any difference of opinion between the administrator and the teacher to be observed regarding the teaching strategy should be noted in the comment section of the Pre-observation Conference Form on the day of the pre-observation conference. Both the teacher and administrator should sign the Pre-observation Conference Form at the end of the pre-observation conference to indicate that both have read and understood the document.

The Observation

During the observation, the lesson will be objectively reported by the observer, taking notes on the process observed and the interaction in the classroom. The observer will reference components and elements in *The Framework for Teaching* rubric as evidence of teacher performance.

The Post-Observation Conference

The post-observation conference occurs when the observer and teacher meet to discuss the lesson as soon as possible, but *no later than ten school days* after the observation. At this meeting, the observer will share the Report of Classroom Observation Part I with the teacher.

The observer will discuss the teacher's specific observed behaviors during the lesson, referencing *The Framework for Teaching* rubric. When needed, the conference will also generate specific recommendations and suggestions that will help the teacher improve his or her performance.

After the post-observation conference, the observer will complete the Report of Classroom Observation Part II with appropriate observed behaviors and recommendations. Upon completion, the entire form will be presented to the teacher. The teacher and observer will sign the form. These signatures will *only* indicate that both parties have read and discussed the contents of the report. Teachers may then comment directly on the form itself or attach a statement.

Note: Probationary teachers may have unannounced observations by administrators at any time. In the event that a building administrator, director, department chairperson, or other supervisory staff enters a classroom for an

unannounced visitation of more than 25 minutes, the administrator will write a report and have a dialogue with the teacher about the lesson.

3. PROCEDURES FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION

The principal, assistant principal, department chairperson, or director will conference with the teacher prior to drafting the annual evaluation to discuss any concerns or issues that should be noted on the Annual Evaluation. Furthermore, the teacher may provide additional evidence for consideration in the annual evaluation. Commendations for inclusion in the final document should be solicited and shared. The Commendations Form should be submitted to the principal, assistant principal, department chairperson, or director by February 15. Nothing at this point should be in final, written form; only notes should be prepared. The teacher will have an opportunity to react at this conference.

After the annual evaluation is completed, the principal will conduct the final evaluation conference with the teacher by June 1, and all parties will affix their signatures. Teachers receiving a score from SED or who have SLOs requiring state assessments may have incomplete evaluations prior to June 1 and will receive completed evaluations as soon as practicable. All other available ratings and subcomponents will be provided to teacher by June 1.

Special note for shared staff members: The principal of the school in which the teacher is based for the majority of his/her time will confer with the teacher on the final document. If there is a question on the contents of the evaluation, the other principal contributing to the evaluation will have a conference with the teacher. All principals will affix their signatures to the document.

4. PROBATIONARY TEACHER TIMELINE

September – December 1	Two formal observations completed
November 1	Local Assessment Data Chart Phase 1 due
November 1	Student Learning Objectives due
Prior to December vacation	Midyear evaluation
January – April 1	One formal observation completed
February 15	Portfolio Project due
February 15	Commendation Form due
May 15	Local Assessment Data Chart
June 1	Final evaluation report to superintendent <i>for all available components*</i>
September 1 of next school year	Final evaluations due for those subcomponents not available before June, if SED data available.

*Teachers receiving a score from SED or who have SLOs requiring state assessments may have incomplete evaluations prior to June 1 and will receive completed evaluations as soon as practicable. All other available ratings and subcomponents will be provided to teacher by June 1.

Note: If due date falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the due date will be the Friday before.

F. PROCEDURES FOR TENURED TEACHER EVALUATION

Teachers who achieve tenure in Byram Hills participate in the teacher evaluation system for tenured teachers. The comprehensive system is a three year evaluation cycle that includes professional development, observations of teaching, review of student assessment data, and continuous feedback through ongoing conversations with administrators.

The tenured teacher evaluation system in Byram Hills fulfills the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) required by state and local policies. The primary purpose of the evaluation cycle is to maintain high standards of teacher performance through meaningful dialogue between administrators and faculty about professional practice.

I. REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation process for tenured teachers places emphasis on professional collaboration and ongoing dialogue between teachers and administrators.

For tenured teachers in Byram Hills, the following is required:

a) Professional Growth Plan

- Teachers develop a Professional Growth Plan in consultation with building administrator, director, or chairperson.
- Submit to principal by October 15.
- Teachers may choose to participate in the *Growth Option*, with approval from their principal and director/chairperson, in place of the Professional Growth Plan.

b) Two required observations

- The observations will be performed by the building or district administration, and/or the appropriate department chairperson/director.
- The two observations will be performed by May 1.

- Teachers in *year 1* of the 3-year cycle must choose one formal observation method as indicated in the Professional Growth Plan requirements.
 - Teachers in *years 2 and 3* of the 3-year cycle will be observed two times from a list of observation methods in collaboration with the administrator.
 - One of the two required observations will be unannounced.
- c) Student Learning Objectives (SLO), where applicable
- Teachers will submit required SLOs by November 1.
 - Pre assessments will be completed before the submission of SLOs.
- d) Local measures of student achievement
- Teachers will participate in the team Local Measures of Student Achievement process.
 - The local assessment will be administered between October 1 and March 31.
 - The teacher submits the Local Assessment Data Chart Phase I by November 1, or before the administration of the local assessment if prior to November 1.
 - The teacher submits the completed Local Assessment Data Chart by May 15.
- e) Commendations form
- Due by April 15.
 - Provides an opportunity for teachers to provide additional information to be included in evaluation.
- f) Annual Evaluation
- The annual evaluation will be completed by June 1.
 - Includes a summary of final conference on the Professional Growth Plan, including a rating of complete or incomplete.
 - Summarizes overall performance aligned to *The Framework for Teaching* rubric.
 - Includes recommendations for improvement.
 - Rates overall performance using the scoring bands as outlined in the Commissioner's regulations.
 - Teachers receiving a score from SED or who have SLOs requiring state assessments may have incomplete evaluations prior to June 1 and will receive completed evaluations as soon as practicable. All other available ratings and subcomponents will be provided to teacher by June 1.

2. THE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN

The Professional Growth Plan for tenured teachers in Byram Hills is intended to strengthen the ongoing learning of teachers in collaboration with the building administrators through an evaluation cycle that includes professional development, observations of teaching practices, and ongoing feedback.

Teachers develop a Professional Growth Plan through conversations with their administrator that focuses on an aspect of curriculum, instruction, or assessment relevant to the teaching assignment of the teacher. The goal of the Plan is to promote professional learning in a collaborative environment between teacher and administrator.

The process for the Professional Growth Plan is outlined below:

- a) The teacher considers an area of focus for his/her growth plan and the methods for achieving the elements of the plan. The Plan includes appropriate Domains and Components of *The Framework for Teaching* rubric that align to the goals of the plan. The teacher drafts the plan, which includes the following criteria:
 - i. Description of Plan: The description of the plan will include the goals for professional learning and the methods the teacher will use to achieve the professional growth outlined in the plan. Teacher plans must reflect Byram Hills Standards and NYS Learning Standards, and plans must align with District goals and priorities.
 - ii. Domains and Components: The teacher selects appropriate Domains and Components from *The Framework for Teaching* rubric that align to the goals and methods of the Plan.
 - iii. Assessment of Implementation: The teacher will assess his/her professional growth by using *one* of the following methods:
 - Anecdotal records
 - Dialogue between teacher and supervisor
 - Log/journal
 - Portfolio
 - Evidence of student learning
 - Videotape assessment
 - Peer review
 - iv. Observation Method: Two observations, to be completed by May 1, are required, with one observation unannounced. The requirements for the *announced* observation are as follows:

Year 1 in cycle: The teacher receives a formal announced observation which includes a pre-observation conference, the observation, and a post-observation conference. The observation method is chosen by the teacher in consultation with his/her administrator during the initial meeting for the Plan.

Year 2 and 3 in cycle: The observation method for the *announced* observation is determined in collaboration between the administrator and the teacher.

- v. Timeline: The teacher includes a timeline of activities to meet the objectives of the Plan, including the date of the initial conference, follow-up meetings, professional development activities, and other important benchmark events in which the teacher participates.
- b) The teacher and the administrator meet to discuss the contents of the Plan during the conference, and they agree upon the elements outlined in the Plan. Any revisions to the Plan are agreed upon during the conference and the Plan is revised.
- c) The teacher, principal and director/chairperson sign the form. The completed Plan is due to the principal by October 15.
- d) The teacher proceeds with the focus, development, and assessment methods outlined in the Plan. Follow-up meetings are held to support collaboration between teacher and administrator. The teacher provides and shares evidence to identify progress in the successful completion of the Plan.
- e) The building principal and the teacher hold a final meeting to assess completion of the Professional Growth Plan by May 15. The Plan will be rated using the HEDI rating categories for the Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness subcomponent.

NOTE: For 2012-2013 only, all Professional Growth Plans will focus on some aspect of assessment design and development, and plans may be written by teams of teachers. Teachers are evaluated individually on the implementation of the plan and observation methods as required by the Commissioner's regulations.

3. THE GROWTH OPTION

Tenured teachers may opt for the alternative Growth Option in place of the Professional Growth Plan described above. The Growth Option is designed to encourage professional learning, collaboration, innovation, change, research, inquiry, and/or peer review. Individual teachers or teams of teachers design and write a proposal to explore a topic related to curriculum, instruction, or assessment.

To participate, teachers must:

- get approval from principal and director/chairperson;
- complete an application process through the Evaluation Committee;
- receive approval of the proposal from the Evaluation Committee; and
- complete all requirements of the tenured teacher evaluation process *except* the Professional Growth Plan. The Growth Option *replaces* the plan described in item 2 above. Teachers must receive two observations as required by the Commissioner's regulations.

The requirements for the Growth Option are as follows:

- a) Teacher or teams of teachers submit proposal/application to District Office by September 21. The principal and the director/chairperson must grant approval to participate in the Growth Option.
- b) The proposal is reviewed by the Evaluation Committee, which consists of teachers and administrators, for acceptance, revision, or rejection.
- c) Upon approval, the teacher or teacher teams proceed with the proposal.
- d) The teacher or teams provide two reports to the Evaluation Committee for successful completion of the growth option. The mid-year report occurs in January, and the end-of-year report takes place in June. One report must be an oral report and the other one may be oral or written.
- e) The teacher will conference with the principal by March 1 to discuss progress toward the elements of *The Framework for Teaching*.
- e) Teachers participating in the Growth Option will **self assess** on Domain 1 and Domain 4 of *The Framework for Teaching* rubric. Teachers submit their self-evaluation to the principal by May 15.

INVESTIGATORS OF PRACTICE

One structured approach for the Growth Option includes the District course, *Investigators of Practice*. Teachers choosing to participate in *Investigators of Practice* follow the same procedures as described above with two exceptions. First, teachers complete and submit the application for this course. The details of their proposals are developed during the course although teachers may consider areas in which to focus in advance. Second, participants in *Investigators of Practice* submit *one* written report in lieu of the two reports to the Evaluation Committee. The written report, due in June, involves a summary of the inquiry in which teachers engaged. Samples of prior summaries can be found on the District website.

NOTE: For 2012-2013 the only Growth Option will be the *Investigators of Practice* course. The Evaluation Committee will review the growth option with regards to the new APPR process during the year and make a recommendation for future implementation.

4. OBSERVATION PROCESS FOR TENURED TEACHERS

As required by the Commissioner's regulations, all teachers must receive multiple observations (at least two) during the school year, and one observation must be unannounced. The observation process at Byram Hills supports collaboration and ongoing dialogue between teachers and administration regarding high quality curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices. Classroom observations will make up 52% of a teacher's rating on the Multiple Measures of Effectiveness band to fulfill the requirements of the NYS regulations.

Two observations, to be completed by May 1, are required, with one observation unannounced. Teachers will choose a formal observation method in consultation with their administrator during the initial meeting of the Professional Growth Plan. The observation methods include:

- a full description and scripting of the lesson;
- a description focused on a particular aspect of the lesson;
- the co-teaching of a lesson by the teacher and the administrator;
- a walk-through process
- an instructional rounds process
- structured peer observation process

In year 1 of the evaluation cycle, the formal observation process will include a pre-observation conference between the teacher and observer, the observation as chosen above, and a post-observation conference. The forms for the probationary teachers observation process may be used for the formal observation.

During all observations, the administrator collects evidence based on the classroom observation. Additionally, the post-observation conference provides teachers an opportunity to present additional evidence of performance aligned to *The Framework for Teaching* rubric. Teachers should review the indicators and examples of evidence noted in the *Framework* rubric. The administrator rates the evidence from the observation process using the rubric scale.

Note: Tenured teachers may have unannounced observations by administrators at any time. In the event that a building administrator, director, department chairperson, or other supervisory staff enters a classroom for an unannounced visitation of more than 25 minutes, the administrator will write a report and have a dialogue with the teacher about the lesson.

5. TENURE TEACHER TIMELINE

September – May 1	Two observations completed
October 15	Professional Growth Plan due to principal
November 1	Local Assessment Data Chart Phase I due
November 1	Student Learning Objectives due
April 15	Commendations Form due
May 15	Last day for final conference on Plan
May 15	Local Assessment Data Chart due
June 1	Final evaluation report to superintendent <i>for all available components*</i>
September 1 of next school year	Final evaluations due for those components not available before June, if SED data available.

Growth Option Timeline

September – May 1	Two observations completed
September 21	Application/proposals due to District Office
October 15	Local Assessment Data Chart Phase I due
November 1	Student Learning Objectives due
January	Midyear report to Evaluation Committee
April 15	Commendations Form due
May 15	Local Assessment Data Chart due
May 15	Self assessment due to principal
June	End-of-year report to Evaluation Committee
June 1	Final evaluation report to superintendent <i>for all available components*</i>
September 1 of next school year	Final evaluations due for those components not available before June, if SED data available.

* Teachers receiving a score from SED or who have SLOs requiring state assessments may have incomplete evaluations prior to June 1 and will receive completed evaluations as soon as practicable. All other available ratings and subcomponents will be provided to teacher by June 1.

Note: If due date falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the due date will be the Friday before.

IV. LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The New York State Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) regulation stipulates that 20% of a teacher's evaluation is based upon achievement or growth in student performance on locally selected assessment data. As defined in the APPR, the assessment measures must be *locally comparable* and *rigorous*.

Locally comparable is defined as the same locally selected measures of student achievement or growth across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in district.

Rigorous, as applied to assessments, is defined in the field of testing standards as validity and reliability. A *valid assessment* accurately gauges what the assessment claims to measure. A *reliable assessment* demonstrates accuracy of results through consistency in what it measures over time. (Mills, 2007; Sagor, 2000).

Several procedures are employed to assure validity and reliability of the locally developed assessment process.

- The Byram Hills assessments are aligned to the NYS Learning Standards and to instructional objectives and activities.
- The assessments are scored using common scoring rubrics and anchor papers.
- The assessments, rubric design, and anchor papers are rated on a *readiness scale*. The scale reflects the continuum in the assessment design from beginning stages to revised/refined stage of development.
- The assessment data are compared to other measures of student performance, including state tests and teacher-created assessments.
- The data analysis process involves collaboration with peers and administrators to reflect on the data and determine instructional improvement methods.

The Byram Hills School District follows a continuous improvement cycle for curriculum, instruction and assessment: study, plan, implement, evaluate, reflect, revise/refine. The assessment design and data analysis process recognize the continuous improvement cycle through a collaborative, reflective process of professional inquiry.

A. ASSESSMENT DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

The teacher collaborates with his or her colleagues (grade level, team, or department) and administrator to develop and implement a common assessment aligned to the New York State Learning Standards and local curriculum. Each assessment will include the Assessment Data Chart, scoring criteria with anchor papers, and other supporting materials as appropriate. The building administrator oversees and approves the assessment design to meet the criteria for rigorous as outlined above. The

assessment is sent to the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction for review before submitting for approval from the Superintendent. All local assessments must be verified for comparability and rigor and approved by the Superintendent.

B. DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS AND ALLOCATION OF POINTS

As stipulated in the APPR regulation, teachers will be allocated up to 20 points for the locally selected measures of student achievement based upon the data inquiry process and student achievement toward target goals. The data inquiry process involves four phases: preparation and implementation; descriptive analysis; inference and action; and reflecting and goal setting. Teachers will meet regularly with their administrator to demonstrate evidence of the indicators below for each phase of the process.

Phase I: Preparation and Implementation

The teacher engages in the following activities:

- a. Teaches lessons aligned to state standards to prepare students with prerequisite skills, knowledge, understandings, and learning habits;
- b. Collaborates in the assessment development process, and administers the common assessment during an agreed upon time;
- c. Participates in the grade level/team/department training on scoring the common assessment;
- d. Reflects upon possible assumptions and predictions about student performance based upon knowledge of students and prior assessment data; and
- e. Sets benchmark achievement goals with team, building and/or department administrator.

Phase 2: Descriptive Analysis

In collaboration with grade level/team/department colleagues, the teacher engages in the following activities:

- a. Scores the assessments using the common criteria, rubric and anchor papers;
- b. Describes the team/course/grade-level results (patterns, trends, surprises, new questions, etc.) from the assessments using appropriate techniques, such as, Looking at Student Work protocol, graphical representations, holistic comparisons, etc;
- c. Discusses results with colleagues using benchmark criteria;
- d. Analyzes student results with respect to standards and learning objectives; and
- e. Identifies students not meeting standards.

Phase 3: Inference and Action

Using the information from the descriptive analysis, the teacher engages in the following activities:

- a. Researches and considers intervention strategies through a collaborative inquiry model;
- b. Develops curricular and instructional strategies to target students scoring below proficiency in meeting standards;
- c. Collects additional student data (for example, from formative and/or interim assessments) aligned to learning goals and standards;
- d. Uses the additional data to monitor improvement efforts toward learning standards; and
- e. Provides feedback to students and continues to target students not meeting standards.

Phase 4: Reflecting and Goal Setting

The teacher engages in the following activities:

- Completes a self-assessment regarding student performance data. The self-assessment includes:
 - a. A reflection upon the assessment results and the effectiveness of the strategies used to improve student learning;
 - b. Long term curricular and instructional goals designed to target students not meeting standards in the future;
 - c. Professional development needs based on assessment data;
 - d. Reflection upon the assessment design and development;

C. POINT ALLOCATION

The administrator will assign points to teacher teams based upon the following criteria:

18 – 20 Points: Highly Effective

- *Meets or exceeds* team achievement goal.
 - 20 points for over 5% of target
 - 19 points for 3% to 5% above target
 - 18 points for 0% to 2% above target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

9 – 17 Points: Effective

- *Slightly below* team achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal.
 - 17 points for 1% - 2% below target
 - 16 points for 3% below target
 - 15 points for 4% below target

BYRAM HILLS CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARMONK, NEW YORK

- 14 points for 5% below target
- 13 points for 6% below target
- 12 points for 7% below target
- 11 points for 8% below target
- 10 points for 9% below target
- 9 points for 10% below target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

3 – 8 Points: Developing

- *Below* team achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal.
 - 8 points for 11% - 12 % below target
 - 7 points for 13% - 14% below target
 - 6 points for 15% - 16% below target
 - 5 points for 17% - 18% below target
 - 4 points for 19% - 20% below target
 - 3 points for 21% - 22% below target
- Participates in *many* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

0 – 2 Points: Ineffective

- *Well below* team achievement goal from 23% or more below target.
 - 2 points for 23% to 26% below target
 - 1 point for 27% to 30% below target
 - 0 points for more than 30% below target
- Participates in *few* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

References

- Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2010). *Driven by data: A practical guide to improve instruction*.
- Boudett, K. P., City, E., & Murnane, R. (2005). *Data Wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning*.
- Heritage, M. (2010). *Formative assessment and next-generation assessment systems: Are we losing an opportunity?*
- Love, N. (2002). *Using data/getting results: A practical guide for school improvement in mathematics and science*.
- Mills, G. E. (2007). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*.
- Pelto, P. J., & Pelto, G. H. (1978). *Anthropological research: The structure of inquiry*.
- Sagor, R. (2000). *Guiding school improvement with action research*.

D. VALUE-ADDED MODEL VERSION

When the NYSED value-added model is implemented, the state growth portion of the teacher evaluation rises to 25% and the *local portion decreases to 15%*. When the change occurs, the local assessment point allocation will be modified as follows:

DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS AND ALLOCATION OF POINTS

As stipulated in the APPR regulation, teachers will be allocated up to *15 points* for the locally selected measures of student achievement based upon the data inquiry process. The data inquiry process involves four phases: preparation and implementation; descriptive analysis; inference and action; and reflecting and goal setting. Teachers will meet regularly with their administrator to demonstrate evidence of the indicators below for each phase of the process.

14 – 15 Points: Highly Effective

- *Meets or exceeds* team achievement goal.
 - 15 points for over 4% of target
 - 14 points for 0% to 4% above target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

8 – 13 Points: Effective

- *Slightly below* team achievement goal from 1% to 11% below target goal.
 - 13 points for 1% - 2% below target
 - 12 points for 3% - 4% below target
 - 11 points for 5% - 6% below target
 - 10 points for 7% - 8% below target
 - 9 points for 9% - 10% below target
 - 8 points for 11% below target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

3 – 7 Points: Developing

- *Below* team achievement goal from 12% to 26% below target goal.
 - 7 points for 12% - 14% below target
 - 6 points for 15% - 17% below target
 - 5 points for 18% - 20% below target
 - 4 points for 21% - 23% below target
 - 3 points for 24% - 26% below target
- Participates in *many* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

BYRAM HILLS CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARMONK, NEW YORK

0 – 2 Points: Ineffective

- *Well below* team achievement goals from 27% or more below target.
 - 2 points for 27% to 28% below target
 - 1 point for 29% to 30% below target
 - 0 points for more than 30% below target
- Participates in *few* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

IV. LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

The New York State Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) regulation stipulates that 20% of a teacher's evaluation is based upon achievement or growth in student performance on locally selected assessment data. As defined in the APPR, the assessment measures must be *locally comparable* and *rigorous*.

Locally comparable is defined as the same locally selected measures of student achievement or growth across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in district.

Rigorous, as applied to assessments, is defined in the field of testing standards as validity and reliability. A *valid assessment* accurately gauges what the assessment claims to measure. A *reliable assessment* demonstrates accuracy of results through consistency in what it measures over time. (Mills, 2007; Sagor, 2000).

Several procedures are employed to assure validity and reliability of the locally developed assessment process.

- The Byram Hills assessments are aligned to the NYS Learning Standards and to instructional objectives and activities.
- The assessments are scored using common scoring rubrics and anchor papers.
- The assessments, rubric design, and anchor papers are rated on a *readiness scale*. The scale reflects the continuum in the assessment design from beginning stages to revised/refined stage of development.
- The assessment data are compared to other measures of student performance, including state tests and teacher-created assessments.
- The data analysis process involves collaboration with peers and administrators to reflect on the data and determine instructional improvement methods.

The Byram Hills School District follows a continuous improvement cycle for curriculum, instruction and assessment: study, plan, implement, evaluate, reflect, revise/refine. The assessment design and data analysis process recognize the continuous improvement cycle through a collaborative, reflective process of professional inquiry.

A. ASSESSMENT DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT

The teacher collaborates with his or her colleagues (grade level, team, or department) and administrator to develop and implement a common assessment aligned to the New York State Learning Standards and local curriculum. Each assessment will include the Assessment Data Chart, scoring criteria with anchor papers, and other supporting materials as appropriate. The building administrator oversees and approves the assessment design to meet the criteria for rigorous as outlined above. The

assessment is sent to the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction for review before submitting for approval from the Superintendent. All local assessments must be verified for comparability and rigor and approved by the Superintendent.

B. DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS AND ALLOCATION OF POINTS

As stipulated in the APPR regulation, teachers will be allocated up to 20 points for the locally selected measures of student achievement based upon the data inquiry process and student achievement toward target goals. The data inquiry process involves four phases: preparation and implementation; descriptive analysis; inference and action; and reflecting and goal setting. Teachers will meet regularly with their administrator to demonstrate evidence of the indicators below for each phase of the process.

Phase I: Preparation and Implementation

The teacher engages in the following activities:

- a. Teaches lessons aligned to state standards to prepare students with prerequisite skills, knowledge, understandings, and learning habits;
- b. Collaborates in the assessment development process, and administers the common assessment during an agreed upon time;
- c. Participates in the grade level/team/department training on scoring the common assessment;
- d. Reflects upon possible assumptions and predictions about student performance based upon knowledge of students and prior assessment data; and
- e. Sets benchmark achievement goals with team, building and/or department administrator.

Phase 2: Descriptive Analysis

In collaboration with grade level/team/department colleagues, the teacher engages in the following activities:

- a. Scores the assessments using the common criteria, rubric and anchor papers;
- b. Describes the team/course/grade-level results (patterns, trends, surprises, new questions, etc.) from the assessments using appropriate techniques, such as, Looking at Student Work protocol, graphical representations, holistic comparisons, etc;
- c. Discusses results with colleagues using benchmark criteria;
- d. Analyzes student results with respect to standards and learning objectives; and
- e. Identifies students not meeting standards.

Phase 3: Inference and Action

Using the information from the descriptive analysis, the teacher engages in the following activities:

- a. Researches and considers intervention strategies through a collaborative inquiry model;
- b. Develops curricular and instructional strategies to target students scoring below proficiency in meeting standards;
- c. Collects additional student data (for example, from formative and/or interim assessments) aligned to learning goals and standards;
- d. Uses the additional data to monitor improvement efforts toward learning standards; and
- e. Provides feedback to students and continues to target students not meeting standards.

Phase 4: Reflecting and Goal Setting

The teacher engages in the following activities:

- Completes a self-assessment regarding student performance data. The self-assessment includes:
 - a. A reflection upon the assessment results and the effectiveness of the strategies used to improve student learning;
 - b. Long term curricular and instructional goals designed to target students not meeting standards in the future;
 - c. Professional development needs based on assessment data;
 - d. Reflection upon the assessment design and development;

C. POINT ALLOCATION

The administrator will assign points to teacher teams based upon the following criteria:

18 – 20 Points: Highly Effective

- *Meets or exceeds* team achievement goal.
 - 20 points for over 5% of target
 - 19 points for 3% to 5% above target
 - 18 points for 0% to 2% above target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

9 – 17 Points: Effective

- *Slightly below* team achievement goal from 1% to 10% below target goal.
 - 17 points for 1% - 2% below target
 - 16 points for 3% below target
 - 15 points for 4% below target

BYRAM HILLS CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARMONK, NEW YORK

- 14 points for 5% below target
- 13 points for 6% below target
- 12 points for 7% below target
- 11 points for 8% below target
- 10 points for 9% below target
- 9 points for 10% below target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

3 – 8 Points: Developing

- *Below* team achievement goal by 11% to 22% below target goal.
 - 8 points for 11% - 12% below target
 - 7 points for 13% - 14% below target
 - 6 points for 15% - 16% below target
 - 5 points for 17% - 18% below target
 - 4 points for 19% - 20% below target
 - 3 points for 21% - 22% below target
- Participates in *many* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

0 – 2 Points: Ineffective

- *Well below* team achievement goal from 23% or more below target.
 - 2 points for 23% to 26% below target
 - 1 point for 27% to 30% below target
 - 0 points for more than 30% below target
- Participates in *few* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

References

- Bambrick-Santoyo, P. (2010). *Driven by data: A practical guide to improve instruction*.
- Boudett, K. P., City, E., & Murnane, R. (2005). *Data Wise: A step-by-step guide to using assessment results to improve teaching and learning*.
- Heritage, M. (2010). *Formative assessment and next-generation assessment systems: Are we losing an opportunity?*
- Love, N. (2002). *Using data/getting results: A practical guide for school improvement in mathematics and science*.
- Mills, G. E. (2007). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*.
- Pelto, P. J., & Pelto, G. H. (1978). *Anthropological research: The structure of inquiry*.
- Sagor, R. (2000). *Guiding school improvement with action research*.

D. VALUE-ADDED MODEL VERSION

When the NYSED value-added model is implemented, the state growth portion of the teacher evaluation rises to 25% and the *local portion decreases to 15%*. When the change occurs, the local assessment point allocation will be modified as follows:

DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS AND ALLOCATION OF POINTS

As stipulated in the APPR regulation, teachers will be allocated up to *15 points* for the locally selected measures of student achievement based upon the data inquiry process. The data inquiry process involves four phases: preparation and implementation; descriptive analysis; inference and action; and reflecting and goal setting. Teachers will meet regularly with their administrator to demonstrate evidence of the indicators below for each phase of the process.

14 – 15 Points: Highly Effective

- *Meets or exceeds* team achievement goal.
 - 15 points for over 4% of target
 - 14 points for 0% to 4% above target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

8 – 13 Points: Effective

- *Slightly below* team achievement goal from 1% to 11% below target goal.
 - 13 points for 1% - 2% below target
 - 12 points for 3% - 4% below target
 - 11 points for 5% - 6% below target
 - 10 points for 7% - 8% below target
 - 9 points for 9% - 10% below target
 - 8 points for 11% below target
- Participates in *all* the local assessment data analysis process activities.

3 – 7 Points: Developing

- *Below* team achievement goal from 12% to 26% below target goal.
 - 7 points for 12% - 14% below target
 - 6 points for 15% - 17% below target
 - 5 points for 18% - 20% below target
 - 4 points for 21% - 23% below target
 - 3 points for 24% - 26% below target
- Participates in *many* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

BYRAM HILLS CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARMONK, NEW YORK

0 – 2 Points: Ineffective

- *Well below* team achievement goals from 27% or more below target.
 - 2 points for 27% to 28% below target
 - 1 point for 29% to 30% below target
 - 0 points for more than 30% below target
- Participates in *few* of the local assessment data analysis process activities.

Principal Evaluation

Local Assessments

The local assessment portion of the APPR for Principals will include two options: (A) artifacts or evidence of local assessment study with student results or, (B) artifacts or evidence that will help to inform improved instruction and student results in a particular subgroup of the school's student population. The data analysis study of artifacts or evidence will be collaboratively agreed upon between the Principal and the Superintendent each year.

Option (A) Artifacts or Evidence on Local Assessment Study with Student Results will be used to assess the implementation of local assessments as formative and summative assessment to positively impact teaching and learning and to study a particular subgroup of students' performance within a school related to the use of local assessments.

The resources of the State Collaborative on Assessment and Standards will be used for this work as a guide for rigor. The FAST study, Formative Assessment for Students and Teachers will be a resource for local assessments (www.ccsso.org).

For development of the artifacts or evidence on local assessment, the Principal will review the following goals:

- Learning Progressions
- Learning Goals and Success Criteria
- Descriptive Feedback
- Self Assessment and Peer Assessment
- Collaboration

The following steps will be used to assess the process used in developing a local assessment study:

1. The Principal will use the research on formative assessment to review the local assessments.
2. The purpose of the collection of artifacts or evidence for locally developed assessments will be to define rigor and comparability across the grades or departments.
3. It is intended that the collection of artifacts or evidence will also assist the Principal in shaping, in collaboration with the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, the evolution of the performance assessment work in the Byram Hills School District and to improve instruction and/or student results.
4. The Principal will also use this collection of artifacts or evidence to help shape the professional development needs of his/her school.
5. For purposes of this document, some questions that may guide the Principals' work include:

- a. To what extent does the evidence or local performance assessment work in each school assist teachers in understanding learning progressions?
- b. To what extent are the learning goals and success criteria in the local assessment evidence collection used with students clearly articulated?
- c. To what extent do the local assessments provide descriptive feedback to students?
- d. To what extent is self assessment and peer assessment used in the performance assessment evidence with students?
- e. To what extent is collaboration between teachers and administrators evident in the local performance or evidence under study?
- f. What are the limitations of the use of local assessments and what are the successes of using local assessments for the subgroup of students under study?
- g. To what extent does the local assessment evidence work with students help to achieve the learning target identified by the administrator for this portion of the APPR evaluation system?

The principal will set target achievement goals, agreed upon by the Superintendent, using the formative or summative assessments used in the Artifacts or Evidence on Local Assessment Study. The Principal Point Allocation Chart will be used to determine the principal score for the locally selected measures of student achievement portion of APPR.

Option (B) Study of Performance of a Subgroup of Students within the School - Using State assessments when available or other assessments when state assessments are not available.

For purposes of APPR, the Principal will:

1. Define a subgroup in the school that needs improved instruction or improved results. Results may come from State assessments, AP exams, local grades, and local assessments that are used across grade levels, teams, courses or departments.
2. Collaboratively set a target achievement goal or growth goal for the subgroup with the Superintendent. Illustrative examples might be:
 - the number of students who receive Academic Intervention Services will be reduced by 10% in Grade 6.
 - the number of students achieving 4's on a State Assessment will increase by 2% in Grade 5.
 - the number of students participating in AP classes in Science will increase by 2% with students receiving not less than 3 on an AP exam.

The study will include a formalized process in the following manner:

1. In collaboration with the Superintendent, the principal will determine the scope of the study. For example: the subgroup to be studied, the number of assessments or evidence to be reviewed, the grade levels, departments or courses to be reviewed, the colleagues who may assist in the study or evidence review; for example: chairpersons, directors, coordinators or teachers.

2. The principal will develop (with district office support as needed) an initiative or service specific to meeting the needs of the students in the subgroup. This will include a quarterly monitoring of the initiative.
3. The principal will collaborate with individual teachers or teams of teachers to create a profile of students' needs. (e.g.: profile from LHRIC).
4. The principal will design with teachers:
 - grouping of students (differentiation)
 - instructional strategies
 - technology integration.
5. The principal and Superintendent will review results to determine if target goal has been met.

The Principal Point Allocation Chart will be used to determine the principal score for the locally selected measures of student achievement portion of APPR using the agreed upon targets for the Study of Performance of a Subgroup of Students within a School.

Principal Point Allocation Chart

Principal Point Allocation Chart <i>with No Value-Added Model</i>		
Points	Effectiveness Rating	Percent of Students Meeting Achievement Target Goals
20	Highly Effective	Over 5% above target goal
19	Highly Effective	3% - 5% above target goal
18	Highly Effective	0% - 2% above target goal
17	Effective	1% - 2% below target goal
16	Effective	3% below target goal
15	Effective	4% below target goal
14	Effective	5% below target goal
13	Effective	6% below target goal
12	Effective	7% below target goal
11	Effective	8% below target goal
10	Effective	9% below target goal
9	Effective	10% below target goal
8	Developing	11% - 12% below target goal
7	Developing	13% - 14% below target goal
6	Developing	15% - 16% below target goal
5	Developing	17% - 18% below target goal
4	Developing	19% - 20% below target goal
3	Developing	21% - 22% below target goal
2	Ineffective	23% - 26% below target goal
1	Ineffective	27% - 30% below target goal
0	Ineffective	More than 30% below target goal

Principal Point Allocation Chart <i>with a Value-Added Model</i>		
Points	Effectiveness Rating	Percent of Students Meeting Achievement Target Goals
15	Highly Effective	Over 4% above target goal
14	Highly Effective	0% - 4% above target goal
13	Effective	1% - 2% below target goal
12	Effective	3% - 4% below target goal
11	Effective	5% - 6% below target goal
10	Effective	7% - 8% below target goal
9	Effective	9% - 10% below target goal
8	Effective	11% - 12% below target goal
7	Developing	13% - 15% below target goal
6	Developing	16% - 18% below target goal
5	Developing	19% - 21% below target goal
4	Developing	22% - 24% below target goal
3	Developing	25% - 27% below target goal
2	Ineffective	28% below target goal
1	Ineffective	29% - 30% below target goal
0	Ineffective	More than 30% below target goal

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN OVERVIEW

The NYS Commissioner's Regulation (30-2.10) requires that any teacher with an annual professional performance review rated as Developing or Ineffective shall receive a Teacher Improvement Plan. A TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher and his or her evaluator. At the end of a mutually agreed upon timeline, the teacher and evaluator shall meet to assess the effectiveness of the TIP in assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based on the outcome of this assessment, the TIP shall be modified accordingly.

A TIP must be implemented no later than 10 school days after the date on which teachers are required to report prior to the opening of classes for the school year.

An improvement plan defines specific standards-based goals in which a teacher must show progress within a specific period of time. Elements in the improvement plan include the identification of areas that need improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support improvement in these areas.

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

The process for developing and implementing a TIP includes:

1. The evaluator identifies the areas of improvement and completes the TIP form. The evaluator meets with the teacher to review and discuss the improvement plan, and they sign the form.
2. The District will provide a coach/mentor to the teacher. The teacher meets at least monthly with the coach/mentor to develop specific actions to meet the goals of the improvement plan.
3. The teacher meets monthly with his or her evaluator to review and discuss progress toward meeting the goals of the improvement plan. The teacher should produce any artifacts or evidence to support progress toward the desired outcomes of the plan.
4. The evaluator meets with the coach/mentor in collaboration with the teacher at least four times throughout the year to review teacher progress toward meeting the goals of the TIP.

5. The evaluator completes the TIP Evaluation Sheet and meets with the teacher to discuss whether or not the teacher satisfied the desired outcomes of the improvement plan.

The Teacher Improvement Plan and the Teacher Improvement Plan Evaluation Sheet are located in the Forms section. The evaluator will complete the forms for teachers as defined by above.

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP)

Teacher: _____

School: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date Final Evaluation Conducted: _____

Date of Plan: _____

The evaluator identifies areas of improvement based on the teacher’s final evaluation and completes the Teacher Improvement Plan below. The evaluator meets with the teacher to review and discuss the goals of the improvement plan.

Check the box next to any domain below that is rated as Developing or Ineffective:

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Domain 2: Learning Environment

Local Assessment

Domain 3: Instructional Practice

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

State Assessment or Comparable Measures (SLOs)

In the spaces below, describe the following: (a) list areas needing improvement to address the categories above assessed as Developing or Ineffective; (b) identify the specific desired outcomes associated with each area of improvement; (c) list differentiated activities or action steps to support the teacher’s improvement; (d) describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed; (e) and provide a timeline for achieving improvement and benchmark checkpoints.

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Activities/action steps to support improvement	How will the improvement be assessed?	Timeline & benchmark checkpoints

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Activities/action steps to support improvement	How will the improvement be assessed?	Timeline & benchmark checkpoints

Teacher's Comments:

Evaluator's Comments:

Teacher's Signature

Date

Evaluator's Signature

Date

TEACHER IMPROVEMENT PLAN (TIP) EVALUATION SHEET

Teacher: _____

School: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

The evaluator completes the TIP Evaluation Sheet at the end of the agreed upon timeline and meets with the teacher to discuss progress toward meeting the desired outcomes.

In the spaces below, the evaluator describes the following: (a) list areas stated as needing improvement; (b) identify the desired outcomes; (c) describe the teacher's progress to address the areas of improvement and the steps taken, stating whether or not the teacher made satisfactory progress; and (d) determine whether or not the teacher satisfied the improvement plan for each area listed.

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Describe the teacher's progress	Is this area satisfied? (Yes or No)

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Describe the teacher's progress	Is this area satisfied? (Yes or No)

Teacher's Comments:

Evaluator's Comments:

Teacher's Signature

Date

Evaluator's Signature

Date

Selection of Principal Practice Rubric from the Approved State Principal Practice Rubric List

For 2011-12, the BHAA and the District agree to use the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (“MPPR”) for the evaluation of the principals in the Gr. 3-8 schools as required by SED Regulation.

For 2012-2013 the BHAA and the District agree to use the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric (MPPR) for the evaluation of the principals in the Grade K-12 schools.

The Domains in the MPPR include:

1. Shared Vision of Learning
2. School Culture and Instructional Program
3. Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment
4. Community
5. Integrity, Fairness and Ethics
6. Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Content

The Superintendent and each Principal will collaboratively complete a pre-assessment of the Principal's practice by October 15th of each school year using the MPPR. For 2011-2012, the pre-assessment will be completed by January 15, 2012 and in 2013, by January 15, 2013. For the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years, 60 points of the overall principal score will come from the MPPR.

The following four ratings for the Principals will be used, as required by the SED Regulation, utilizing the MPPR:

<u>Ineffective</u>	<u>Developing</u>	<u>Effective</u>	<u>Highly Effective</u>
0-15	16-30	31-44	45-60

The current BHAA practice of a mid-year evaluation written by the Superintendent will address specific elements within the Rubric.

Other Items for Consideration in the Scoring of the Rubric:

Multiple Measures

The Superintendent and each Principal will meet regularly throughout the year to discuss the Principal's practice. This will include:

- The Superintendent will attend and observe a Principal's Coffee each year.
- The Principal will participate in Board of Education meetings as needed.
- The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction will meet regularly with the Principal for curriculum, instruction and assessment goals.
- The Assistant Superintendent for Business and Management Services will meet with the Principal regarding matters of finance and facilities' review.
- The Superintendent will meet and observe the Principal monthly. These observations may include:

- assemblies and student interactions,
- parent meetings,
- teacher meetings,
- classroom visitations,
- data review.

Assignments of 60-Points for Each Domain on the Multidimensional Principal Practice Rubric (MPPR)

The following points will be assigned to each domain:

<u>Domain</u>	<u>Points</u>
1	8
2	20
3	10
4	6
5	12
6	4

At the end of the year, each Principal will self assess his/her practice using the MPPR for evidence of achievement and success. The evidence for each domain will be provided by the Principal at his/her discretion. The Superintendent will make the final point distribution using the MPPR.

MPPR Rubric		
<i>Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning (possible 8 points)</i>		
	Rubric Score	Conversion Score
Culture	1	1
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4
Sustainability	1	1
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4

~~~~~

| <b>MPPR Rubric</b>                                                                    |                     |                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| <b><i>Domain 2: School Culture and Instructional Program (possible 20 points)</i></b> |                     |                         |
|                                                                                       | <b>Rubric Score</b> | <b>Conversion Score</b> |
| Culture                                                                               | 1                   | 1                       |
|                                                                                       | 2                   | 2                       |
|                                                                                       | 3                   | 3                       |
|                                                                                       | 4                   | 4                       |
| Instructional Program                                                                 | 1                   | 1                       |
|                                                                                       | 2                   | 2                       |
|                                                                                       | 3                   | 3                       |
|                                                                                       | 4                   | 4                       |
| Capacity Building                                                                     | 1                   | 1                       |
|                                                                                       | 2                   | 2                       |
|                                                                                       | 3                   | 3                       |
|                                                                                       | 4                   | 4                       |
| Sustainability                                                                        | 1                   | 1                       |
|                                                                                       | 2                   | 2                       |
|                                                                                       | 3                   | 3                       |
|                                                                                       | 4                   | 4                       |
| Strategic Planning Process                                                            | 1                   | 1                       |
|                                                                                       | 2                   | 2                       |
|                                                                                       | 3                   | 3                       |
|                                                                                       | 4                   | 4                       |

~~~~~

MPPR Rubric		
<i>Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment (possible 10 points)</i>		
	Rubric Score	Conversion Score
Capacity Building	1	0
	2	0
	3	1
	4	2
Culture	1	0
	2	0
	3	1
	4	2
Sustainability	1	0
	2	1
	3	2
	4	3
Instruction Program	1	0
	2	1
	3	2
	4	3

~~~~~

| <b>MPPR Rubric</b>                                    |                     |                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| <b><i>Domain 4: Community (possible 6 points)</i></b> |                     |                         |
|                                                       | <b>Rubric Score</b> | <b>Conversion Score</b> |
| <b>Strategic Planning Inquiry</b>                     | 1                   | 0                       |
|                                                       | 2                   | 0                       |
|                                                       | 3                   | 1                       |
|                                                       | 4                   | 2                       |
| <b>Culture</b>                                        | 1                   | 0                       |
|                                                       | 2                   | 0                       |
|                                                       | 3                   | 1                       |
|                                                       | 4                   | 2                       |
| <b>Sustainability</b>                                 | 1                   | 0                       |
|                                                       | 2                   | 0                       |
|                                                       | 3                   | 1                       |
|                                                       | 4                   | 2                       |

~~~~~

MPPR Rubric		
<i>Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (possible 12 points)</i>		
	Rubric Score	Conversion Score
Sustainability	1	1
	2	3
	3	5
	4	6
Culture	1	1
	2	3
	3	5
	4	6
MPPR Rubric		
<i>Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context (possible 4 points)</i>		
	Rubric Score	Conversion Score
Sustainability	1	0
	2	0
	3	1
	4	2
Culture	1	0
	2	0
	3	1
	4	2

**BYRAM HILLS SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARMONK, NEW YORK**

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Principal: _____

School: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date Final Evaluation Conducted: _____

Date of Plan: _____

Any principal receiving a composite score of Developing or Ineffective must complete a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) within 10 days of the start of the school year following the evaluation. The evaluator and principal will hold an initial meeting to discuss areas of strengths and areas of improvement as identified in the principal's final evaluation, and they complete the Principal Improvement Plan below.

Check the box next to any domain below from the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric that is rated as Developing or Ineffective:

- Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning
- Domain 2: School Cultural and Instructional Program
- Domain 3: Safe, Efficient, Effective Learning Environment
- Local Assessment
- Domain 4: Community
- Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics
- Domain 6: Political, Social, Economic, Legal and Cultural Context
- State Assessment or Comparable Measures (SLOs)

In the spaces below, describe the following: (a) list areas needing improvement to address the categories above assessed as Developing or Ineffective; (b) identify the specific desired outcomes associated with each area of improvement; (c) list differentiated activities or action steps to support the principal's improvement; (d) describe the manner in which the improvement will be assessed; (e) and provide a timeline for achieving improvement and benchmark checkpoints.

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Activities/action steps to support improvement	How will the improvement be assessed?	Timeline & benchmark checkpoints

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Activities/action steps to support improvement	How will the improvement be assessed?	Timeline & benchmark checkpoints

(Add more rows if necessary)

Additional comments if needed:

Additional information may be attached if needed:

Principal's Signature

Date

Evaluator's Signature

Date

**BYRAM HILLS SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARMONK, NEW YORK**

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) Evaluation Sheet

Principal: _____

School: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

The evaluator completes the Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) Evaluation Sheet at the end of the agreed upon timeline and meets with the principal to discuss progress toward meeting the desired outcomes.

In the spaces below, the evaluator describes the following: (a) list areas stated as needing improvement; (b) identify the desired outcomes; (c) describe the principal's progress to address the areas of improvement and the steps taken, stating whether or not the principal made satisfactory progress; and (d) determine whether or not the principal satisfied the improvement plan for each area listed.

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Describe the principal's progress	Is this area satisfied? (Yes or No)

Areas needing improvement from area(s) above	Desired outcomes	Describe the principal's progress	Is this area satisfied? (Yes or No)

(Add more rows if necessary)

Additional comments if needed:

Additional information may be attached if needed:

Principal's Signature

Date

Evaluator's Signature

Date

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature: Date: 9/25/12

Teachers Union President Signature: Date: 9-19-12

Administrative Union President Signature: Date: 9.19.12

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

9-24-12