



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

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

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

December 12, 2013

**Revised**

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. 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: Harold Coles

**NOTE:**

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, July 29, 2013

---

## 1

### Disclaimers

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

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the school district or BOCES are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this APPR plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan approved by the Department. The Department also 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) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

1.3) 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
1.3) 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

1.3) 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
---	---------

## 1.4) Submission Status

For BOCES or charter schools that did not have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year only, is this a first-time submission, a re-submission, or a submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan? For districts, BOCES or charter schools that did have an approved APPR plan for the 2012-13 school year, this must be listed as a submission of material changes to the approved APPR plan.

Submission of material changes to an approved APPR plan

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

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, November 25, 2013

---

### Page 1

#### STATE-PROVIDED MEASURES OF STUDENT GROWTH

(25 points with an approved value-added measure)

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

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

Please note that if the Board of Regents does not approve a value-added measure for these grades/subjects, 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.	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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned

points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points. Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% - 74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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
--	------	------------

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.

Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% -74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.

Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time

frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% - 74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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	Byram Hills-developed Grade 8 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher

teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.

Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% - 74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 2.11, below.</p>	<p>First, a review of available data will be conducted for the students in the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.</p> <p>Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.</p> <p>Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well-above District goals for similar students.</p>	<p>For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective</p>

on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% - 74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets

are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.

Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting. The District does not offer a Regents level physics course.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% - 74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

NOTE: For Algebra 1, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.

Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting.

All students enrolled in the Algebra course will take the NYS Common Core Algebra Regents only, with one exception; students in our current 10th grade Expanded Algebra course in 2013-2014 will take the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents. No students will take both exams.

The District does not offer a Regents level Algebra 2 course.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective

on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% -74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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. Be sure to select the English Regents assessment in at least one grade in Task 2.9 (9, 10, and/or 11).

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

	High School English Courses	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	District, regional or BOCES-developed assessment	Byram Hills developed Grade 9 ELA assesment
Grade 10 ELA	Regents assessment	NYS Comprehensive English Regents Exam (2013-2014 only); Byram Hills-developed grade 10 ELA assessment all years going forward after 2013-2014.
Grade 11 ELA	Regents assessment	Byram Hills-developed grade 11 ELA assessment in 2013-2014 and 2014-2015; NYS Common Core English Regents (for students entering grade 9 in 2013-2014 and after)

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 measuring student growth on the assessments listed for this Task.

NOTE: For Grade 11 ELA, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The

2.11, below.

data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.

Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting.

Students enrolled in 10th grade English in 2013-2014 will take the NYS Comprehensive English Regents assessment; students in earlier grades will take the NYS Common Core English Regents assessments at the appropriate time. No students will take both assessments.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% - 74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his

or 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-2, 9-12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed Grades K-2 and 9-12 Physical Education assessments
Math - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed course-specific math assessments
Science - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed course-specific science assessments
Social Studies - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed course-specific Social Studies assessments
English - all other teachers not named above	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed course-specific English assessments
World Languages Grades 7 - 12	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed course-specific Language assessments
All other teachers not named above (i.e., Health, computer science)	District, Regional or BOCES-developed	Byram Hills-developed course-specific assessments
Physical Education 3-5	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS grades 4-5 ELA State Assessment
Physical Education 6-8	School/BOCES-wide/group/team results based on State	NYS grades 6-8 ELA State Assessment

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

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 the classroom using the Lower Hudson Regional Data Base Level 1 portal by the data teams in each building. The data teams, supervised by the principals and assistant principals, distribute appropriate data to classroom teachers and teacher teams.

Second, HEDI points and ratings will be assigned using the uploaded chart in section 2.11. The District provides 2 methods for setting SLO targets and for assigning points. In Method 1, student post assessment data is reviewed and analyzed for growth target setting. In Method 2, pre assessment data is analyzed and used for individual student target-setting. Targets are set for individual students in the class using the pre assessment data, and each student is assigned points based upon

his or her relative growth, using the point allocation chart and formulas in the upload in section 2.11. Teachers are assigned points based on the average points accumulated by the students. Please note that all teachers of the same grade and subject will use the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points.

Finally, all Student Learning Objectives are developed by teachers and administrators, or in the case of building-wide SLOs, by building administration in consultation with District Office administration. The SLOs are reviewed and approved by the building principal or designee, (chairperson or director) using the guidelines established in the Lead Evaluator Training program. The SLOs are submitted to the District Office no later than November 1. Post assessments are administered in the time frame indicated on the SLO, and teachers will not score their own assessments. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction reviews sample SLOs from each building for accuracy, rigor, and appropriate growth target-setting. For physical education teachers in grades 3-5 and 6-8, school-wide measures of growth will be used using student results on the NYS English Language Arts assessment for each building. HEDI scores for teachers will be assigned based on the school-wide growth results on the NYS grades 4-5 ELA assessments and on NYS grades 6-8 ELA assessments using the school-wide results for the corresponding physical education teachers. The growth targets are set and approved by the superintendent or his or her designee.

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

For method 1, if 85% of students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth meets or exceeds the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Highly Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 75% - 84% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 1% and 10% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Effective on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if 60% - 74% of the students on a class roster reach the defined growth target on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth is between 11% and 22% below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Developing on this portion of his or her annual evaluation.

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

For method 1, if less than 60% of the students on a class roster do not reach the defined growth target on the the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on the HEDI rating for this portion of his or her annual evaluation. For method 2, if student growth falls 23% or more below the target on average on the SLO, the teacher will be rated Ineffective on this portion of his or 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/12186/575326-TXEttx9bQW/2.11 SETTING TARGETS FOR STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES-final.pdf

## 2.12) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used assigning points to a teacher’s score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: student prior academic history, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

## 2.13) Teachers with more than one growth measure

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

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

## 2.14) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

2.14) Assurances   Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by SED (see: <a href="http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document">http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document</a> ).	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that past academic performance and/or baseline academic data of students will be taken into account when developing an SLO.	Checked
2.14) Assurances   Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educators	Checked

---

in ways that improve student learning and instruction.

---

2.14) Assurances | Assure that it is possible for an educator to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range. Checked

2.14) Assurances | Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms. Checked

### 3. Local Measures (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, November 04, 2013

---

#### Page 1

#### Locally Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

Locally selected measures for common branch teachers: This form calls for locally selected measures in both ELA and math in grades typically served by common branch teachers. Districts may select local measures for common branch teachers that involve subjects other than ELA and math. Whatever local measure is selected for common branch teachers, please enter it under ELA and/or math and describe the assessment used, including the subject. Use N/A for other lines in that grade level that are served by common branch teachers. Describe the HEDI criteria for the measure in the same section where you identified the locally selected measure and assessment. Additionally, please provide a brief explanation in the HEDI general description box of why you have listed the grade/course as "Not Applicable" (e.g., district/BOCES does not offer this grade/subject; common branch teacher).

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 in the following format: "[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment." For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: "GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment."

NOTE: If your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth and other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponent, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

#### 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 7<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 4 ELA assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 5 ELA assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 ELA assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 ELA assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 8 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.*

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the general process for assigning HEDI categories for these grades/subjects in this subcomponent. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic at 3.3, below.</p>	<p>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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.</p>
<p>Highly Effective (14 - 15 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>See upload in section 3.3.</p>
<p>Effective (8- 13 points) Results meet District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>See upload in section 3.3.</p>
<p>Developing (3 - 7 points) Results are below District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.</p>	<p>See upload in section 3.3.</p>

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

See upload in section 3.3.

### 3.2) Grades 4-8 Math

Using the drop-down boxes below, select the measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
4	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 4 Math assessment
5	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 5 Math assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Math assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Math assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	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.

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

See upload in section 3.3.

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

See upload in section 3.3.

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

See upload in section 3.3.

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

See upload in section 3.3.

### 3.3) HEDI Tables or Graphics

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

[assets/survey-uploads/12149/575327-rhJdBgDruP/3.3 LOCAL ASSESSMENTS-VALUE ADDED-15 POINTS\\_1.pdf](assets/survey-uploads/12149/575327-rhJdBgDruP/3.3 LOCAL ASSESSMENTS-VALUE ADDED-15 POINTS_1.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 7<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment compared to those same students' performance levels on the 6<sup>th</sup> grade math State assessment, or an increase in the percentage of a teacher's students earning the advanced performance level (four) on the 4<sup>th</sup> grade ELA or math State assessments compared to those students' performance levels on the 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Kindergarten ELA assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 1 ELA assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 2 ELA assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	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.*

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
 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.

Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective:  
 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.	Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing: 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.	Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective. 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
K	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Kindergarten Math assessment
1	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 1 Math assessment
2	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 2 Math assessment
3	6(ii) School-wide measure computed locally	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.	<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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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</p>
---	---

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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
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.

Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective:  
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.

Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing:  
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.

Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective.  
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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Science assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Science assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	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.

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective: 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.	Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective: 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.	Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing: 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.	Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective. 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
6	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 6 Social Studies assessment
7	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 7 Social Studies assessment
8	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	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.

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
 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.

Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective:  
 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.	Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing: 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.	Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective. 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Global 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Global 1 assessment
Global 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Global 2 assessment
American History	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	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.*

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
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.

Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective:  
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.

Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing:  
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.

Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective.  
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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Living Environment	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Living Environment assessment
Earth Science	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Earth Science assessment
Chemistry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Chemistry assessment
Physics	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
 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.

Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing:  
 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.

Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective:  
 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 grade/subject.

Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective.  
 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Algebra 1	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Algebra 1 assessment
Geometry	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Geometry assessment
Algebra 2	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	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.*

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Integrated Algebra Regents, the Common Core Algebra Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
 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.	Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective: 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.	Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing: 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.	Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective. 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 measure that will be used as the locally-selected measure of student achievement. Then name the specific assessment that will be used with the locally-selected measure, listing the full name of the assessment.

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

	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
Grade 9 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 9 ELA assessment
Grade 10 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills-developed Grade 10 ELA assessment
Grade 11 ELA	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	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.*

NOTE: As applicable, please specify whether your district will be offering the Comprehensive English Regents, the Common Core English Regents, or both and how the HEDI process will be adjusted accordingly.

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
 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.

Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective:  
 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.	Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing: 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.	Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective. 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	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed K-12 Art assessments
Music K - 12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed K-12 Music assessments
Physical Education	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed K-12 Physical Education assessments
Math - all other teachers not covered above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed course-specific math assessments
Science - all other teachers not covered above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed course-specific Science assessments
Social Studies - all other teachers not covered above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed course-specific Social Studies assessments
English - all other teachers not covered above	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed course-specific English assessments
World Languages grades 7 - 12	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed course-specific World Languages assessments
All other teachers not covered above (i.e., Health, science research, electives, etc.)	6(ii) School wide measure computed locally	Byram Hills developed course-specific 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.*

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 achievement targets are set by the teachers in consultation with their building or department administrator, and the targets are approved by the administrator. 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. The percent above/below indicates the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal for the course.

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

Student performance meets or exceeds the District-adopted achievement goal for teacher to be rated Highly Effective:  
 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.

Student performance falls within the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Effective:  
 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.	Student performance falls below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Developing: 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.	Student performance falls well below the District-adopted expectations of achievement goal for the teacher to be rated Ineffective. 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/12149/575327-y92vNseFa4/3.13 LOCALLY SELECTED MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT-20 POINTS\_1.pdf

### 3.14) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

(No response)

### 3.15) Teachers with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

Describe the district's process for combining multiple locally selected measures, each scored from 0-15 or 0-20 points as applicable, into a single subcomponent HEDI category and score. Examples may include: 4th grade teacher with locally-selected measures for both ELA and Math; High School teacher with more than 1 SLO.

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. When weighting local assessment scores, typical rounding rules apply (i.e., less than 0.5 rounds down; greater than or equal to 0.5 rounds up.) However, a teacher's HEDI rating cannot change levels as a result of rounding.

### 3.16) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 4. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Monday, November 04, 2013

---

### Page 1

#### 4.1) Teacher Practice Rubric

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

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

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

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)

NYLA-SSL/SLSA School Librarian Evaluation Rubric

#### 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 by the points assignment indicated immediately below (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

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, label accordingly, and combine them into a single file, and upload as an attachment for review. Click here for a downloadable copy of Form 4.2. (MS Word )

(No response)

### 4.3) Survey Tools (if applicable)

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

(No response)

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

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

### 4.4) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

### 4.5) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

Teachers in Byram Hills follow a comprehensive process that produces evidence for the evaluation system. Probationary teachers receive three observations with pre and post observation meetings, and receive at least one additional unannounced observation, by a trained administrator. They 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 at least two observations each year, one of which is unannounced, write a professional growth plan from a selection of three growth options

approved by their administrator, and collaborate with their administrator and colleagues on many district initiatives. Administrators will evaluate teacher evidence in the processes above using the Danielson (2011) teacher practice rubric for classroom teachers or the NYLA-SSL/SLSA School Librarian Evaluation Rubric for Library Media Specialists. Administrators provide feedback to teachers using various observation methods and tools, 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 uploaded document in this section 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 based upon the collection of evidence throughout the year.

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)

In the NYLA-SSL/SLSA School Librarian Evaluation Rubric, the 7 domains upon which library media specialists are evaluated include:

- 1 - Knowledge of students and student learning
- 2 - knowledge of content and instructional planning
- 3 - Instructional practice: teaching for learning
- 4 - Learning environment
- 5 - Assessment for student learning
- 6 - Collaboration and professional responsibilities
- 7 - Professional growth

Administrators review evidence from multiple classroom observations and review evidence from artifacts collected in the professional portfolio project, the professional growth plans, the local assessment data analysis process, and the commendations form. Observations are made, evidence collected, and evidence for each component will be rated throughout the year. Component scores are subsequently calculated at the end of the year, using the appropriate practice rubric. Each component of the rubric is rated and weighted using the formula outlined in the uploaded document in this section. The rubric indicates that 52% of the rating (31 points) is based on classroom observations for classroom teachers (Domains 2 & 3), and 52% based on classroom observation for library media specialists. The evidence collected from classroom observations is evaluated on the appropriate rubric domains and components. The final rubric scores (1 through 4 ratings) are the minimum scores necessary to obtain the HEDI scores.

The remaining 48% (29 points) of a teacher's rating is based on structured review of lesson plans, student work, and other teacher artifacts. For probationary teachers, evidence includes: review of lesson plans during pre-observation conferences, reflection during post observation conferences, participation in the District's data analysis process for local assessments as recorded on the Local Assessment Data Chart, a midyear summary of performance, the District's Professional Portfolio Project, and the teacher submission of artifacts through the Commendation Form. For tenured teachers, evidence includes: pre-observation and post observation conferences, participation in the Professional Growth Plan or the Professional Review Plan, participation in the District's data analysis process for local assessments as recorded on the Local Assessment Data Chart, the teacher submission of artifacts through the Commendation Form.

Additional evidence of teacher's professional practice is collected throughout the year by administrators and rated on the appropriate practice rubric during other activities outside the classroom, including, but not limited to: department meetings, faculty meetings, professional learning communities meetings, parent conferences, professional development workshops, student extra help sessions, extracurricular activities, committee work, and other contributions to the department, school, or district.

Component scores are subsequently calculated at the end of the year, using the appropriate practice rubric. The final rubric scores (1 through 4 ratings) are the minimum scores necessary to obtain the HEDI scores.

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/12179/575328-eka9yMJ855/4.5 MULTIPLE MEASURES CHART-60 POINTS\_3.pdf

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

Highly Effective: Overall performance and results exceed NYS Teaching Standards.	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	1
4.6) Observations of Probationary Teachers   Enter Total	4

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	0
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?



# 5. Composite Scoring (Teachers)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Tuesday, July 30, 2013

---

## 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.

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 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

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 scoring ranges for educators for whom there is an approved Value-Added measure for student growth will be:

Where Value-Added growth measure applies  
**Growth or Comparable Measures**  
**Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement**  
**Other Measures of Effectiveness**  
**(60 points)**

**Overall Composite Score**  
**Highly Effective**  
**22-25**  
**14-15**  
**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**  
**Effective**  
**10-21**  
**8-13**  
**75-90**  
**Developing**  
**3-9**  
**3-7**  
**65-74**  
**Ineffective**  
**0-2**  
**0-2**  
**0-64**

# 6. Additional Requirements - Teachers

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, October 31, 2013

## Page 1

### 6.1) Assurances -- Improvement Plans

Please check the boxes below:

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

### 6.2) Attachment: Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

As a required attachment to this APPR plan, upload the TIP forms that are used in the school district or BOCES. All TIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas. For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

[assets/survey-uploads/12193/575330-Df0w3Xx5v6/6.2 TIP - BLANK TEMPLATE.pdf](#)

### 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 and will occur in a timely and expeditious manner.

## 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 within 5 school days of filing the appeal. The principal renders a decision within 10 school days from the meeting date.
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 within 5 school days of receiving the decision from the principal. The superintendent will respond within 5 school days from receipt of the appeal.

### B. TENURED TEACHERS

1. The tenured teacher meets with the building principal to review the written appeal document within 5 school days of filing the appeal. The principal renders a decision on the appeal within 10 school days from the meeting date.
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 presents 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 from the date of the teacher's presentation to the Evaluation Committee. A copy of this recommendation will be provided to the teacher. The teacher has 5 school days from the date of the report to withdraw the appeal. The superintendent will make a final decision within 10 school days from receiving the final report from the Evaluation Committee.

## 6.4) Training of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) 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 and other designated administrators 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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Tuesday, October 08, 2013

## Page 1

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

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

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

Please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure, (e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12, etc.).

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 Elementary School Principal
6-8 H. C.Crittenden Middle School Principal
9-12 Byram Hills High School Principal
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)
(No response)

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

Please check the boxes below:

7.2) Assurances -- State-Provided Measures of Student Growth   Assure that the value-added growth score(s) 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	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 assessments 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. The district must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs will begin first with the SGP/VA results.

Additional SLOs will then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments, where applicable.

If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/course(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options: State-approved 3rd party or district/regional/BOCES-developed assessments that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

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 grade configuration of the school or program the SLO applies to. Then, using the drop-down boxes below, please select the type of 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 in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.” For State-approved 3rd party assessments, please include the name of the assessment exactly as it appears in RED on the State-approved list. For State assessments or Regents examinations, please indicate as such in the assessment name.

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

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. Please describe the process your district is using to measure student growth on the assessments listed for this Task. If applicable, please also include a description of the process for combining the State-provided growth score with the SLO(s) for this Task.

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.	<p>The K-2 principal will receive HEDI points based on student growth on the Byram Hills developed K-2 Math and ELA assessments using the targets defined.</p> <p>The individual targets for growth are set by the principal in collaboration with the superintendent, and the targets are approved by the superintendent. Pre assessments are administered at the start of the school year to provide baseline data. Also, previous year's post assessments are used to provide additional baseline data for 1st and 2nd grade. The targets represent minimum growth expectations. Once the rigorous growth targets are established, the HEDI categories and points are assigned using the table in the uploaded document in this section.</p>
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 reach or exceed the growth 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 reach the growth 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 reach the growth 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).	Less than 60% of the students will reach the growth 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.

assets/survey-uploads/12156/575331-lha0DogRNw/Principals-HEDI CRITERIA FOR STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES.pdf

## 7.4) Special Considerations for Comparable Growth Measures

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a principal's score for this subcomponent, 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 the following: prior student achievement results, students with disabilities, English language learners, and students in poverty.

(No response)

## 7.5) Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

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

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

## 7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures

Please check all of the boxes below:

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure the application of locally developed controls will be rigorous, fair, and transparent and only those used for State Growth will be used for Comparable Growth Measures.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that use of locally developed controls will not have a disparate impact on underrepresented students in accordance with applicable civil rights laws.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that district will develop SLOs according to the rules established by NYSED for principal SLOs: <a href="http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document">http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives-guidance-document</a> .	Checked

7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that the process for assigning points for SLOs for the Growth Subcomponent will use the narrative HEDI descriptions described in the regulations to effectively differentiate educator performance in ways that improve student learning and instruction.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that it is possible for a principal to earn each point, including 0, for SLOs in the Growth subcomponent scoring range.	Checked
7.6) Assurances -- Comparable Growth Measures   Assure that processes are in place to monitor SLOs to ensure rigor and comparability across classrooms.	Checked

# 8. Local Measures (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, October 31, 2013

---

## Page 1

### Locally-Selected Measures of Student Achievement or Growth

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

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

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

Districts or BOCES that intend to use a district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment must include the name, grade, and subject of the assessment in the following format: “[Name of your District/Region/BOCES] developed [Grade] [Subject] Assessment.” For example, a BOCES-developed 7th grade Social Studies assessment would be written as follows: “GVEP-Developed Grade 7 Social Studies Assessment.”

Also note: if your district/BOCES is using the same assessment for both the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent and the locally-selected measures subcomponents, be sure that a *different* measure of student performance is being used with the assessment (e.g., achievement rather than growth; growth measured in a different manner).

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

**In the table below, please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal’s students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth or value-added measure (e.g., K-5, 6-8, 9-12). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure of growth or achievement from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.1 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.1.**

***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/Program	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approved Measures	Assessment
3-5	(c) results for SWD's and ELL's	NYS grades 4 & 5 ELA and Math assessments
6-8	(c) results for SWD's and ELL's	NYS grades 6-8 ELA and math assessments
9-12	(g) % achieving specific level on Regents or alternatives	NYS Common Core English Regents (for students entering grade 9 in 2013-2014 and after; otherwise the NYS Comprehensive English Regents), and Common Core Algebra Regents

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.*

<p>Use this box, if needed, to describe the process for assigning HEDI categories. If needed, you may upload a table or graphic below.</p>	<p>The local assessment portion of the APPR for Principals includes evidence that will help to inform improved instruction and student results in a particular subgroup of the school's student population. The principal will define a subgroup in the school that needs improvement. Evidence comes from state assessments, when available, and local assessments, course grades, AP exams, and other student performance data that are used across grade levels, teams, courses or departments. The principal will set a target based on the evidence for the identified subgroup. The Superintendent approves the target. The principal collaborates with the superintendent on the approach he or she takes to achieve the target goal. The principal rating is based upon the degree to which students meet the achievement target set by the superintendent and the principal using the chart in the uploaded document in this section.</p>
--	--

When math assessments are utilized, the NYS Common Core Algebra Regents will be used. When English assessments are utilized, the NYS Common Core English Regents will be used starting with students entering grade 9 in 2013-2014 and after; otherwise, the NYS Comprehensive English English Regents will be used in 2013-2014 only.

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

See the upload in 8.1 below.

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

See the upload in 8.1 below.

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

See the upload in 8.1 below.

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

See the upload in 8.1 below.

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

(No response)

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

assets/survey-uploads/12190/575332-qBFVOWF7fC/8.1 Principals-LOCAL MEASURES POINT ALLOCATION FOR VALUE ADDED.pdf

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

**In the table below, list all of the grade configurations/programs used in your district or BOCES in which the district/BOCES expects that fewer than 30% of students will receive a State-provided growth score (e.g., K-2, K-3, CTE). Then for each grade configuration, select a measure from the drop-down menu. As a reminder, the grade configurations/programs listed in Task 8.2 should be the same as those listed in Task 7.3.**

***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 developed 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 includes evidence that will help to inform improved instruction and student results in a particular subgroup of the school's student population. The principal will define a subgroup in the school that needs improvement. Evidence comes from state assessments, when available, and local assessments, course grades, AP exams, and other student performance data that are used across grade levels, teams, courses or departments. The principal will set a target based on the evidence for the identified subgroup. The Superintendent approves the target. The principal collaborates with the superintendent on the approach he or she takes to achieve the target goal. The principal rating is based upon the degree to which students meet the achievement target set by the superintendent and the principal using the chart in the uploaded document in this section.
Highly Effective (18 - 20 points) Results are well above District- or BOCES-adopted expectations for growth or achievement for grade/subject.	20 points allotted for over 5% above target goal. 19 points allotted for 3% to 5% above target goal. 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/12190/575332-T8MIGWUVm1/8.2 Principals-LOCAL MEASURES POINT ALLOCATION WITH NO VALUE ADDED.pdf

### 8.3) Locally Developed Controls

Describe any adjustments, controls, or other special considerations that will be used in assigning points to a teacher's score for this subcomponent, the rationale for including such factors, and the processes that will be used to mitigate potentially problematic incentives associated with the controls or adjustments.

(No response)

### 8.4) Principals with More Than One Locally Selected Measure

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

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 weighted based on the percentage of students in each subgroup. The HEDI points are allocated using the uploaded local achievement chart. When using weighted averages, typical rounding rules will apply. (That is, for scores less than 0.5, round down; for scores greater than or equal to 0.5, round up.) However, rounding will not result in a change in HEDI levels.

### 8.5) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

# 9. Other Measures of Effectiveness (Principals)

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Tuesday, October 08, 2013

---

## Page 1

### 9.1) Principal Practice Rubric

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

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

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 point 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 point 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, label accordingly, 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 assigning any points to "ambitious and measurable goals":

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

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

### 9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)

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

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Structured feedback from teachers using a State-approved tool	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Structured feedback from students using a State-approved tool	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Structured feedback from families using a State-approved tool	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   School visits by other trained evaluators	(No response)
--	---------------

9.4) Sources of Evidence (if applicable)   Review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes (all count as one source)	(No response)
---	---------------

### 9.5) Survey Tool(s) (if applicable)

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

(No response)

Note: When the State-approved survey list is updated, this list will be updated within the drop-down menu of approved survey tools.

Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey for Teachers	(No response)
---	---------------

K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 3-5) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
--	---------------

K12 Insight Student Survey (Grades 6-12) for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
---	---------------

K12 Insight Parent Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
--	---------------

K12 Insight Teacher/Staff Survey for Principal Evaluation in New York	(No response)
---	---------------

District variance	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Parent Survey)	(No response)
Principal Evaluation Tripod School Perception Survey (Combined Student Surveys)	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Parent Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Student Survey	(No response)
NYC School Survey-2012 Teacher Survey	(No response)

## 9.6) Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below:

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

## 9.7) Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

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

The points will be assigned based on the 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. The 60 points will be the sum of the conversion points. Please see the uploaded in this section.

The Superintendent reviews the evidence that he or she collects throughout the year from multiple visits and observed principal practices, and rates the principal against the components of the MPPR, assigning points and ratings using the uploaded chart in this section. Evidence from observations during school visits and other evidence are collected throughout the year in each component of the rubric. Component scores are subsequently calculated at the end of the year. While we ask the principals to "self assess" against the components of the rubric, the superintendent rates the principal on his or her collected evidence; the self assessment serves as a tool for reflection and self-awareness on one's practice for the purposes of discussion with the superintendent.

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/12205/575333-pMADJ4gk6R/9.7 Principals-Multiple Measures of Effectiveness\_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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, July 31, 2013

---

## 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.

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 scoring ranges for principals for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth will be:

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 9.7), from 0 to 60 points

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

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

Where Value-Added growth measure applies  
**Growth or Comparable Measures**  
**Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement**  
**Other Measures of Effectiveness**  
**(60 points)**

**Overall Composite Score**  
**Highly Effective**  
**22-25**

**14-15**

**Ranges determined locally--see above**

**91-100**

**Effective**

**10-21**

**8-13**

**75-90**

**Developing**

**3-9**

**3-7**

**65-74**

**Ineffective**

**0-2**

**0-2**

**0-64**

# 11. Additional Requirements - Principals

Created Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Thursday, October 31, 2013

---

## 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 the school district or BOCES. All PIP plans must include: 1) identification of needed areas of improvement, 2) a timeline for achieving improvement, 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, 4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

For a list of supported file types, go to the Resources folder (above) and click Technical Tips. Please be sure to update a document with a form layout, with fillable spaces and not just a narrative.

[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 based upon the grounds outlined in regulation 30-2 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 of Lead Evaluators and Evaluators and Certification of Lead Evaluators

Describe the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators. Your description must include 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators, 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability, 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) 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	Checked
---	---------

school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured.	
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 Tuesday, April 30, 2013

Updated Wednesday, December 11, 2013

---

### Page 1

#### 12.1) Upload the Joint Certification of the APPR Plan

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the APPR Plan using this form: APPR District Certification Form. Please note that Review Room timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision.

<assets/survey-uploads/12158/575336-3Uqgn5g9Iu/CertificationForm December 2013.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.

## **SETTING TARGETS FOR STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of setting rigorous growth targets in Student Learning Objectives is to provide opportunities for all students to achieve high learning goals in every course throughout the District. Teachers are able to meet individual learning needs when they have information on past student performance and prior knowledge of skills and content. Two processes for setting SLO targets are outlined below; they were developed to support differentiated instructional practices. The first method uses historical student data from a previous year's post assessment, and the target is set for all students in the course. The second method uses pre assessment data at the start of a course, and a target is set for each student in the course.

As the SLO is being developed, the teacher and administrator will determine which method to use. The best method to use depends upon a few factors. Method 1 should be used when a strong alignment exists between post assessments from one course to the next. Also, this method is most useful when large numbers of students are on the SLO roster. Method 2 should be used when a valid and reliable pre assessment, aligned to the post assessment, has been developed. Also method 2 is particularly appropriate for teachers with small numbers of students in their SLOs.

Teachers in the same grade or subject will use the same locally selected measures of student growth and the same method for setting SLO targets and assigning points. The process for each target-setting approach is outlined below.

### **I. USING DATA FROM PREVIOUS YEAR'S END-OF-COURSE ASSESSMENT – FOR COURSE TARGET SETTING**

When an end-of-year assessment is used from the previous year for the Student Learning Objectives, the teacher target will be set by determining the score that falls at the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile for the students on the teacher's roster using data from the previous year's post assessment. This target will be the minimum rigor expectation for student growth.

The steps to setting the SLO target using end-of-course assessment data are as follows:

1. Order the student scores from the previous year's end-of-year assessment from highest to lowest.
2. Determine 85% of the number of students in the class. ( $.85 \times n$ )
3. Count up from the bottom of the list the number of students in step 2.
4. Determine the score that falls at the place in step 3. This is the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile, and thus, the target for the teacher's SLO.

### **HEDI CRITERIA**

The teacher's HEDI score is calculated based upon the student scores on the post assessment, aligned to the HEDI bands prescribed by the NYSED Commissioner. The points are allocated by determining the percentage of students who met the target in the SLO. The HEDI score is determined using the following criteria:

<b>Highly Effective</b> <i>18 – 20 points</i>	<b>Effective</b> <i>9 – 17 points</i>	<b>Developing</b> <i>3 – 8 points</i>	<b>Ineffective</b> <i>0 – 2 points</i>
85% of the students reach or exceed the growth target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	75% - 84% of the students reach or exceed the growth target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	60% - 74% of the students reach or exceed the growth target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	Below 60% of the students reach or exceed the growth 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%

## 2. USING PRE ASSESSMENT DATA – FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TARGET SETTING

When a pre assessment is administered for the Student Learning Objectives, the teacher target will be determined by setting targets for each student on the teacher’s roster for his or her SLO course. This approach aligns with the District belief in differentiating instruction to meet individual learning needs of each student.

**Make-up process:** If a student is absent on the day the pre assessment is administered, the teacher will schedule a make-up session within a 2-week period following the administration of the pre assessment. Any student who does not take the pre assessment during the make-up period will be assigned a score of 0 for the purpose of calculating the growth score at the time of the post assessment administration.

The teacher will be awarded points based on the degree to which *each student* met his or her individual target. The target is set based on moving each student 60% from the pre assessment score toward 100% on the post assessment. Each student will be assigned a score from 0 to 20 based upon the degree to which he or she reached the target. The teacher receives the average score of all students on the SLO roster.

The steps to setting the SLO target using pre assessment data are as follows:

1. Record each student’s pre assessment score.
2. Subtract the pre assessment score from 100 to find the *gap* toward 100%.
3. Take 60% of the *gap* in step 2 to find the *expected growth*.
4. Add the *expected growth* in step 3 to the pre assessment score. This is the *target score*.

Note: The highest target possible is 90. Thus, any calculated target exceeding 90 defaults to the maximum target score of 90.

An Excel spreadsheet, located on the Staff Forms Share Drive or located on the Google drive, is provided to calculate the target scores.

**EXAMPLE**

1. A student scores a 30 on the pre assessment.
2. The *gap* toward 100% is:  $100 - 30 = 70$ .
3. The *expected growth* is:  $60\%$  of  $70 = 42$ .
4. The *target score* is:  $30 + 42 = 72$ .

**ADDITIONAL EXAMPLES INCLUDE:**

Pre Score	Target	Pre Score	Target	Pre Score	Target
0	60	35	74	70	88
5	62	40	76	75	90
10	64	45	78	80	90
15	66	50	80	85	90
20	68	55	82	90	90
25	70	60	84	95	90
30	72	65	86	100	90

**HEDI CRITERIA**

The teacher’s HEDI score is calculated as an average of the points allocated for *each student*, aligned to the HEDI bands prescribed by the NYSED Commissioner. Typical rounding rules are used when averaging data from multiple sources (i.e., less than 0.5 rounds down; greater than or equal to 0.5 rounds up.) A teacher’s HEDI rating cannot change due to rounding. The points are allocated using the following criteria:

<b>Highly Effective</b> <i>18 – 20 points</i>	<b>Effective</b> <i>9 – 17 points</i>	<b>Developing</b> <i>3 – 8 points</i>	<b>Ineffective</b> <i>0 – 2 points</i>
Students meet or exceed the growth target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	Students achieve a percentage of expected growth toward the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	Students achieve a percentage of expected growth toward the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.	Students achieve a percentage of expected growth toward the target determined in the Student Learning Objective.
<b><i>The points within each category are distributed as follows:</i></b>			
18 points: 0% - 2% above target score 19 points: 3% - 5% above target score 20 points: more than 5% above target score	9 points: 10% below 10 points: 9% below 11 points: 8% below 12 points: 7% below 13 points: 6% below 14 points: 5% below 15 points: 4% below 16 points: 3% below	3 points: 21% - 22% below 4 points: 19% - 20% below 5 points: 17% - 18% below 6 points: 15% - 16% below	0 points: More than 30% below target 1 point: 27% - 30% below 2 points: 23% - 26% below

	17 points: 1% - 2% below	7 points: 13% - 14% below 8 points: 11% - 12% below	
--	--------------------------	--	--

When a NYS test is the post assessment

In some cases a post assessment may be a NYS test that is scored only using proficiency levels 1 through 4. In these situations, the following method will be used to translate the students' NYS scale scores to an equivalent growth target:

- a. Determine the target using the above process
- b. Use the following chart for percent equivalents:
  - Level 4 equates to a target of 90
  - Level 3 equates to a target of 85 to 89
  - Level 2 equates to a target of 74 to 84
  - Level 1 equates to a target of 60 to 73
- c. Using the scale scores for the appropriate state assessment, divide each performance level into equivalent proportioned scale scores, and align with the target percentage from above to each scale score within each performance level.
- d. Match the post assessment scale score to the equivalent percent, and determine the equivalent percent change.
- e. Use the HEDI Criteria chart above to calculate the HEDI score and rating.

EXAMPLE

The following example illustrates the above process using the NYS Grade 3 ELA assessment, matching the student's scale score with the closest scale score below:

Pre Score	Target	NYS Scale Score	Pre Score	Target	NYS Scale Score	Pre Score	Target	NYS Scale Score
0	60	148	34	73.6	291	68	87.2	340
1	60.4	152	35	74	292	69	87.6	344
2	60.8	156	36	74.4	293	70	88	347
3	61.2	161	37	74.8	294	71	88.4	350
4	61.6	165	38	75.2	295	72	88.8	353
5	62	169	39	75.6	296	73	89.2	357
6	62.4	173	40	76	297	74	89.6	358
7	62.8	177	41	76.4	298	75	90	360
8	63.2	182	42	76.8	299	76	90.4	363
9	63.6	186	43	77.2	300	77	90.8	365
10	64	190	44	77.6	301	78	91.2	368
11	64.4	194	45	78	302	79	91.6	370
12	64.8	198	46	78.4	303	80	92	373
13	65.2	203	47	78.8	304	81	92.4	375
14	65.6	207	48	79.2	305	82	92.8	378
15	66	211	49	79.6	306	83	93.2	380
16	66.4	215	50	80	307	84	93.6	383

<b>17</b>	66.8	219	<b>51</b>	80.4	308	<b>85</b>	94	385
<b>18</b>	67.2	224	<b>52</b>	80.8	309	<b>86</b>	94.4	388
<b>19</b>	67.6	228	<b>53</b>	81.2	310	<b>87</b>	94.8	390
<b>20</b>	68	232	<b>54</b>	81.6	311	<b>88</b>	95.2	393
<b>21</b>	68.4	236	<b>55</b>	82	312	<b>89</b>	95.6	395
<b>22</b>	68.8	240	<b>56</b>	82.4	313	<b>90</b>	96	398
<b>23</b>	69.2	245	<b>57</b>	82.8	314	<b>91</b>	96.4	400
<b>24</b>	69.6	249	<b>58</b>	83.2	315	<b>92</b>	96.8	403
<b>25</b>	70	253	<b>59</b>	83.6	316	<b>93</b>	97.2	405
<b>26</b>	70.4	257	<b>60</b>	84	317	<b>94</b>	97.6	408
<b>27</b>	70.8	261	<b>61</b>	84.4	319	<b>95</b>	98	410
<b>28</b>	71.2	267	<b>62</b>	84.8	320	<b>96</b>	98.4	413
<b>29</b>	71.6	272	<b>63</b>	85.2	323	<b>97</b>	98.8	415
<b>30</b>	72	277	<b>64</b>	85.6	326	<b>98</b>	99.2	418
<b>31</b>	72.4	282	<b>65</b>	86	329	<b>99</b>	99.6	420
<b>32</b>	72.8	286	<b>66</b>	86.4	332	<b>100</b>	100	423
<b>33</b>	73.2	290	<b>67</b>	86.8	336			

### 3. SCHOOL-WIDE MEASURES

In some instances the District will develop school-wide growth measures for Student Learning Objectives in consultation with building or department administration. The target setting approach outlined above will be used as appropriate or individual targets will be set using appropriate goal-setting measures specific to the content area.

The growth targets will be set by the superintendent or his or her designee in consultation with teachers and approved by the Superintendent or his or her designee. These school-wide targets will be based on specified NYS assessments. Teachers will receive HEDI scores based on the school-wide growth as measured by results on the specified NYS assessment for the appropriate school, determined by the appropriate administrator and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction.

School-wide measures for Student Learning Objectives will follow the rules outline in the NYSED Guidance Document and the assessments will be noted in the NYSED portal as required.

## 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:

---

### I. 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 student progress toward teachers' target goals. Furthermore, teachers will collaborate to analyze and improve student learning using the four-phase data inquiry process described in the upload in section 3.13: preparation and implementation; descriptive analysis; inference and action; and reflecting and goal setting. Achievement targets are set by the teachers in collaboration with their building and/or department administrator, and targets are approved by the administrator. Teachers will meet regularly with their administrator to demonstrate evidence of the indicators below for each phase of the process.

The administrator will assign points to teacher teams based upon the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal on the local assessment as indicated below:

#### **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

#### **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

#### **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.

#### **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

[Example: A target might be that “85% of students will reach a score of 90 on the local assessment.” If 82% of the students reach a score of 90, then the teacher is below the target goal by 3% ( $85\% - 82\% = 3\%$ ). Thus, the teacher receives 12 points and is rated effective for the local assessment sub component.]

*The 20 point allocation chart is uploaded in section 3.13 and will be used until a value-added system is implemented.*

## 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 or 15% of a teacher's evaluation for those with an approved value added measure from NYSED. 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 student progress toward teachers' target goals. Furthermore, teachers will collaborate to analyze and improve student learning using the four-phase data inquiry process: preparation and implementation; descriptive analysis; inference and action; and reflecting and goal setting. Achievement targets are set by the teachers in collaboration with their building and/or department administrator, and targets are approved by the administrator. Teachers will meet regularly with their administrator to demonstrate evidence of the indicators below for each phase of the process.

### **Phase 1: 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 and approved by 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;

#### **POINT ALLOCATION**

The administrator will assign points to teacher teams based upon the difference between the actual percent of students reaching the achievement goal and the target percent of students reaching the achievement goal on the local assessment as indicated below:

##### **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

##### **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
  - 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

### **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

### **0 – 2 Points: Ineffective**

- *Well below* team achievement goals 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

[Example: A target might be that “85% of students will reach a score of 90 on the local assessment.” If 82% of the students reach a score of 90, then the teacher is below the target goal by 3% (85% - 82% = 3%). Thus, the teacher receives 16 points and is rated effective for the local assessment sub component.]

*A 15-point allocation chart is uploaded in section 3.3 to be used when value-added is implemented.*

---

### **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.*

### **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 to 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. Library Media Specialists will use the approved rubric, *School Library Systems Association & NY Library Association Framework*.

Faculty members who fall outside of the NYS 3012-C requirements will use relevant rubrics for their area of specialization as determined by the Evaluation Committee. Those faculty members and corresponding rubrics include:

- Guidance Counselors, *Danielson Framework for School Counselors (2007)*
- Psychologists, *Danielson Framework for School Psychologists (2007)*
- Building Technology Consultants, *Danielson Framework for Instructional Coaches (2007)*
- Library Media Specialists, *School Library Systems Association & the NYS Library Association Framework*

#### **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.

##### **I. 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. One (1) observation will be unannounced.

### 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%

Observations are made and evidence collected throughout the year on each component. Component scores are subsequently calculated at the end of the year 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”)

For library media specialists using the NYLA-SSL/SLSA rubric, each component of each domain is weighted equally. Each component is scored on a scaled of 1 – 4 as indicated above, and the total of all components is divided by 24 to reach the average score. Classroom observations are 52% of the score as indicated by the following domains/components: 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 4.3, 5.1, and 6.1.

Observations are made, evidence collected, and evidence for each component will be rated throughout the year. Component scores are subsequently calculated at the end of the year using the weighting formulas above.

Typical rounding rules are used when averaging data from multiple sources (i.e., less than 0.5 rounds down; greater than or equal to 0.5 rounds up.) A teacher’s HEDI rating cannot change due to rounding. The Total Rubric Score is converted to a point value for the Multiple Measures of Teacher Effectiveness component using the following conversion scale. The final rubric scores (1 through 4 ratings) are the minimum scores necessary to obtain the HEDI scores.

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:

<b>Rating Category</b>	<b>Teacher Effectiveness Score</b>
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 educators for whom there is no approved Value-Added measure of student growth:

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

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

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

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

**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:

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domain 1: Planning and Preparation | <input type="checkbox"/> Domain 2: Learning Environment          | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Assessment                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domain 3: Instructional Practice   | <input type="checkbox"/> Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities | <input type="checkbox"/> State Assessment or Comparable Measures (SLOs) |

- For Library Media Specialists:*  1: Knowledge of students & student learning  
 2: Knowledge of content & instructional planning  3: Instructional practice  4: learning environment  
 5: Assessment for student learning  6: Collaboration & professional learning  7: Professional growth

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

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

**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.

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

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

## HEDI CRITERIA FOR STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

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

<b>Highly Effective</b> <i>18 – 20 points</i>	<b>Effective</b> <i>9 – 17 points</i>	<b>Developing</b> <i>3 – 8 points</i>	<b>Ineffective</b> <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%

## LOCAL MEASURES POINT ALLOCATION FOR VALUE-ADDED

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.

<b>Principal Point Allocation Chart <i>with a Value-Added Model</i></b>		
<b>Points</b>	<b>Effectiveness Rating</b>	<b>Percent of Students Meeting Achievement Target Goals</b>
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

NOTE: The 20-point chart in section 8.2 will be used until value added is implemented.

## LOCAL MEASURES POINT ALLOCATION WITH NO VALUE-ADDED

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.

<b>Principal Point Allocation Chart <i>with No Value-Added Model</i></b>		
<b>Points</b>	<b>Effectiveness Rating</b>	<b>Percent of Students Meeting Achievement Target Goals</b>
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

NOTE: The chart in 8.1 will be used when value added is implemented.

## **MULTIPLE MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS**

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 15<sup>th</sup> of each school year using the MPPR. 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, and
  - 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:

Domain	Points
1	8
2	20
3	10
4	6
5	12
6	4

At the end of the year, each Principal reflects on his or her practice using the components of the MPPR and discusses the self-assessment with the Superintendent. The Superintendent reviews the evidence collected throughout the year from multiple visits, and the observed practices described above, and rates the principal against the components of the MPPR, assigning points using the chart below.

Evidence from observations from school visits and other evidence are collected throughout the year in each component of the rubric. Component scores are subsequently calculated at the end of the year.

<b>MPPR Rubric</b>		
<b><i>Domain 1: Shared Vision of Learning (possible 8 points)</i></b>		
	<b>Rubric Score</b>	<b>Conversion Score</b>
Culture	1	0
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4
Sustainability	1	0
	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	0
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4
Instructional Program	1	0
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4

Capacity Building	1	0
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4
Sustainability	1	0
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4
Strategic Planning Process	1	0
	2	2
	3	3
	4	4

~~~~~

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

~~~~~

<b>MPPR Rubric</b>		
<i>Domain 4: Community (possible 6 points)</i>		
	<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

~~~~~

| <b>MPPR Rubric</b>                                                |                     |                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Domain 5: Integrity, Fairness, Ethics (possible 12 points)</i> |                     |                         |
|                                                                   | <b>Rubric Score</b> | <b>Conversion Score</b> |
| <b>Sustainability</b>                                             | 1                   | 0                       |
|                                                                   | 2                   | 3                       |
|                                                                   | 3                   | 5                       |
|                                                                   | 4                   | 6                       |
| <b>Culture</b>                                                    | 1                   | 0                       |
|                                                                   | 2                   | 3                       |
|                                                                   | 3                   | 5                       |
|                                                                   | 4                   | 6                       |

~~~~~

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

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

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

(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 certify that this APPR plan is the district's or BOCES' complete APPR plan and that such plan will be fully implemented by the school district or BOCES; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict or interfere with full implementation of the APPR Plan; and that no material changes will be made to the plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The school district and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also acknowledge that if approval of this APPR plan is rejected or rescinded for any reason, any State aid increases received as a result of the Commissioner's approval of this APPR plan will be returned or forfeited to the State pursuant to Chapter 57 of the Laws of 2012 and/or 2013, as applicable.

**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, 2013, assure that this was the result of unresolved collective bargaining negotiations

**Signatures, dates**

Superintendent Signature: Date:

*William D. ...* 12-3-13

Teachers Union President Signature: Date:

*...* 12-5-13

Administrative Union President Signature: Date:

*Dr. H. ...* 12.2.13

Board of Education President Signature: Date:

*...* 12-10-13