

**ATTACHED DOCUMENTS TO NYCDOE
APPR PLAN REVIEW ROOM SUBMISSION**

Table of Contents Teachers

Task 2 State Growth or Other Comparable Measures 2
Task 3 Locally Selected Measures..... 34
Task 4 - Other Measures Of Effectiveness 37
Task 5 – Composite Scoring Teachers..... 77
Task 6 - Teacher Improvement Plan 78

Task 2

Section 1 – Rules: State-Provided Growth or Other Comparable Measures Subcomponent

1. For teachers with 51-100% of their students in 4-8 common branch, ELA, and Math, NYSED will provide a State-provided growth score (SGP/VA) which will constitute the teacher's score for the State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent.
2. For all other classroom teachers with less than a majority of their students in grades 4-8 common branch, ELA and Math, these teachers must have Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) for the State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent. Please see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives> for NYSED's resources, including guidance, sample SLOs, and videos that can help to support educators in their development of SLOs.
3. The law requires that all classroom teachers be evaluated under the new law. The regulations define "classroom teacher" as a teacher in the classroom teaching service as defined in §80-1.1 of the Commissioner's regulations. For further guidance on teachers and other school personnel considered "classroom teachers" under the new law please see Section B of APPR Guidance: <http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/appr-field-guidance.pdf>
 - a. A teacher performing instructional support services for more than 40% of his/her time will not be included in the definition of classroom teacher for purposes of compliance with Education Law §3012-c unless he/she is also serving as a teacher in the classroom teaching service for 40% or more of his/her time. (please see B3 of APPR Guidance: <http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/appr-field-guidance.pdf>)
 - b. Special education teachers in integrated co-teaching classrooms (also referred to as collaborative team teaching by NYCDOE) are subject to the new evaluation requirements. Co-teachers will both receive the same evaluation score, based on all of the students in the classroom, for the Growth subcomponent whether it is a State-provided growth measure or a Student Learning Objective. (please see B7 of APPR Guidance: <http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/appr-field-guidance.pdf>)
 - c. Resource room teachers, "push-in, pull-out" teachers, and academic intervention services (AIS) specialists are all subject to the new evaluation requirements. (please see B8 of APPR Guidance: <http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/appr-field-guidance.pdf>)
 - d. Librarians who are certified as a library media specialist or school media specialist (library) are teachers in the classroom teaching service and are subject to the new evaluation requirements. (please see B12 of APPR Guidance: <http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/appr-field-guidance.pdf>)
4. If teachers 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 the principal (or principal's designee) must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.
5. For all classroom teachers in grades K-8 common branch, ELA and Math with less than a majority of their students in grades 4-8 common branch, ELA and Math, these teachers must have SLOs for the State Growth or Other Comparable measures subcomponent for both ELA and Math (unless the teacher only teaches one of these subjects).
6. The number of SLOs to be set for teachers with multiple course/sections must follow the State's rules which can be found in the following documents (generally: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objectives/>):
 - a. <http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/slo-guidance.pdf>

- b. <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations/>
 - c. <http://www.engageny.org/resource/student-learning-objective-road-map-for-english-as-a-second-language-and-bilingual>
7. SLOs must be set using the State’s SLO template which can be found here: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/new-york-state-student-learning-objective-template>
 8. The process by which SLOs must be submitted to the principal (or the principal’s designee) is to be determined by the Chancellor. The Chancellor may determine that this process be left to be determined by the principals of school buildings.
 9. The building principal (or the principal’s designee) will make the final determination on any elements of the SLO proposed by the teacher. Principals – responsible for approving SLOs that teachers have proposed – may use NYCDOE-generated growth scores for the creation of SLO targets if the NYCDOE has generated a target expectation for the SLO of any grade/subject.
 10. An SLO must be set for the entire length of the course. Generally, SLOs will be set for an entire academic year. (please see D32 of the APPR Guidance: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations/>).
 - a. All SLOs must be finalized no later than November 15 of each school year for full year courses, absent any extraordinary circumstances, from the start of the school year. Teachers must submit their proposed SLOs to their building principal (or principal’s designee) no later than October 15 of each school year, absent any extraordinary circumstances, from the start of the school year. The building principal (or principal’s designee) must provide teachers with their final SLO no later than November 15 of each school year, absent any extraordinary circumstances, from the start of the school year. In all instances, the principal will make the final determination of any elements of the SLO where there is disagreement with what the teacher has proposed. The principal does not need to meet with the teacher to discuss the revisions that are made from the initial, proposed SLO to the final, approved SLO; however, it is recommended that such a discussion occur and that where possible the teacher have the opportunity to revise the SLO to meet the expectations of the principal.
 - b. For semestered courses (where a teacher does not teach the same course which ends in the same summative assessment in both semesters), all SLOs must be finalized within six weeks from the start of the semester, absent any extraordinary circumstances. Teachers must submit their proposed SLOs to their building principal (or principal’s designee) no later than three weeks from the start of the semester, absent any extraordinary circumstances. The building principal (or principal’s designee) must provide teachers with their final SLO no later than six weeks from the start of the semester, absent any extraordinary circumstances. In all instances, the principal will make the final determination of any elements of the SLO where there is disagreement with what the teacher has proposed. The principal does not need to meet with the teacher to discuss the revisions that are made from the initial, proposed SLO to the final, approved SLO; however, it is recommended that such a discussion occur and that where possible the teacher have the opportunity to revise the SLO to meet the expectations of the principal.
 - c. For trimester courses (where a teacher does not teach the same course which ends in the same summative assessment in all three trimesters), all SLOs must be finalized within three weeks from the start of the trimester, absent any extraordinary circumstances. Teachers must submit their proposed SLOs to their building principal (or principal’s designee) no later than one week from the start of the trimester, absent any extraordinary circumstances. The building principal (or principal’s designee) must provide teachers with their final SLO no later than three weeks from the start of the trimester, absent any extraordinary circumstances. In all instances, the principal will make the final determination of any elements of the SLO where there is disagreement with

what the teacher has proposed. The principal does not need to meet with the teacher to discuss the revisions that are made from the initial, proposed SLO to the final, approved SLO; however, it is recommended that such a discussion occur and that where possible the teacher have the opportunity to revise the SLO to meet the expectations of the principal.

- d. For cycle-based courses (where a teacher does not teach the same course which ends in the same summative assessment in all cycles), all SLOs must be finalized within two weeks from the start of the cycle, absent any extraordinary circumstances. Teachers must submit their proposed SLOs to their building principal (or principal's designee) no later than one week from the start of the cycle, absent any extraordinary circumstances. The building principal (or principal's designee) must provide teachers with their final SLO no later than two weeks from the start of the cycle, absent any extraordinary circumstances. In all instances, the principal will make the final determination of any elements of the SLO where there is disagreement with what the teacher has proposed. The principal does not need to meet with the teacher to discuss the revisions that are made from the initial, proposed SLO to the final, approved SLO; however, it is recommended that such a discussion occur and that where possible the teacher have the opportunity to revise the SLO to meet the expectations of the principal.

11. Assessments to be used in SLOs:

- a. For teachers with any courses that end in a grade 4-8 ELA or Math assessment who do not have a State-provided growth measure for less than a majority of their students, SLOs must first be set using the results of the State-provided growth measure (see D20 and D35 of APPR Guidance: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/guidance-on-new-york-s-annual-professional-performance-review-law-and-regulations/>).
- b. For courses that culminate in a State assessment (i.e., 3rd grade ELA and Math, 4th grade Science, 8th grade Science, all Regents courses, NYSESLAT and NYSAA courses) such State assessments must be used in the SLO(s) to determine the teacher's State Growth or Other Comparable measures subcomponent score.
- c. For core courses not ending in a State assessment (i.e., grades 6-7 Science and grades 6-8 Social Studies), the assessment used in the SLO(s) must be grade and subject specific and shall be either a NYCDOE-developed performance assessment or, if a NYCDOE-developed performance assessment has not been developed, the Chancellor must select an approved third-party assessment from the State's list (see: <http://usny.nysed.gov/rtt/teachers-leaders/assessments/approved-list.html> – note that not all assessments on this list are approved for growth – only those approved for the State growth subcomponent may be selected by the Chancellor for this subcomponent. The assessment selected for a grade/subject must also be approved for the grade/subject that is listed).
- d. For all other courses not included above, the assessment(s) used in the SLO(s) for the teachers in a grade/subject will be a NYCDOE-developed performance assessment. For teachers in a grade/subject where the district has not developed a performance assessment, the principals may select from the following options: (1) SLOs with a school-wide, group or team measure of student growth using State assessments administered within the particular school building; or (2) a third party assessment selected by the Chancellor from the State's approved list. For the 2013-2014 school year, the principal must decide what measures will be used for the upcoming school year by the opening day of classes and by August 15 of all subsequent years of this plan. If the principal does not decide by the date specified, the NYCDOE must use a school-wide measure based on State assessments administered within the particular school building in which the teacher being assessed resides.
 - i. For the purposes of a school-wide, group or team measure, the teachers can only be linked to other teachers in the same school with State assessment results.

- e. For all other teachers in a grade/subject where the district had not developed a performance assessment and the school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments cannot be used because none of the grade configurations in the building or program have State assessments (e.g., grades K-2), then the Chancellor must select an approved third-party assessment from the State's list (see: <http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/assessments/cte-approved-list.html> and <http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/assessments/approved-list.html> – note that not all assessments on this list are approved for growth – only those approved for the State growth subcomponent may be selected by the Chancellor for this subcomponent).
- f. For all teachers with SLOs for the Other Comparable Measures subcomponent who are using a NYCDOE-developed performance assessment, State assessment, and/or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor, the NYCDOE must determine what will be used as a baseline for use in the SLOs and provide this to principals and teachers no later than the first day of the start of the school year (the pre-assessment does not need to be an actual assessment; historical data can be used in conjunction or in place of an actual assessment – see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/slo-103-for-teachers>).

12. Task-by-Task HEDI Growth Processes to be used in SLOs:

- a. Task 2.2 K-3 ELA Teachers
 - i. **For Kindergarten ELA Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:**
 - 1. For Kindergarten ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Kindergarten ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
 - ii. **For Kindergarten ELA Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:**
 - 1. For all Kindergarten ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
 - 2. For Kindergarten ELA teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those

teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. Default Option: For Kindergarten ELA Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Kindergarten ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Kindergarten ELA teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iv. For Grade 1 ELA Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 1 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 1 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

v. For Grade 1 ELA Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 1 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Grade 1 ELA teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

vi. Default Option: For Grade 1 ELA Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 1 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Grade 1 ELA teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

vii. For Grade 2 ELA Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 2 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth

targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 2 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

viii. For Grade 2 ELA Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 2 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Grade 2 ELA teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ix. Default Option: For Grade 2 ELA Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 2 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Grade 2 ELA teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the

SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

- x. **For Grade 3 ELA Teachers using the NYS Grade 3 ELA assessment:**
 - 1. For Grade 3 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 3 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Grade 3 ELA assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
- b. Task 2.3 K-3 Math Teachers
 - i. **For Kindergarten Math Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:**
 - 1. For Kindergarten Math teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Kindergarten Math teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
 - ii. **For Kindergarten Math Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:**
 - 1. For all Kindergarten Math teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

2. For Kindergarten Math teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
- iii. **Default Option: For Kindergarten Math Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:**
1. For all Kindergarten Math teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
 2. For Kindergarten Math teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
- iv. **For Grade 1 Math Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:**
1. For Grade 1 Math teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 1 Math teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

v. For Grade 1 Math Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 1 Math teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Grade 1 Math teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

vi. Default Option: For Grade 1 Math Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 1 Math teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Grade 1 Math teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

vii. For Grade 2 Math Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 2 Math teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 2 Math teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

viii. For Grade 2 Math Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 2 Math teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Grade 2 Math teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ix. Default Option: For Grade 2 Math Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 2 Math teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

2. For Grade 2 Math teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

x. For Grade 3 Math Teachers using the NYS Grade 3 Math assessment:

1. For Grade 3 Math teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 3 Math teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Grade 3 Math assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

c. Task 2.4 6-8 Science Teachers

i. For Grade 6 Science Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 6 Science teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 6 Science teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ii. For Grade 7 Science Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 7 Science teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see:

<http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 7 Science teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. For Grade 8 Science Teachers using the NYS Grade 8 Science assessment:

1. For Grade 8 Science teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 8 Science teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Grade 8 Science assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

d. Task 2.5 6-8 Social Studies Teachers

i. For Grade 6 Social Studies Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 6 Social Studies teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 6 Social Studies teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ii. For Grade 7 Social Studies Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 7 Social Studies teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric

must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 7 Social Studies teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. For Grade 8 Social Studies Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 8 Social Studies teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 8 Social Studies teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

e. Task 2.6 High School Social Studies Regents Courses Teachers

i. For Global 1 Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Global 1 teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Global 1 teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ii. For Global 1 Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Global 1 teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide,

group or team targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. Default Option: For Global 1 Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Global 1 teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iv. For Global 2 Teachers using the NYS Global History and Geography Regents assessment:

1. For Global 2 teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Global 2 teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Global History and Geography Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

v. For American History Teachers using the NYS U.S. History and Government Regents assessment:

1. For American History teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the American History teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS U.S. History and Government Regents

assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

f. Task 2.7 High School Science Regents Courses Teachers

i. For Living Environment Teachers using the NYS Living Environment Regents assessment:

1. For Living Environment teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Living Environment teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Living Environment Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ii. For Earth Science Teachers using the NYS Earth Science Regents assessment:

1. For Earth Science teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Earth Science teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Earth Science Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. For Chemistry Teachers using the NYS Chemistry Regents assessment:

1. For Chemistry teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Chemistry teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Chemistry Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iv. For Physics Teachers using the NYS Physics Regents assessment:

1. For Physics teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Physics teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Physics Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

g. Task 2.7 High School Math Regents Courses Teachers

i. For Algebra 1 Teachers using the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents assessment:

1. For Algebra 1 teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Algebra 1 teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
 - a. NOTE: January 2015 is the final administration of the Integrated Algebra Regents exam. Any student taking an Algebra 1 Regents course culminating in a Regents exam must take the Common Core Algebra 1 Regents exam after January 2015.

ii. For Geometry Teachers using the NYS Geometry Regents assessment:

1. For Geometry teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Geometry teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Geometry Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. For Algebra 2 Teachers using the NYS Algebra 2 Regents assessment:

1. For Algebra 2 teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Algebra 2 teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Algebra 2 Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

h. Task 2.9 High School English Language Arts Teachers

- i. NOTE:** The NYS Comprehensive English Regents exam option must be selected for at least one (1) of the three (3) high school ELA courses listed in Task 2.9.

ii. For Grade 9 ELA Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 9 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 9 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. For Grade 9 ELA Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 9 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iv. Default Option: For Grade 9 ELA Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 9 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

v. For Grade 9 ELA Teachers using the NYS Comprehensive English Regents assessment:

1. For Grade 9 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 9 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Comprehensive English Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
 - a. NOTE: June 2016 is the final administration of the NYS Comprehensive English Regents exam. Any student taking an English Regents course culminating in a Regents exam must take the Common Core English Regents exam after June 2016.

vi. For Grade 10 ELA Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Grade 10 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 10 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the

Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

vii. For Grade 10 ELA Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 10 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

viii. Default Option: For Grade 10 ELA Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Grade 10 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ix. For Grade 10 ELA Teachers using the NYS Comprehensive English Regents assessment:

1. For Grade 10 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 10 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Comprehensive English Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
 - a. NOTE: June 2016 is the final administration of the NYS Comprehensive English Regents exam. Any student taking an English Regents course culminating in a Regents exam must take the Common Core English Regents exam after June 2016.

- x. **For Grade 11 ELA Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:**
 - 1. For Grade 11 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal’s designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal’s designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 11 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
- xi. **For Grade 11 ELA Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:**
 - 1. For all Grade 11 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal’s supervisor (or supervisor’s designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
- xii. **Default Option: For Grade 11 ELA Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:**
 - 1. For all Grade 11 ELA teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal’s supervisor (or supervisor’s designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
- xiii. **For Grade 11 ELA Teachers using the NYS Comprehensive English Regents assessment:**
 - 1. For Grade 11 ELA teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal’s designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the

SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal’s designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 11 ELA teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Comprehensive English Regents assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

- a. NOTE: June 2016 is the final administration of the NYS Comprehensive English Regents exam. Any student taking an English Regents course culminating in a Regents exam must take the Common Core English Regents exam after June 2016.

i. Task 2.10 All Other Courses

i. For Librarians using a NYCDOE-developed assessment:

1. For Librarians, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal’s designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal’s designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to Librarians based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ii. For Librarians using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Librarians in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal’s supervisor (or supervisor’s designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Librarians who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State

assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iii. Default Option: For Librarians using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Librarians in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Librarians who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

iv. For Foreign Language Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment:

1. For Foreign Language teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Foreign Language teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

v. For Foreign Language Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Foreign Language teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team

growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

2. For Foreign Language teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

vi. **Default Option: For Foreign Language Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:**

1. For all Foreign Language teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Foreign Language teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

vii. **For Art Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment:**

1. For Art teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Art teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

viii. For Art Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Art teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Art teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

ix. Default Option: For Art Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Art teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Art teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

x. For Physical Education Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment:

1. For Physical Education teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student

growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Physical Education teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xi. For Physical Education Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Physical Education teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Physical Education teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xii. Default Option: For Physical Education Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Physical Education teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Physical Education teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those

teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xiii. For Health Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment:

1. For Health teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Health teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xiv. For Health Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Health teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For Health teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xv. Default Option: For Health Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Health teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or

supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

2. For Health teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xvi. For CTE Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For CTE teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the CTE teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xvii. For CTE Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all CTE teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xviii. Default Option: For CTE Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all CTE teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. The target proposed by the principal must be

approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xix. For Non-Regents High School Teachers using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For Non-Regents High School teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Non-Regents High School teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xx. For Non-Regents High School Teachers using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Non-Regents High School teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xxi. Default Option: For Non-Regents High School Teachers using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all Non-Regents High School teachers in the school, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents

assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xxii. For Grade 4 Science Teachers using the NYS Grade 4 Science assessment:

1. For Grade 4 Science teachers, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the Grade 4 Science teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYS Grade 4 Science assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xxiii. For ESL or Bilingual Teachers:

1. For ESL or Bilingual teachers with 10 or more students who take the NYSESLAT, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points for this portion of the SLO will be awarded to the teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYSESLAT assessment and the HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the assessment chosen for that grade/subject (e.g., Grade 3 Bilingual Teacher would have 3 SLOs: 3rd grade ELA and Math State assessment SLOs and NYSESLAT SLO). See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xxiv. For Teachers with students who take the NYSAA assessment:

1. For teachers with students who take the NYSAA assessment, using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs), teachers in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the teacher with students

who take the NYSAA assessment based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the NYSAA assessment. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xxv. For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task using a NYCDOE-developed assessment or a State-approved 3rd party assessment selected by the Chancellor:

1. For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task, these teachers will use available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., prior academic history, IEPs) and in collaboration with their building principals (or the principal's designee), will set individual student growth targets for all of the students on their class roster. The teacher must ensure the SLOs submitted meet the expectations set forth in the multi-state SLO rubric (see: <http://www.engageny.org/resource/draft-multi-state-slo-rubric>). This rubric must be used by the principal (or the principal's designee) in the approval process of the SLO. If the principal (or designee) does not agree with any elements of the SLOs, the principal (or designee) will make the final determinations on any elements of the SLO. HEDI points will be awarded to the teacher based on the overall percentage of their students who meet or exceed their individual growth targets on the summative assessment determined by the Chancellor. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xxvi. For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task using a school-wide, group or team measure based on State assessments:

1. For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task, the building principal will propose a school-wide, group or team target using available baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State assessments students take. The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal's supervisor (or supervisor's designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide, group or team targets for the State assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the SLO based on the percentage of students who meet or exceed their school-wide, group or team growth target on the applicable State assessment(s) within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.
2. For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

xxvii. Default Option: For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task using a school-wide measure based on State assessments:

1. For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task, the building principal will propose a school-wide target using available

baseline data and/or pre-assessment data (e.g., historical trends, student records), that is based on all of the State and/or Regents assessments given in the school (except for grades 4-8 ELA and Math). The target proposed by the principal must be approved by the principal’s supervisor (or supervisor’s designee) who then makes the final determinations on the proposed school-wide targets for the State and/or Regents assessments. HEDI points will be awarded for the school-wide SLO based on the percentage of students school-wide who meet or exceed their school-wide growth target on the applicable State and/or Regents assessments within the building. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

- For all other teachers of any additional grades and subjects not included already in this Task who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, the SLO process will be as follows: the State will provide a HEDI score based on the results of the NYS ELA and Math assessments grades 4-8 given in the building. The HEDI results will be weighted proportionately with the HEDI results from the additional SLOs that use the school-wide targets based on any additional State and/or Regents assessments given in the school. See the uploaded chart in Task 2.11 for the specific allocation of HEDI points.

Task 2.11 HEDI Tables or Graphics

- H: 90-100%
- E: 75-89%
- D: 60-74%
- I: 0-59%

HEDI Chart for Task 2.11																				
% of students meeting or exceeding target																				
Highly Effective			Effective			Developing		Ineffective												
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-97	96-93	92-90	89-85	84-80	79-75	74-67	66-60	59-55	54-49	48-44	43-39	38-34	33-29	28-25	24-21	20-17	16-13	12-9	8-5	4-0

Task 3

After considering all relevant factors, including the significant size and diversity of the NYC school district, the Commissioner has determined that he will adopt UFT's position that there must be a "school-based measures of student learning committee" responsible for recommending to the principal the selection of the measures for the locally selected measures subcomponent and how the measures will be used. The school committee shall have 8 members: 4 selected by the chapter leader of the UFT and 4 selected by the principal of the school. Due to the size of the NYCDOE, it is imperative that each school be given the flexibility to set its own measures while allowing for input from both teachers and the administrators. All decisions of the school committee must be recommended to the principal, who shall either accept or reject the recommendations of the committee. For the 2013-2014 school year only, the principal must decide what measures will be used for the upcoming school year by the opening day of classes and by August 15 of all subsequent years of this plan. The recommendations of the school committee, and the decision of the principal, must use the following rules:

For all teachers of grades 4-8 ELA/Math who receive a State-provided growth score for the State Growth subcomponent, the locally-selected subcomponent must use a NYCDOE-developed performance assessment, if these assessments were developed by August 1. If a performance assessment has not been developed by the NYCDOE by August 1 of that school year for a particular grade/subject, then the school committee must select one or more of the following options to recommend to the principal:

- (1) student achievement target on any state-approved third party assessments selected by the Chancellor by August 1 as an allowable option for use in teacher evaluations for these grades/subjects; and/or
- (2) student achievement target on State assessments provided that a different measure is used than that used for the State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent (e.g., performance of lowest-performing students); and/or
- (3) 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 4-8 ELA or math State assessments or (ii) a school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on any or all State, State-approved 3rd party, or NYCDOE- developed performance assessments used in the school building.

For all other teachers who do not receive a State-provided growth score for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent (i.e., teachers outside of grades 4-8 ELA/Math), the school committee must select one or more of the following options to recommend to the principal:

- (1) student achievement target on any NYCDOE-developed performance assessment that has been developed by August 1 for a grade/subject; and/or
- (2) student achievement target on any state-approved third party assessments selected by the Chancellor by August 1 as an allowable option for use in teacher evaluations for these grades/subjects; and/or
- (3) student achievement target on State assessments provided that a different measure is used than that used for the State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent (e.g., performance of lowest-performing students); and/or
- (4) 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 4-8 ELA or math State assessments or (ii) a school-wide measure of student growth or achievement computed in a manner determined locally based on any or all State, State-approved 3rd party, or NYCDOE- developed performance assessments used in the school building.

For the 2013-2014 school year, if the principal cannot determine a locally selected measure for any grade/subject by the date of the opening of classes and by August 15 of all subsequent years of this plan, then the locally selected measure for such grade/subject must be a school-wide measure of student growth using a

State-provided student growth score covering all students in the school that took the State assessment in English language arts and mathematics in grades 4-8 (see Research Appendix on school-wide measures). If the school-wide measure of growth using the State-provided growth score is not available, then the locally selected measure for such grade/subject must be a school-wide measure of student growth based on all applicable assessments administered within the building which shall include and be limited to the NYCDOE performance assessments, if developed by August 1 prior to the start of the school year, and/or State approved 3rd party assessments (Chancellor must select by August 1 prior to the start of the school year), and/or State assessments. In both of these default situations, the Chancellor must ensure that a measure different from that used in this subcomponent is used for the State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent.

**Option to be used if a decision is not reached by the principal
for the locally-selected measure and how such measure will be used:**

Teachers of Grades 4-8 ELA and/or Math

Option 6(i) –

For teachers of grades 4-8 ELA and/or Math who received a State-provided growth score for their State Growth subcomponent, HEDI points for the locally-selected subcomponent will be awarded to a teacher based on the State-provided school-wide growth score for all students in the school taking the State ELA and Math assessments in grades 4-8 (or any combination thereof which are administered in the building). If the value-added model is not approved by the Board of Regents, the State will provide a number between 0-20 for the school-wide State-provided growth score which will be used for the teacher’s HEDI score for the Locally-selected measures subcomponent. If the value-added model is approved by the Board of Regents, the State will provide a number between 0-25 for the school-wide State-provided growth score which will be used for the teacher’s HEDI score for the Locally-selected measures subcomponent and HEDI points between 0-15 points will then be allocated according to the chart in Task 3.3.

HEDI Chart for Task 3.3 (if the Value-Added Model is approved)															
Average of State-provided Growth Scores															
Highly Effective		Effective		Developing		Ineffective									
15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
25-24	23	21-22	19-20	17-18	16	14-15	12-13	10-11	8-9	6-7	4-5	3	2	1	0

Teachers in a building with Grades 4-8 ELA and/or Math

Option 6(i) –

For teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are administered and State-provided growth scores are provided by NYSED for those teachers, HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher for the locally-selected subcomponent based on the State-provided school-wide growth score for all students in the school taking the State ELA and Math assessments in grades 4-8 (or any combination thereof which are administered in the building). If the value-added model is not

approved by the Board of Regents, the State will provide a number between 0-20 for the school-wide State-provided growth score which will be used for the teacher’s HEDI score for the locally-selected measures subcomponent. If the value-added model is approved by the Board of Regents, the State will provide a number between 0-25 for the school-wide State-provided growth score which will be used for the for the teacher’s HEDI score for the Locally-selected measures subcomponent and HEDI points between 0-20 will then be allocated according to the appropriate chart in Task 3.13.

Option 6i - HEDI Chart for Task 3.13 (if the Value-Added Model is approved)																				
Conversion of State-provided school-wide growth score (25 points to 20 points)																				
Highly Effective			Effective			Developing		Ineffective												
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
25	24	23	22-21	20	19	18-17	16	15-14	13-12	11-10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Teachers in a building without Grades 4-8 ELA and/or Math (or no State-provided growth score is given)

Option 6(ii) – For teachers who reside in school buildings in which the grades 4-8 ELA and Math State assessments, or any combination thereof, are not administered or State-provided school-wide growth scores are not provided by NYSED for those teachers, HEDI points will be awarded to a teacher for the locally-selected subcomponent based on the school-wide average of the percentage of students having met or exceeded their individual growth targets (where applicable) on all of the applicable State, Regents, State-approved third-party, or NYCDOE-developed performance assessments administered for the State Growth or Other Comparable Measures subcomponent. See chart uploaded in Task 3.13 for the specific allocation of points.

Option 6ii - HEDI Chart for Task 3.13																				
% of students school-wide meeting or exceeding individual growth targets																				
Highly Effective			Effective			Developing		Ineffective												
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
100-97	96-93	92-90	89-85	84-80	79-75	74-67	66-60	59-55	54-49	48-44	43-39	38-34	33-29	28-25	24-21	20-17	16-13	12-9	8-5	4-0

TASK 4 - OTHER MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS (TEACHERS)

4.1 Teacher Practice Rubric

Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition)

4.2 Points Within Other Measures of Effectiveness

60 points- For all K-2 Teachers and for all Teachers grades 3-12 (in 2013-14 only), Multiple (at least two) classroom observations by principal or other trained Administrator, at least one of which must be unannounced.

55/5 Split using Surveys- For all Teachers grades 3-12 (beginning in 2014-15)

4.3 Survey Tools (Teachers 3-12 Only, beginning in 2014-15)

Tripod Elementary Student Perception Survey (Teachers of grades 3-5)

Tripod Secondary Student Perception Survey (Teachers of grades 6-12)

4.4 Assurances

Checked

4.5 Process for Assigning Points and Determining HEDI Ratings

Section II: Observation Options 1 and 2

Section VI: Scoring Process Summary

4.6 Observations of Probationary Teachers

Option 1

1 Formal/Long (Announced)

3 Informal/Short (Unannounced, minimum of 3)

Option 2

6 Informal/Short (All Unannounced, minimum of 6)

Both Options: done in person and/or video (if authorized by the teacher)

4.7 Observations of Tenured Teachers

Option 1

1 Formal/Long (Announced)

3 Informal/Short (Unannounced, minimum of 3)

Option 2

6 Informal/Short (All Unannounced, minimum of 6)

Both Options: done in person and/or video (if authorized by the teacher)

TASK 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview Summary	39
I. OBSERVATIONS OVERVIEW	39
Observation Option 1:	40
Observation Option 2:	40
II. OBSERVATION OPTIONS 1 and 2	41
OBSERVATION OPTION 1	41
GENERAL OVERVIEW	41
1) FORMAL ANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROCESS	42
A) Pre-Observation Conference	42
B) Formal Announced Classroom Observation	43
Optional Video Observation	43
C) Post-Observation Conference	43
2) INFORMAL/SHORT UNANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROCESS	44
OBSERVATION OPTION 2	45
GENERAL OVERVIEW	45
1) INFORMAL/SHORT UNANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROCESS	45
Optional Video Observation	46
III. INITIAL PLANNING CONFERENCE OVERVIEW	46
Teacher Artifacts	47
Procedure:	47
Scoring:	48
Timelines:	48
IV. TRIPOD STUDENT PERCEPTION SURVEYS	48
OVERVIEW	48
PROTECTING STUDENT CONFIDENTIALITY	49
Length of survey	50
Identification/selection of school proctors	50
Coordination of survey administration	50
Accommodations for students with special needs participating in the survey	50
REPORTING	50
SURVEY SCORING	50
V. Scoring Process Summary	50
APPENDIX	51
Teacher Evaluation Selection Form	52
PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE FORM FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS (OPTIONAL)	53
EVALUATOR FORM A	54
EVALUATOR FORM B (use as applicable)	56
EVALUATOR FORM C (use as applicable)	59
EVALUATOR FORM OPTION 1D (use as applicable)	61
EVALUATOR FORM OPTION 2D (use as applicable)	63
EVALUATOR FORM E	66
FINAL SUMMARY FORM	68
CONVERSION CHART	70
SURVEY SCORING (2014-15 and Beyond)	71
SAMPLE LIST OF ARTIFACTS FOR TEACHER'S COLLECTION	72
DEFINITIONS	73

Overview Summary

The Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition) shall be used exclusively for assessing teacher performance to determine a teacher’s score on the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent. The Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition) must be used in its entirety, rather than using only certain components of the rubric to the exclusion of others. Therefore, all four Domains of The Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition) Rubric shall be evaluated, thereby addressing all seven NYS Teaching Standards annually. Each of the 22 components within the four Danielson Domains will be rated on a 1-4 scale as “Highly Effective”, “Effective”, “Developing”, or “Ineffective.” No other rating may be given to a component. If prior to the summative end of year conference the principal has not collected evidence on any of the 22 components of the rubric, the principal must request any additional artifacts from the teacher for the summative end of year conference and/or conduct additional observations to ensure all 22 components of the rubric have been evaluated annually.

If a teacher receives scores of one in all categories, the final overall Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score automatically results in a score of zero. In addition, if any educator is rated Ineffective in both the State growth or other comparable measures and locally selected measures subcomponents, he/she must be rated Ineffective overall in accordance with the legislative intent of Education Law §3012-c. In addition, the composite scoring ranges prescribed in Education Law §3012-c(2)(a) for the 2012-2013 school year remain in effect, unless the Board of Regents adopts the alternative composite scoring bands recommended by NYCDOE.

Teachers will be assigned a final overall Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score from 0-60 points based on multiple classroom observations and evaluations of structured reviews of other teacher artifacts (e.g., lesson plans, student portfolios) using the Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition). Additionally, beginning in school year 2014-15 for teachers of grades 3-12, results obtained through the use of the grade appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey will also be incorporated into the final overall Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score. Specifically, beginning in school year 2014-15 teachers of grades 3-12 will have 55 of their total 60 overall Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score points derived from multiple classroom observations and evaluations of relevant teacher artifacts as described herein. The remaining 5 points of their 0-60 overall Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score will be calculated using the applicable Tripod Student Perception Surveys. Teachers of grades K-2 will have their total 0-60 overall Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score points obtained solely on the basis of multiple classroom observations and evaluations of relevant teacher artifacts.

For the 2013-14 school year only, teachers of grades 3-12 will use the grade appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey for formative purposes only. The student survey results will not be used within the teacher’s overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score for the 2013-14 school year only. This will provide for an opportunity to pilot at scale the use of student surveys.

I. OBSERVATIONS OVERVIEW

Teachers will have a choice based on the two options listed below as to the minimum number of observations and the types of observations that will be conducted for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent. Teachers will indicate which observation option they have chosen during the initial planning conference conducted at the beginning of the school year.

The two options for teachers to select from for their observations include the following: formal announced classroom observations (formal) and informal short unannounced classroom observations (informal). The formal observation will encompass a three-tiered evaluation process incorporating a pre-observation conference, formal observation, and a post-observation conference. The informal observations are unannounced and shall not require a pre- or post-observation conference. A complete detailed analysis of evaluation processes and procedures for both the formal three-tiered observation and the informal observation is provided in Section II of this document.

Please note that additional informal observations are allowable for formative or evaluative purposes and are recommended. Based on evidence from any observations – those for evaluative purposes or those for formative purposes – evaluators should note for teachers areas of growth to praise and also note one or two key change levers that were observed. If the evaluation is conducted for evaluative purposes then the appropriate evaluator form must be used (Evaluator Form 1D for option 1 and Evaluator Form 2D for option 2). For informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE’s proposal, “the principal shall provide feedback to the teacher through an in-person conversation, in writing, via email or through any other form of communication.” In addition, for informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE’s proposal, “observation reports must be provided to the teacher and placed in the file within 90 school days of the observation. A teacher’s absences shall not count toward the 90-day time frame.”

If practicable, multiple evaluators should be used in the evaluation process. It is also recommended that peer observation/inter-visitation occur for formative purposes. Only the evaluator’s observational analysis notes and documentation contained in the corresponding observation report as described herein shall be considered when determining a teacher’s overall 0-60 HEDI score for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent – the evaluator is not required to provide the teacher with all low-inference notes taken during any classroom visit.

Observation Option 1:

Observation option 1 allows for teachers to be observed through a formal announced classroom observation lasting a full classroom period which includes a pre-observation conference and a post-observation conference to be held as described herein. In addition, observation option 1 will include a minimum of three informal/short unannounced classroom observations to be performed during the school year. Each informal/short unannounced classroom observation will last a minimum of 15 minutes and shall not require a pre- or post-observation conference. The decision as to how many informal/short unannounced classroom observations will be performed shall be the sole discretion of the school principal as described herein.

Observation Option 2:

Alternatively, observation option 2 allows for teachers to have a minimum of six informal/short unannounced classroom observations to be conducted during the school year. Each informal/short unannounced classroom observation will last a minimum of 15 minutes and shall not require a pre- or post-observation conference. The decision as to how many informal/short unannounced classroom observations will be performed shall be the sole discretion of the school principal as described herein.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION OVERVIEW

OBSERVATION OPTION 1	OBSERVATION OPTION 2
<p><u>Mandatory Initial Planning Conference</u> Completion of Evaluation Selection Form By Teacher</p> <p><u>Formal Announced Classroom Observation (one)</u> <u>Pre-Observation Conference</u> - Completion of Pre-Observation Form By Teacher (optional) - Up to 2 artifacts (of the 8 total) may be submitted <u>Post-Observation Conference</u> - Up to 2 artifacts (of the 8 total) may be submitted</p> <p><u>Informal Unannounced Short Classroom Observations (minimum three)</u></p> <p><u>Tripod Student Perception Survey Administered (as applicable)</u> For teachers of grades 3-12, the grade-appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey will also be used. For the 2013-14 school year the survey will be used for formative purposes and for the 2014-15 school year and beyond it will be used in determining the teacher’s final Other Measures of Effectiveness 0-60 HEDI score. (See Section V for a full description of how the Tripod Student Perception Survey will be used)</p> <p><u>Mandatory Summative End Of Year Conference</u> End-of-year teacher artifacts submitted (of any remaining of the 8 total)</p>	<p><u>Mandatory Initial Planning Conference</u> Completion of Evaluation Selection Form By Teacher - Up to 2 artifacts (of the 8 total) may be submitted</p> <p><u>Informal Unannounced Short Classroom Observations (minimum six)</u></p> <p><u>Tripod Student Perception Survey Administered (as applicable)</u> For teachers of grades 3-12, the grade-appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey will also be used. For the 2013-14 school year the survey will be used for formative purposes and for the 2014-15 school year and beyond it will be used in determining the teacher’s final Other Measures of Effectiveness 0-60 HEDI score. (See Section V for a full description of how the Tripod Student Perception Survey will be used)</p> <p><u>Mandatory Summative End Of Year Conference</u> End-of-year teacher artifacts submitted (of any remaining of the 8 total)</p>

II. OBSERVATION OPTIONS 1 and 2

OBSERVATION OPTION 1

GENERAL OVERVIEW

In addition to both the mandatory initial planning conference and the summative end of year conference held at the beginning and end of school year, respectively, teachers who elect observation option 1 on their Teacher Evaluation Selection Form (completed during the initial planning conference) as the process by which they will be observed and evaluated will have the following observations performed throughout the year:

- One formal announced classroom observation lasting a full class period; and
- Minimum of 3 informal/short unannounced classroom observations lasting a minimum of 15 minutes each; and
- Submission of up to a maximum of 8 teacher artifacts; and
- For teachers of grades 3-12, the grade appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey will also be used in determining 5 points of the teacher’s overall 0-60 points Other Measures of Effectiveness score beginning in school year 2014-15. *For the 2013-14 school year the Tripod Student Perception Survey will only be used for formative purposes.*

The formal and informal observations shall not be conducted prior to the initial planning conference held between the teacher and evaluator. No initial planning conference shall be held after the last Friday in October, with observations commencing on a rolling basis thereafter with no observations performed later than the first Friday in June absent extraordinary circumstances (e.g., teacher on medical leave, teachers hired mid-year or

late year).

For teachers who choose the formal, full-period observation and informal observation option, the teacher may request to conduct the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference at the same time. Therefore, at the initial planning conference, a teacher may elect to also have a pre-observation conducted whereby they will use a Pre-Observation Conference Form in order to lay out the lesson plan that will be used during the evaluation. Note that the pre-observation conference must be held no less than one school day or a maximum of twenty school days from the date on which the scheduled formal announced classroom observation is to occur. If the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference are conducted separately, the formal observation option must include a pre-observation conference a maximum of twenty days prior to the formal observation where additional artifacts (two maximum), such as handouts for the day of the observation, can be provided to the evaluator.

For teachers who choose option 2, the initial planning conference is also an opportunity to provide teacher artifacts (two maximum) to the evaluator.

1) FORMAL ANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROCESS

A three-tier observation process will be performed for all formal announced classroom observations consisting of a pre-observation conference, formal announced classroom observation, and a post-observation conference between the evaluator and teacher. As indicated above, the formal announced classroom observation three-tiered evaluation process will be conducted after the initial planning conference/pre-conference occurs with no observations performed later than the first Friday in June of the current school year absent extraordinary circumstances (e.g., teacher on medical leave, teachers hired mid-year or late year). Prior to the formal announced classroom observation performed by the evaluator, a pre-observation conference must be scheduled and held as described below. A post-observation conference will be conducted following the formal observation also outlined below.

A) Pre-Observation Conference

Before the evaluator may conduct a formal announced classroom observation, a pre-observation conference must be scheduled by the evaluator and the teacher. The pre-observation conference shall be scheduled and held no less than one school day or a maximum of twenty school days from the date on which the scheduled formal announced classroom observation is to occur.

For teachers who choose the formal, full-period observation and informal observation option, the teacher may request to conduct the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference at the same time. The pre-observation conference is also an opportunity to provide teacher artifacts to the evaluator. Therefore, at the initial planning conference, a teacher may elect to also have a pre-observation conducted whereby they will use a pre-observation form in order to lay out the lesson plan that will be used during the evaluation. If combined, the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference must still be held no less than one school day or a maximum of twenty school days from the date on which the scheduled formal announced classroom observation is to occur. If the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference are conducted separately, the formal observation option must include a pre-observation conference a maximum of twenty days prior to the formal observation where additional artifacts, such as handouts for the day of the observation, can be provided to the evaluator.

Prior to the pre-observation conference, the teacher has the option to submit to the evaluator a completed pre-observation conference form (see: Evaluator Form A: Pre-Observation and/or Initial Planning Conference Artifact Form) no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled conference.

The scheduled pre-observation conference shall be conducted during normal school day hours as described herein. The pre-observation conference shall be defined as an individual face-to-face conversation between the teacher and evaluator, the purpose of which is to discuss the lesson focus, activities, and expectations prior to the formal announced classroom observation being performed.

In addition, the evaluator will discuss with the teacher the specific components within the Danielson 2013 Rubric to be evaluated and scored as outlined in the attached Evaluator Form B: Formal Announced Classroom Observation. The evaluator shall address any questions and/or concerns the teacher may have and both shall agree on a time and date on which the formal announced classroom observation is to take place.

During the pre-observation conference and using the pre-observation conference form (as applicable), the evaluator will take and maintain all relevant notes and communications between the evaluator and teacher. Additionally, the pre-observation conference will provide an opportunity for the teacher to submit up to two teacher artifacts in support of the Danielson 2013 Rubric components identified in Evaluator Form A: Pre-Observation and/or Initial Planning Conference Artifact Form. These artifacts will align with the indicators identified in the Danielson 2013 Rubric and will coincide with the specific Danielson 2013 Rubric components outlined in Evaluator Form A attached to this document. Based on the discussions and evaluation of the pre-observation form and any other resources/documents the teacher may provide to the evaluator, a score of 1-4 will be provided for each of the identified Danielson components listed within Evaluator Form A. Utilizing the process described in the Final Summary Form in the appendix of this document a 1-4 rubric score will be determined for these conferences and be weighted with the classroom observation scores to ultimately result in an overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score for the teacher.

B) Formal Announced Classroom Observation

Following the pre-observation conference, the evaluator will conduct a formal announced classroom observation of the teacher on the date agreed upon during the pre-observation conference (no earlier than one school day or a maximum of twenty school days from the date in which the pre-observation conference was held). The formal announced classroom observation will last a full class period. The evaluator will score each of the observed Danielson Domains and components outlined in Evaluator Form B on a 1-4 HEDI scale. Please see the scoring process described in Section VI of this document.

Optional Video Observation

The use of video as an alternative observational tool may only be used for the formal announced classroom observation and/or informal/short unannounced classroom observation with the express written consent of the teacher. The method of how the formal and/or informal observations will be observed shall be discussed and agreed upon by both the evaluator and teacher during the pre-observation conference, memorialized in writing on the Evaluation Selection Form, and placed in the teacher's summative report file. The teacher shall be provided with an unedited copy of all such videos. The ability to capture a lesson on video can help an evaluator play back parts of the lesson that are addressed in the Danielson Framework while filling out the rubric and writing observation analysis notes. Videos can also help during a post-observation conference to show a teacher what is being critiqued. Please also note that the use of video outside of the evaluation process - for formative purposes, such as for coaching and professional development of teachers - is recommended and allowable.

C) Post-Observation Conference

Following the formal announced classroom observation a post-observation conference between the evaluator and teacher shall be held at a mutually agreed upon time no later than twenty school days from which the formal announced classroom observation was performed. The post-observation conference shall be defined as an individual face-to-face meeting between the evaluator and teacher during which the parties will reflect upon the

teacher's performance during the classroom visit, discuss student work and learning outcomes, and guide future teaching practice. The post-observation conference will provide an opportunity to discuss any evidence obtained during the formal announced classroom observation using a dialogue which incorporates the Danielson 2013 Rubric as a framework for the conversation. All forms used to evaluate teachers – including completed rubrics with evidence statements for any formal/informal observations – must be shown to the teacher at post-observation conference(s) and at the summative end of the year conference, as applicable, so that the teachers are able to keep a record of their own progress and development needs. The post-observation conference shall be used to discuss the teacher's progress, prioritize areas in need of further development, and discuss agreed upon concrete next steps to ensure the teacher has the opportunity to continuously improve and develop.

Additionally, the post-observation conference will provide an opportunity for a teacher to submit up to two additional teacher artifacts in support of the Danielson 2013 Rubric components identified in Evaluator Form C: Post-Observation Conference Teacher Artifact Form. These artifacts will align with the indicators identified in the Danielson 2013 Rubric and coincide with the specific Danielson 2013 Rubric components outlined in Evaluator Form C attached to this document. Based on the discussions and evaluation of the Pre-Observation Form (A) and any other resources/documents, the teacher may provide to the administrator, lead evaluator and/or administrator designee, a score of 1-4 will be provided for each of the identified Danielson components listed within Evaluator Form C. This 1-4 post-observation score will be combined with the 1-4 scores obtained during the initial planning conference/pre-observation conference as well as the summative end of year conference. Utilizing the process described in the Final Summary Form in the appendix of this document a 1-4 rubric score will be determined for these conferences and be weighted with the classroom observation scores to ultimately result in an overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score for the teacher.

2) INFORMAL/SHORT UNANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROCESS

For teachers who select observation option 1, a minimum of three informal/short unannounced classroom observations will be performed in addition to the one formal announced classroom observation. Similar to the formal announced classroom observation, the informal/short unannounced classroom observations shall be conducted after the initial planning conference occurs with no observations performed later than the first Friday in June of the current school year absent extraordinary circumstances (e.g., teacher on medical leave, teachers hired mid-year or late year). Unlike the three-tiered formal announced classroom observation process, the informal/short unannounced classroom observations shall not require a pre- or post-observation conference; however, a post-observation may occur for formative purposes at the sole discretion of the principal. These unannounced classroom observations will provide evaluators with an opportunity to get an authentic sense of each teacher's workday with students. As such, it will enable evaluators to note areas for targeted growth and development observed during the visit and a post-observation conference can facilitate critical conversations between the evaluator and the teacher. For informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE's proposal, "the principal shall provide feedback to the teacher through an in-person conversation, in writing, via email or through any other form of communication." In addition, for informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE's proposal, "observation reports must be provided to the teacher and placed in the file within 90 school days of the observation. A teacher's absences shall not count toward the 90-day time frame."

The evaluator shall have the sole discretion as to how many informal/short unannounced classroom observations will be performed throughout the year, however in no case will a teacher who chooses observation option 1 receive less than three informal observations in a given school year.

The informal/short unannounced classroom observation will consist of an evaluator observing a class for a minimum of 15 minutes using Evaluator Form 1D: Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation

attached to this document. The method in which the evaluator may conduct the informal observation may be either in person or via video following the procedural requirements previously outlined in this Section.

Evaluator Form 1D identifies specific components within Domains 2 and 3 **only** of the Danielson 2013 Rubric. Similar to the formal announced classroom observation scoring process, each of the components identified in Evaluator Form 1D will be scored on a 1-4 HEDI scale. Each classroom observation conducted for evaluative purposes must be scored individually. Utilizing the process described in the Final Summary Form found in the appendix of this document, a 1-4 HEDI rubric score will be determined and ultimately result in a 0-60 HEDI score for the teacher.

OBSERVATION OPTION 2

GENERAL OVERVIEW

In addition to the both the mandatory initial planning conference and the summative end of year conference held at the beginning and end of the school year, respectively, teachers who elect to use observation option 2 on their evaluation selection form (completed during the initial planning conference) as the process by which they will be observed and evaluated will have the following observations performed throughout the year:

- Minimum of 6 informal/short unannounced classroom observations lasting a minimum of 15 minutes each; and
- Submission of up to a maximum of 8 teacher artifacts; and
- For teachers of grades 3-12, the grade appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey will also be used in determining 5 points the teacher's overall 0-60 points Other Measures of Effectiveness score beginning in school year 2014-15. *For the 2013-14 school year the Tripod Student Perception Survey will only be used for formative purposes.*

For teachers who choose option 2, the initial planning conference will provide an opportunity for the teacher to submit up to two teacher artifacts in support of the Danielson 2013 Rubric components identified in Evaluator Form A: Pre-Observation and/or Initial Planning Conference Artifact Form. The informal/short unannounced classroom observations shall not be conducted prior to the initial planning conference held between the teacher and evaluator. In addition, no observation shall be conducted after the initial planning conference occurs with no observations performed later than the first Friday in June absent extraordinary circumstances (e.g., teacher on medical leave, teachers hired mid-year or late year).

1) INFORMAL/SHORT UNANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION PROCESS

For teachers who select observation option 2, a minimum of six informal/short unannounced classroom observations will be performed throughout the school year. The informal/short unannounced classroom observations conducted through observation option 2 shall be conducted after the initial planning conference occurs with no observations performed later than the first Friday in June of the current school year, absent extraordinary circumstances (e.g., teacher on medical leave, teachers hired mid-year or late year), and shall not require a post-observation conference; however, a post-observation may occur for formative purposes at the sole discretion of the principal. These unannounced classroom observations will provide evaluators with an opportunity to get an authentic sense of each teacher's workday with students. As such, it will enable evaluators to note areas for targeted growth and development observed during the visit and a post-observation conference can facilitate critical conversations between the evaluator and the teacher. A post-observation

conference can facilitate critical conversations between the evaluator and the teacher. For informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE’s proposal, “the principal shall provide feedback to the teacher through an in-person conversation, in writing, via email or through any other form of communication.” In addition, for informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE’s proposal, “observation reports must be provided to the teacher and placed in the file within 90 school days of the observation. A teacher’s absences shall not count toward the 90-day time frame.”

The informal observations will consist of an evaluator observing a class for a minimum of 15 minutes using Evaluator Form 2D: Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation attached to this document. The evaluator shall have the sole discretion as to how many informal/short unannounced classroom observations will be performed throughout the year, however in no case will a teacher who chooses observation option 2 receive less than six short unannounced observations for the purposes of an APPR evaluation in a given school year. The method in which the evaluator may conduct the informal observation may either be in person or via video as described below.

As indicated above, for each informal observation performed, the evaluator shall use Evaluator Form 2D. During these observations, any artifacts seen within the classroom (e.g., student work and/or assignments) may be considered by the evaluator and scored on the rubric. Any components of Domains 1 and 4 that are not observed during informal/short classroom observations must be evaluated through the use of artifacts during the end of year conference (See Section IV for further information regarding the end of year conference and artifacts). Similar to the formal announced classroom observation scoring process, each of the Domains and components observed will be scored on a 1-4 HEDI scale using Evaluator Form 2D. Each classroom observation conducted for evaluative purposes must be scored individually. Utilizing the process described in the Final Summary Form in the appendix of this document a 1-4 rubric score will be determined for the conferences and be weighted with the classroom observation scores (and surveys, as applicable, beginning in school year 2014-15) to ultimately result in an overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score for the teacher.

Optional Video Observation

The use of video as an alternative observational tool may only be used for the formal announced classroom observation and/or informal/short unannounced classroom observation with the express written consent of the teacher. The method of how the formal and/or informal observations will be observed shall be discussed and agreed upon by both the evaluator and teacher during the pre-observation conference, memorialized in writing on the Evaluation Selection Form, and placed in the teacher’s summative report file. The teacher shall be provided with an unedited copy of all such videos. The ability to capture a lesson on video can help an evaluator play back parts of the lesson that are addressed in the Danielson Framework while filling out the rubric and writing observation analysis notes. Videos can also help during a post-observation conference to show a teacher what is being critiqued. Please also note that the use of video outside of the evaluation process - for formative purposes, such as for coaching and professional development of teachers - is recommended and allowable.

III. INITIAL PLANNING CONFERENCE OVERVIEW

An initial planning conference is a mandatory component of all teachers’ evaluations for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent. This initial planning conference must be held no later than the last Friday in October between the teacher and the evaluator, and must be held prior to conducting any teacher observations absent extraordinary circumstances (e.g., teacher on medical leave, teachers hired mid-year or late year). School administrator(s) selected to conduct the initial planning conference shall be determined at the school

level.

The evaluator will discuss with the teacher which observation options the teacher will select for the school year and whether observations will occur via video or in-person. While not required it is recommended that evaluators consider having teachers self-assess on the Danielson 2013 framework during the initial planning conference as a part of best practice, and to set formative professional goals (2-4 are recommended) for the school year. It is also recommended that these formative goals align and help leverage SLOs, as applicable, to ensure formative instructional decisions and approaches will support academic improvement for all students. During the initial planning conference a Teacher Evaluation Selection Form will be completed accordingly and signed by both parties.

For teachers who know they intend to choose the formal, full-period observation and informal observation option, the teacher may request to conduct the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference at the same time. The pre-observation conference is also an opportunity to provide teacher artifacts to the evaluator. Therefore, at the initial planning conference, a teacher may elect to also have a pre-observation conducted whereby they will use a pre-observation form (Evaluator Form A) in order to lay out the lesson plan that will be used during the evaluation. If combined, the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference must be held no less than one school day or a maximum of twenty school days from the date on which the scheduled formal announced classroom observation is to occur. If the initial planning conference and the pre-observation conference are conducted separately, the formal observation option must include a pre-observation conference a maximum of twenty days prior to the formal observation where additional artifacts, such as handouts for the day of the observation, can be provided to the evaluator.

For teachers who choose the informal observation only option, the teacher may choose to submit up to two artifacts to be considered by the evaluator at the initial planning conference.

Teacher Artifacts

Procedure:

Teachers may submit up to a total of 8 teacher artifacts to the school principal or administrative designee's office no later than the second Friday of April of each year. The teacher artifacts shall be reviewed and brought to the scheduled summative end of year conference by the evaluator; it is recommended that teachers also bring copies of the artifacts submitted to their school principal. Appendix: Sample List of Artifacts for Teacher's Collection shall serve as a non-exhaustive sample list of possible artifacts which may be collected and submitted for review by the teacher. If prior to the summative end of year conference the principal has not collected evidence on any of the 22 components of the rubric, the principal must request any relevant additional artifacts from the teacher and/or conduct additional observations. If a teacher chooses to not submit any additional artifacts requested by his/her principal (or his/her designee) to complete the review of any of the components of the rubric in Domains 1 or 4 prior to the second Friday of April deadline, the principal (or his/her designee) shall render an overall component score of 1 out of 4 which represents the lowest score a teacher may receive for the component (only in Domains 1 or 4). No later than ten school days from the conclusion of the summative end of year conference every teacher shall receive a copy of the 1-4 Teacher Artifact HEDI score (Evaluator Form E: End of Year Teacher Artifacts) scored by the principal (or his/her designee). The original copy of Evaluator Form E shall be placed in the teacher's summative observation report file as described herein.

Scoring:

The submitted teacher artifacts shall provide evidence that aligns with Domains 1 and 4 of the Danielson 2013 Rubric. Each teacher artifact shall be scored independently of one another on a 1-4 HEDI scale as indicated in Evaluator Form E. The evaluator shall give a score of 1-4 for each of the components identified in Evaluator Form E of which the teaching artifact(s) illustrate. Once all artifacts have been scored through Domain 1 and 4 of the Danielson 2013 Rubric, each component score of 1-4 will be added together and divided by the number of components evaluated. As a result of this scoring process an overall HEDI score of 1-4 will be determined. Utilizing the process described in the Final Summary Form in the appendix of this document a 1-4 rubric score will be determined for the conferences and be weighted with the classroom observation scores (and surveys, as applicable, beginning in school year 2014-15) to ultimately result in an overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score for the teacher. For a more thorough analysis of how each measure will be scored and result in an overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score see Final Summary Form in the appendix of this document.

Timelines:

Note that all timelines must be adhered to absent extraordinary circumstances (e.g., teacher on medical leave, teachers hired mid-year or late in the year).

- **On or before the last Friday in October**
Initial planning conference held
- **Between the first day of March and the last day of May**
Tripod Student Perception Survey Administered to students in grades 3-12 (Chancellor to determine the date and time for administration)
- **After the Initial Planning Conference occurs (no later than the last Friday in October) and the first Friday in June**
All formal and informal observations take place
- **On or before the second Friday of April**
End of year submission of teacher artifacts to the office of the building principal (or the office of the administrator's designee)
- **Between the last Friday of April and no later than the last Friday of June on which school is in session**
Summative End of Year Conference to discuss teacher artifacts, feedback from evidence-based observations of practice, and steps for continued professional growth.
- **Following the Summative End of Year Conference and no later than September 1 of the following school year of the evaluation**
The complete APPR shall be provided to the teacher and placed in his/her personnel file as soon as practicable but no later than September 1st of the school year following the year of the evaluation.

IV. TRIPOD STUDENT PERCEPTION SURVEYS

(Mandatory for teachers of grades 3-12)

OVERVIEW

For the 2013-14 school year only, teachers of grades 3-12 will use the grade appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey for formative purposes only. The results of the student survey results will not be used within the teacher's overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score for the 2013-14 school year only. This will provide for an opportunity to pilot at scale the use of student surveys.

Beginning in the 2014-15 school year, the Tripod Student Perception Surveys will be used as 5 points of the overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score for teachers of grades 3-12. For teachers of grades 3-5 the Tripod Elementary Student Perception Survey will be used. For teachers of grades 6-12 the Tripod Secondary Student Perception Survey will be used.

The Surveys will be administered between the first day of March and the last day of May via paper format. The day and time for the survey administration will be determined by the Chancellor. The survey may be administered anytime during normal school hours during the designated two-month window. The principal and one or two staff members from each school will coordinate the survey administration and will have the chance to participate in information sessions provided by NYCDOE and/or Cambridge Education (Tripod Survey). The principal and these staff members are responsible for distributing the materials required to survey students. For paper administration, they will also collect and ship completed surveys. Cambridge Education also provides Helpdesk support to schools before, during, and after the survey administration which the NYCDOE may decide to use to support principals and teachers in this process. The details regarding administration protocols and scripts for survey deployment will be provided by Cambridge Education to the NYCDOE who will provide this information to principals. Students who are absent on the day the survey is administered will not re-take the survey at a later date and will not be counted in the teacher's results.

Teachers who teach self-contained classes (e.g., elementary teachers, special education teachers) will have all the students in their class surveyed. For special education, inclusion, ESL, etc. teachers, the principal shall schedule a time when all students taught by these teachers can complete the survey; however, students who are absent on the day the survey is administered will not re-take the survey at a later date and will not be counted in the teacher's results. For departmentalized teachers (e.g., middle and high school teachers, elementary PE and music teachers), designated classes of students will be surveyed with principals choosing at least two (2) class periods consisting of different students during which all students will complete the survey so that those surveyed are representative of the students the teacher is teaching. In all instances, the principal or his/her designee will determine the selection of the classes. There is a possibility that students may be selected to complete surveys on more than one teacher. Teachers of Kindergarten through Second Grade will not administer surveys to their students. All attempts at student confidentiality will be maintained: in no cases will a teacher with fewer than 10 students receive a student survey report back (note: teachers who teach multiple course sections with fewer than 10 students in each section will receive a student survey report back as long as they have more than 10 students who take the survey across course sections).

If there are extreme extenuating circumstances and a teacher does not have students taking the survey, then the teacher's entire 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent score will be based on observations only (such situations must be flagged to the principal's supervisor within 5 business days). Once all the surveys have been administered, the survey data will be scored using the process described below and will account for a maximum total of 5 HEDI points out of the 60 combined points allotted for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent.

PROTECTING STUDENT CONFIDENTIALITY

The surveys will be administered at the classroom level; therefore, individual student data will not be required. Each teacher will receive a survey packet. Each student is provided with a thick, "8-inch by 11-inch" envelope for their completed survey. Each envelope will then be sealed by the student.

Students will use the paper/pencil format for the surveys unless the Chancellor submits to the Commissioner a letter signed by the Chancellor and the president of the UFT by August 1st prior to each school year requesting to use a Web-based survey form. Paper and pencil surveys can be completed without any special equipment while online administration requires use of a computer lab or access to a Web-based survey form.

Length of survey

Usually, 30 minutes is more than ample time to complete the entire process for the comprehensive version of the survey at the secondary level, including material distribution and instructions. The elementary versions of the survey are shorter, thus reducing the amount of time required to complete the survey.

Identification/selection of school proctors

Principals, assistant principals, counselors, and paraprofessionals are all good candidates to serve as proctors for the survey. A clear protocol and script will be provided.

Coordination of survey administration

The principal and one or two school staff members (survey coordinators) will coordinate the survey administration. This group will have the chance to participate in information sessions provided by NYCDOE and/or Cambridge Education. The group's role is to distribute the required survey materials and to respond to teacher inquiries. For paper/pencil survey administrations, this survey team will also collect and ship completed surveys. Cambridge Education also provides Helpdesk support to schools before, during, and after the survey administration which the NYCDOE may elect to use and/or have principals and coordinators use.

Accommodations for students with special needs participating in the survey

Specific accommodations for students with special needs are determined at the school level. This includes utilizing a facilitator to read the items to the students, utilizing a scribe to record the answers for students, and splitting the survey administration into manageable sessions.

REPORTING

Once completed, paper surveys are shipped to the Tripod Survey facility for scanning. Analysis and reporting usually require a 4-6 week lag from survey completion to reporting. Principals must provide teachers with the results of their surveys (including a copy of the survey) no later than at the summative end of year conference.

SURVEY SCORING

The Tripod Project for School Improvement collects and reports on student perspectives about teaching and learning. Each survey that a student completes pertains to a particular classroom and is organized around the Tripod Seven Cs of effective teaching. Teachers will receive an overall, aggregated rating on the Seven C's which will translate into a 1-4 rating. This rating will count as 5 points of the overall 0-60 point Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent HEDI score beginning in the 2014-15 school year.

<i>Aggregate Seven Cs rating</i>	<i>100%-90%</i>	<i>89%- 75%</i>	<i>74% - 60%</i>	<i>59% - 40%</i>	<i>39% - 20%</i>	<i>19% - 0%</i>
HEDI Points	5	4	3	2	1	0

V. Scoring Process Summary

See Appendix: Final Summary Form for details on the scoring process for all teachers.

APPENDIX

Teacher Evaluation Selection Form

School Building(s) _____

Teacher _____

Grade Level(s) _____

Subject _____

School Principal/Administrator _____

School Year _____ - _____

Observation Option Selected (Option 1 (formal and informal) or Option 2 (informal only)): _____

Consent to video as an observational tool for: (check all which apply)

BOTH Formal Announced AND Informal Unannounced Classroom Observations

Formal Announced Classroom Observation ONLY

Informal Unannounced Short Classroom Observation ONLY

DO NOT CONSENT TO USE OF VIDEO

Teacher Signature

Date _____

School Administrator/Lead Evaluator Signature

Date _____

PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE FORM FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS (OPTIONAL)

Structured Review of Lesson Plan (*lesson plan must be submitted with this form*)

Teacher _____ Date _____

Grade Level(s) _____ Subject _____

Identify the standards to be taught and how they connect to other standards within or outside of the discipline. For teachers of grades/subjects without CCSS, how are you ensuring that you incorporate the CCSS in your lesson?

What do you expect the students to know and be able to do after the lesson?

How has student data (e.g., from Data Driven Instruction/Inquiry) informed your instruction, and how does this lesson specifically address the needs identified from a review of the data?

How will you know if students have achieved the instructional objective?

What changes or adjustments to the lesson will you need to make if students do not show evidence that they have mastered the sub-objectives?

Are there specific areas where you would like feedback?

Is there anything else you want me to be aware of before going to observe this lesson?

EVALUATOR FORM A

PRE-OBSERVATION AND/OR INITIAL PLANNING CONFERENCE ARTIFACT FORM

(Note: Up To Two Artifacts May Be Submitted)

Form A: Pre-Observation Conference Teacher Artifact Components**	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1c: Selecting instructional outcomes <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1e: Designing coherent instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1f: Designing student assessments <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4a: Reflecting on teaching <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4b: Maintaining accurate records <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

4c: Communicating with families <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4d: Participating in a professional community <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4e: Growing and developing professionally <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4f: Showing professionalism <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

**Teacher should have artifacts for these components which may or may not be directly observed during the Formal Announced Classroom Observation

Pre-Observation Conference and/or Initial Planning Conference Teacher Artifact Rubric Score:

Total # of points attained divided by # of possible points (please write n/a if no artifacts were submitted) = _____ (1-4 HEDI Score)

Example: a lesson plan and student data from the first round of a Data Driven Instruction cycle are submitted as two artifacts by the teacher. The teacher receives a score of 2 on the lesson plan and a score of 4 on their Data Driven Instruction cycle student data and records. The points from each artifact are added (2+4) and divided by the total number of possible points in this instance (6). This results in a teacher receiving a score of 3 for this form. For teachers who exercise the option to not submit artifacts, please notate n/a.

Additional Evaluator Notes (please attach more pages, as necessary):

Evaluator's signature _____ date _____

Teacher's signature _____ date _____

EVALUATOR FORM B (use as applicable)

FORMAL ANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Teacher _____

Date _____

Grade Level _____

Subject _____

Form B: Formal Announced Classroom Observation Components*	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1c: Selecting instructional outcomes <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1e: Designing coherent instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1f: Designing student assessments <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2b: Establishing a culture for learning <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

2c: Managing classroom procedures <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2d: Managing student behavior <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2e: Organizing physical space <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3a: Communicating with students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3c: Engaging students in learning <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3d: Using assessment in instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

4a: Reflecting on teaching <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4b: Maintaining accurate records <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4c: Communicating with families <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4d: Participating in a professional community <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4e: Growing and developing professionally <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4f: Showing Professionalism <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

**Note: The components in Domains 1 and 4 may or may not be readily observable during the formal observation. If you observe artifacts during the classroom observation they may also be scored here.*

Formal Announced Classroom Observation Rubric Score:

Total # of points attained divided by # of components observed = _____ (1-4 HEDI Score)

Evaluator Notes (please attach more pages, as necessary):

Evaluator's signature _____ date _____

Teacher's signature _____ date _____

EVALUATOR FORM C (use as applicable)

POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE TEACHER ARTIFACT FORM

(Note: Up To Two Artifacts May Be Submitted)

Form C: Post-Observation Conference Teacher Artifact Components*	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1c: Selecting instructional outcomes <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1e: Designing coherent instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1f: Designing student assessments <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4a: Reflecting on teaching <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4b: Maintaining accurate records <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

4c: Communicating with families <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4d: Participating in a professional community <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4e: Growing and developing professionally <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4f: Showing professionalism <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

*Teacher should have artifacts for these components which may or may not be directly observed during the Formal Announced Classroom Observation

Post-Observation Conference Teacher Artifact Rubric Score:

Total # of points attained divided by # of possible points (please write n/a if no artifacts were submitted) = _____ (1-4 HEDI Score)

Example: a lesson plan and student data from the first round of a Data Driven Instruction cycle are submitted as two artifacts by the teacher. The teacher receives a score of 2 on the lesson plan and a score of 4 on their Data Driven Instruction cycle student data and records. The points from each artifact are added (2+4) and divided by the total number of possible points in this instance (6). This results in a teacher receiving a score of 3 for this form. For teachers who exercise the option to not submit artifacts, please notate n/a.

Additional Evaluator Notes (please attach more pages, as necessary):

Evaluator's signature _____ date _____

Teacher's signature _____ date _____

EVALUATOR FORM OPTION 1D (use as applicable)

INFORMAL/SHORT UNANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Subject or Level: _____ Time: _____

Form 1D: Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation Components	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2b: Establishing a culture for learning <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2c: Managing classroom procedures <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2d: Managing student behavior <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2e: Organizing physical space <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3a: Communicating with students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3c: Engaging students in learning <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3d: Using assessment in instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation Rubric Score

Total # of points attained divided by # of components observed = _____ (1-4 HEDI Score)

Evaluator Notes (please attach more pages, as necessary):

Evaluator's signature _____ date _____

Teacher's signature _____ date _____

EVALUATOR FORM OPTION 2D (use as applicable)

INFORMAL/SHORT UNANNOUNCED CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Subject or Level: _____ Time: _____

Form 2D: Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation Components*	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1c: Selecting instructional outcomes <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1e: Designing coherent instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1f: Designing student assessments <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2b: Establishing a culture for learning <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

2c: Managing classroom procedures <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2d: Managing student behavior <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
2e: Organizing physical space <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3a: Communicating with students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3c: Engaging students in learning <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3d: Using assessment in instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

4a: Reflecting on teaching <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4b: Maintaining accurate records <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4c: Communicating with families <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4d: Participating in a professional community <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4e: Growing and developing professionally <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4f: Showing Professionalism <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

* Note: The components in Domains 1 and 4 may or may not be readily observable during the informal/short observation. If you observe artifacts during the classroom observation they may also be scored here.

Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation Rubric Score

Total # of points attained divided by # of components observed = _____ (1-4 HEDI Score)

Evaluator Notes (please attach more pages, as necessary):

Evaluator's signature _____ date _____

Teacher's signature _____ date _____

EVALUATOR FORM E

END OF YEAR TEACHER ARTIFACTS

(Note: Submit the Number of Artifacts That Would Total No More Than Eight Artifacts Overall)

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Subject or Level: _____ Time: _____

Form E: End Of Year Teacher Artifact Components*	Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1c: Selecting instructional outcomes <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1e: Designing coherent instruction <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
1f: Designing student assessments <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4a: Reflecting on teaching <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

4b: Maintaining accurate records <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4c: Communicating with families <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4d: Participating in a professional community <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4e: Growing and developing professionally <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4
4f: Showing professionalism <i>Rationale for component score:</i>	1	2	3	4

**Note: Teacher should have artifacts for these components which may or may not be directly observed during the course of observations conducted during the school year.*

End of Year Teacher Artifacts

Total # of points attained divided by # of possible points = _____ (1-4 HEDI Score)

Example: a lesson plan and student data from the first round of a Data Driven Instruction cycle are submitted as two artifacts by the teacher. The teacher receives a score of 2 on the lesson plan and a score of 4 on their Data Driven Instruction cycle student data and records. The points from each artifact are added (2+4) and divided by the total number of possible points in this instance (6). This results in a teacher receiving a score of 3 for this form. For teachers who exercise the option to not submit artifacts, please notate n/a.

Evaluator Notes (please attach more pages, as necessary):

Evaluator's signature _____ date _____

Teacher's signature _____ date _____

FINAL SUMMARY FORM

OVERALL 0-60 HEDI SCORING SHEET

Name of Teacher: _____ School/Building: _____

Tenured: Yes No

Probationary Period: (From) ____/____/____ (To) ____/____/____

Option 1: 75% Domains 2 and 3, 25% Domains 1 and 4

Formal Observation: Scored on all 22 components (each of the 4 Domains scored: Domain 1 10%, Domain 2 12.5%, Domain 3 12.5%, Domain 4 10%) - 45% of total points for observations

- Minimum of 1
- If more than 1, scores from each individual observation averaged across the total number conducted

Informal observations: Domains 2 and 3 only - 50% of total points for observations

- Minimum of 3, scores from each individual observation averaged across the total number conducted
- If more than 3, scores from each individual observation averaged across the total number conducted

Artifacts for Domains 1 and 4 (Initial Planning Conference, Pre- and/or Post-Observation Conference, Summative End of Year Conference) - 5% of total points for observations

Option 2: 75% Domains 2 and 3, 25% Domains 1 and 4

Informal observations: Scored on all 22 components (Domains 2 & 3: 75%, Domains 1 & 4: 20%) - 95% of total points for observations

- Minimum of 6, scores from each individual observation averaged across the total number conducted
- If more than 6, scores from each individual observation averaged across the total number conducted

Artifacts for Domains 1 and 4 (Initial Planning Conference, Summative End of Year Conference): 5% of total points for observations

See Conversion Chart for

Assign a Final Teacher Effectiveness HEDI rating to the Teacher based Directions Above

Final Teacher Effectiveness HEDI rating

HE	E	D	I
-----------	----------	----------	----------

(mark X on applicable Final HEDI rating)

Additional Scoring Step 1 (for use in 2014-15 and beyond): [Only for teachers of grades 3-12] Determine how many points from 0-5 will be awarded to the teacher based on their student survey results administered during the school year.

HEDI score for the Student Surveys Form (conversion chart below) = _____ (0-5 HEDI points)

Additional Scoring Step 2 (for use in 2014-15 and beyond): [Only for teachers of grades 3-12]
Weight the 0-60 HEDI Points from Option 1/Option 2 end of year results at 92% to result in a weighted 0-60 HEDI point score.

= _____ (0-60 HEDI points)

Additional Scoring Step 3 (for use in 2014-15 and beyond): [Only for teachers of grades 3-12]:
Add 0-5 points from the survey results (step 4) to the weighted HEDI points (step 2).

_____ + _____ = _____ (0-60 HEDI points)

Additional Scoring Step 4 (for use in 2014-15 and beyond): Assign a Final Teacher Effectiveness HEDI rating to the Teacher based on Step 3 (K-2 teachers)

Final Teacher Effectiveness HEDI rating

HE	E	D	I
----	---	---	---

(mark X on applicable Final HEDI rating)

SUMMARY

0-60 HEDI SCORE: _____

Teacher Effectiveness Rating: _____

Teacher's signature _____ date _____

Evaluator's signature _____ date _____

CONVERSION CHART

Commissioner Imposed Scoring Ranges

I	0-38	1.00-1.75
D	39-44	1.76-2.50
E	45-54	2.51-3.25
H	55-60	3.26-4.00

	Min	Max
0	1	1
1	1.01	1.01
2	1.02	1.03
3	1.04	1.05
4	1.06	1.07
5	1.08	1.09
6	1.1	1.11
7	1.12	1.13
8	1.14	1.15
9	1.16	1.17
10	1.18	1.19
11	1.2	1.21
12	1.22	1.23
13	1.24	1.25
14	1.26	1.27
15	1.28	1.29
16	1.3	1.31
17	1.32	1.33
18	1.34	1.35
19	1.36	1.37
20	1.38	1.39
21	1.4	1.41
22	1.42	1.43
23	1.44	1.45
24	1.46	1.47
25	1.48	1.49
26	1.5	1.51
27	1.52	1.53
28	1.54	1.55
29	1.56	1.57
30	1.58	1.59
31	1.6	1.61

32	1.62	1.63
33	1.64	1.65
34	1.66	1.67
35	1.68	1.69
36	1.7	1.71
37	1.72	1.73
38	1.74	1.75
39	1.76	1.87
40	1.88	1.99
41	2	2.11
42	2.12	2.24
43	2.25	2.37
44	2.38	2.5
45	2.51	2.57
46	2.58	2.64
47	2.65	2.71
48	2.72	2.78
49	2.79	2.85
50	2.86	2.93
51	2.94	3.01
52	3.02	3.09
53	3.1	3.17
54	3.18	3.25
55	3.26	3.37
56	3.38	3.49
57	3.5	3.61
58	3.62	3.74
59	3.75	3.87
60	3.88	4

SURVEY SCORING (2014-15 and Beyond)

Beginning in 2014-15 and beyond, teachers will receive an overall, aggregated rating on the Seven C's which will translate into a 1-4 rating. This rating will count as 5 points of the overall 0-60 point Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent HEDI score.

<i>Aggregate Seven Cs rating</i>	<i>100%-90%</i>	<i>89%- 75%</i>	<i>74% - 60%</i>	<i>59% - 40%</i>	<i>39% - 20%</i>	<i>19% - 0%</i>
HEDI Points	5	4	3	2	1	0

SAMPLE LIST OF ARTIFACTS FOR TEACHER’S COLLECTION

Alignment to Domains 1 and 4: This list includes, but is not limited to, teacher and student artifacts that may be used to document skill in one or more components from Domains 1 and 4.

ARTIFACT	COMPONENTS
Unit plan with all component parts (essential questions, skills/knowledge, assessments, aligned lessons)	1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f
Lesson or unit plan that shows teacher adapted instruction to address student needs (demonstrates differentiated instructional strategies)	1b, 1c
Technology-infused learning designs resulting in depth of student engagement and original student product	1d
Teacher created assessments (formative or summative)	1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 1f
Student achievement data	1b, 1f, 4b
Parent, student surveys	1b, 4c
Analysis of student work	1f
Video or audio of student performance assessment	1f
Student behavioral plan	4b
Classroom management plan and procedures	4b
Reflection Journal	4a
Back to school night, open house agendas	4c
Evidence of attendance and active participation in local, state or national professional organizations	4d, 4e
Evidence of a leadership role in at least one aspect of school life	4d, 4e
Curriculum leadership evidenced by participation in teacher team and/or grade level planning meetings	1a, 4d, 4e
Hosting a student teacher	1a, 1b, 4d, 4e
Regular teacher participation in and support of school and community initiatives	4d, 4e
Evidence of attendance and participation in professional development sessions focused on Data Driven Instruction, Common Core State Standards, and/or components of the APPR system	4e
Team action planning template that includes thoughtful, rich discussion of data, targeted, measurable achievement goal, action steps targeting leverage points	4d, 4e, 4f
Documented communication with: counselors, health professionals, other staff members, parents, community support agencies	4c, 4f

DEFINITIONS

As used in this plan:

- A. The term “teacher” refers to only those teachers to whom this plan applies, in accordance with Education Law §3012-c and as outlined in this plan.
- B. The term “evaluator” shall mean any District Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Principal, or Assistant Principal (or other trained administrator) of the observed teachers’ school who has received the requisite training to properly observe and evaluate teachers in accordance with Education Law §3012-c and as outlined in this plan.
- C. The term “lead evaluator” shall mean any authorized District Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Principal, or Assistant Principal (or other trained administrator) of the observed teachers’ school who has received the requisite training to properly observe, evaluate, and/or score the teacher’s Final Composite APPR Rating in accordance with Education Law §3012-c and as outlined in this plan.
- D. The terms “Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition),” “Danielson 2013 Rubric,” “rubric,” and “Danielson Rubric” are used interchangeably and shall all refer to the Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition) rubric utilized in evaluating teachers.
- E. The term “Domain(s)” shall mean any or all of the four (4) major framework categories outlined in the Danielson 2013 Rubric for which the teacher will be evaluated and scored. The four (4) Domains are as follows:
 - Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation
 - Domain 2 - The Classroom Environment
 - Domain 3 - Instruction
 - Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities
- F. The term “components” refers to the 22 specific categories as outlined in the four (4) Domains of Danielson’s Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition).
- G. The term “component score” or “component rating” shall mean the 1-4 HEDI score of each component within the four (4) Domains of the Danielson Rubric received based on the observations and teacher artifacts observed or submitted to the evaluator.
- H. The term “normal school day hours” shall mean the timeframe between the start and end of a typical school day in which students attend their first class and the time in which the last class concludes.
- I. The “initial planning conference” shall be defined as an individual face-to-face conversation between the teacher and evaluator conducted at a mutually agreed upon time no later than the last Friday of October of the current school year. The purpose of the initial development conference is to outline the teacher’s goals for the school year and to outline a plan in which the teacher will be evaluated throughout the school year. Additionally, the teacher and evaluator will discuss which observation option the teacher has chosen under which to be evaluated as described herein. In addition, the evaluator and teacher will discuss the components to be evaluated and scored as outlined in the attached Evaluator Form B: Formal Announced Classroom Observation and address any questions and/or concerns the teacher may have.

- J. The “summative end of year conference” shall be defined as a face-to-face conversation between the teacher and evaluator conducted between the last Friday of April and no later than the last Friday of June on which school is in session. The purpose of the summative end of year conference shall be for the teacher and his/her building principal and/or another trained administrator to have a conversation regarding the classroom observations and scored evaluations conducted throughout the year. Additionally, the summative end of year conference provides the teacher an opportunity to present, explain, and answer any questions the evaluator may have regarding their submitted teacher artifacts. The use of the Danielson’s 2013 Rubric shall provide the platform in which a meaningful discussion can take place identifying areas of improvement observed throughout the school year and what next steps should be taken for future growth.
- K. The “Formal Announced Classroom Observation Evaluation Process,” “Formal Evaluation process,” or any variation thereof shall be defined as the three-tiered evaluation process conducted by an evaluator of a teacher consisting of a pre-observation conference, formal announced classroom observation, and a post-observation conference between the evaluator and teacher.
- L. The “Pre-Observation Conference Form for Classroom Teachers” shall be defined as the optional document a teacher may submit to the evaluator no later than 24 hours prior to the scheduled pre-observation conference. The purpose of the Pre-Observation Conference Form for classroom teachers is to provide a basis for discussion as to what the content, goals, expectations of students, anticipated instructional outcomes, and other pertinent information pertaining to the lesson the evaluator will observe during the formal announced classroom observation. As such, a lesson plan must be attached and submitted to this form if the teacher elects to use this.
- M. The “Pre-Observation Conference” shall be defined as a conversation between the teacher and evaluator, the purpose of which is to discuss the lesson focus, activities, and expectations prior to the formal announced classroom observation being performed. In addition, the evaluator will discuss with the teacher the specific components within the Danielson 2013 Rubric to be evaluated and scored as outlined in the attached Evaluator Form B: Formal Announced Classroom Observation. The evaluator shall address any questions and/or concerns the teacher may have and both shall agree on a time and date on which the formal announced classroom observation is to take place. During the pre-observation conference and using the Pre-Observation Conference Form (as applicable), the evaluator will take and maintain all relevant notes and communications between the evaluator and teacher. Additionally, the post-observation conference will provide an opportunity for the teacher to submit up to two (2) teacher artifacts in support of the Danielson 2013 Rubric components identified in Evaluator Form A: Pre-Observation Conference/Teacher Artifacts. These artifacts will align with the indicators identified in the Danielson 2013 Rubric and will coincide with the specific Danielson 2013 Rubric components outlined in Evaluator Form A: Pre-Observation Conference/Teacher Artifacts attached to this document.
- N. The “Formal Announced Classroom Observation” shall be conducted following the pre-observation conference and is defined as the formal classroom observation an evaluator performs at a mutually agreed upon date and time of a teacher after the initial planning conference and no later than the last Friday in May. The evaluator will utilize Evaluator Form B: Formal Announced Classroom Observation for the formal announced classroom observation.
- O. The “Post-Observation Conference” shall be defined as a meeting between the teacher and evaluator during which the parties will reflect upon the teacher’s performance during the formal announced classroom observation, discuss student work and learning outcomes, and guide future teaching practice. The post-observation conference will provide an opportunity to discuss any evidence obtained during the formal announced classroom observation using a dialogue which incorporates the Danielson 2013

Rubric as a framework for the conversation. The post-observation conference shall be used to discuss the teacher's progress, prioritize areas in need of further development, and discuss agreed upon concrete next steps to ensure the teacher has the opportunity to continuously improve and develop. Additionally, the post-observation conference will provide an opportunity for a teacher to submit up to two additional teacher artifacts in support of the Danielson 2013 Rubric components identified in Evaluator Form C: Post Observation Conference/Teacher Artifacts. These artifacts will align with the indicators identified in the Danielson 2013 Rubric and coincide with the specific Danielson 2013 Rubric components outlined in Form C attached to this document.

- P. The "Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation," "Informal Observation," or any variation thereof shall be defined as an informal classroom observation an evaluator performs lasting a minimum of 15 minutes and without prior notification to the teacher. The evaluator will utilize the applicable Evaluator Form 1D/2D: Informal/Short Unannounced Classroom Observation for each informal/short unannounced classroom observation.
- Q. The "Final Summary Form" shall be defined as the document the principal or his/her designee completes once all formal and/or informal evaluations have been completed for the teacher, and – as applicable – survey scores and HEDI points have been calculated. The Final Summary Form shall provide the overall final 0-60 HEDI point score for the teacher for the Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent.
- R. The term "low-inference notes" shall be defined as the notes of any evaluator taken during any formal or informal classroom observation or formative observation. Any notes that are not explicitly labeled as "Observation Report" will be deemed low-inference notes. Low-inference notes are the sole property of the evaluator and do not constitute a record, formal or informal, of the teacher observation process and therefore will not be included within a teacher's file. Evaluators are not required to submit low-inference notes to a teacher.
- S. The term "Observation Report" shall be defined as all completed rubrics with evidence statements for any formal/informal observations- must be shown to the teacher at the post-observation conference and at the summative end of the year conference, as applicable, so that the teachers are able to keep a record of their own progress and development needs. These forms should be the starting point for a meaningful discussion about the improvement of a teacher's instructional practices. Any other documentation that is not recorded on the "Observation Report" forms contained herein or a part of the "Observation Report" narrative, does not constitute an official record of the teacher observation process and will not be included in the documents available for review by the requesting teacher or placed within their file.
- T. For informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE's proposal, "the principal shall provide feedback to the teacher through an in-person conversation, in writing, via email or through any other form of communication." In addition, for informal observations, consistent with NYCDOE's proposal, "observation reports must be provided to the teacher and placed in the file within 90 school days of the observation. A teacher's absences shall not count toward the 90-day time frame."
- U. The term "teacher artifacts" shall mean any tangible evidence a teacher has gathered over the course of the current school year for which they are being evaluated illustrative of the teacher's best teaching practices and used as evidentiary support to warrant a 1-4 HEDI score within the identified components of Domains 1 and 4 of Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013 Revised Edition) as outlined in the attached Forms A, C, and E. Additionally, a non-exhaustive list of teacher artifacts that a teacher may submit during the pre- and post-observation conferences as well as at a summative end-of-the-year collection of teacher artifacts has been incorporated into this document. The sample list of artifacts shall

only be intended to provide teachers with examples of possible artifacts which may be submitted and are not intended to be inclusive.

- V. The terms “Tripod Student Perception Survey,” “Tripod Survey,” “Student Survey,” or any variation thereof shall mean the applicable Student Perception Survey administered to students for which the teacher has been designated as the teacher of record. The two (2) surveys administered will be the Tripod Elementary Student Perception Survey for teachers of grades 3-5 and the Tripod Secondary Student Perception Survey for teachers of grades 6-12. For the 2013-14 school year only, teachers of grades 3-12 will use the grade appropriate Tripod Student Perception Survey for formative purposes only. For the subsequent school years, the results of the surveys will be incorporated into the overall final Other Measures of Effectiveness 0-60 HEDI score using the methodology described herein.
- W. The terms “Final Composite APPR Rating,” “Overall APPR Composite Score,” or any variation thereof shall mean the final score a teacher will receive based on the composite scores of the three (3) components (State, Local, Other Measures of Effectiveness) of which the APPR encompasses.
- X. The term “HEDI” shall be defined as the abbreviation for the four performance rating categories (Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective) established by the Commissioner of the New York State Education Department.
- Y. The terms “Overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness subcomponent HEDI score,” “0-60 HEDI Score,” or any variation thereof shall be defined as the culminating final HEDI score a teacher shall receive after the formal announced and/or informal unannounced evaluations including all required documents, forms, and artifacts/evidence have been evaluated and scored by the evaluator(s). The overall 0-60 Other Measures of Effectiveness HEDI score shall be calculated by the principal or his/her designee using the Final Summary Form attached.
- Z. The terms “1-4 HEDI score,” “1-4 HEDI rating,” “1-4 scale,” or any variation thereof shall mean numerical value a teacher receives based on the evaluator(s) scoring of the components within each of the four (4) Danielson Domains. The 1-4 HEDI score represents the numerical value associated with the four (4) performance rating categories (Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective) established by the Commissioner of the New York State Education Department.
- AA. The terms “Overall 1-4 Domain HEDI score,” “Domain Score,” “1-4 Domain Rating,” or any variation thereof shall be defined as the numerical value of 1-4 (corresponds to the four (4) performance rating categories) given to a specific Domain within the rubric once all the components in a given Domain have been scored on a 1-4 HEDI scale and averaged together applying conventional rounding rules to the nearest hundredths place.

Task 5 – Composite Scoring Teachers

Please note: If any educator is rated Ineffective in both the State growth or other comparable measures and locally selected measures subcomponents, he/she must be rated Ineffective overall in accordance with the legislative intent of Education Law §3012-c. In addition, the composite scoring ranges prescribed in Education Law §3012-c(2)(a) for the 2012-2013 school year remain in effect in the Commissioner’s imposed cut scores.

<u>Commissioner Imposed Cut Scores</u>				
<u>Where there is no Approved Value-Added Measure of Student Growth</u>	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	<u>Overall Composite Score</u>
	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>60</u>	
Ineffective	0-12	0-12	0-38	0-64
Developing	13-14	13-14	39-44	65-74
Effective	15-17	15-17	45-54	75-90
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	55-60	91-100

<u>Commissioner Imposed Cut Scores</u>				
<u>Where there is an Approved Value-Added Measure of Student Growth</u>	Growth or Comparable Measures	Locally-selected Measures of growth or achievement	Other Measures of Effectiveness (60 points)	<u>Overall Composite Score</u>
	<u>25</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>60</u>	
Ineffective	0-15	0-9	0-38	0-64
Developing	16-18	10-11	39-44	65-74
Effective	19-22	12-13	45-54	75-90
Highly Effective	23-25	14-15	55-60	91-100

Task 6 - Teacher Improvement Plan

Section 1: Statutory Authority and Purpose

A teacher improvement plan (TIP) is required to be developed and implemented for teachers rated “developing” or “ineffective” through the annual professional performance review (APPR) process conducted pursuant to Education Law §3012-c and Subpart 30-2.10 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. Such TIP must be developed and implemented as soon as possible, but no later than ten (10) school days after the opening of classes in the school year following the school year in which the teacher was rated either “developing” or “ineffective.”

The purpose of a TIP is to assist teachers to work to their fullest potential. The TIP provides assistance and feedback to the teacher and establishes a timeline for assessing its overall effectiveness. The TIP should in no way be construed as disciplinary in nature and should be seen by all parties involved as a way to improve educator effectiveness through professional development.

Section 2: Teacher Improvement Plan Process

Upon a final composite score rating of “developing” or “ineffective,” a meeting shall be scheduled between the teacher and his/her supervisor to develop and implement the TIP with the foci of the meeting being the following: (1) areas in need of improvement; (2) where appropriate, differentiated activities to improve upon these areas; (3) a timeline for achieving the improvement; and (4) the manner(s) in which the improvement will be assessed.

For teachers rated ineffective, to the extent practicable, the teachers shall have an in-person meeting with their supervisor within ten (10) school days, and in no case will this meeting occur later than 10 additional school days.

At the TIP meeting between the teacher and his/her supervisor, it is the responsibility of the supervisor to outline for the teacher the areas in which the supervisor determines are the areas in need of improvement. This outline should be created utilizing as much evidence as possible including, but not limited to, the substance of the teacher’s ratings in each of the three subcomponents (State growth or other comparable measures, locally-selected measures, other measures of effectiveness) of the annual professional performance review (APPR). The teacher is encouraged but not required to create a similar outline based on the evidence referenced above and the feedback received from the supervisor during post-visit conferences to be used as a way of facilitating discussion between the teacher and his/her supervisor during the development and implementation process of the TIP.

In the event the teacher and his/her supervisor cannot come to an agreement on the content of the TIP, the final decision will rest with the supervisor as to the content of the TIP.

The final piece of the TIP meeting shall include a discussion on the manner in which improvement will be assessed. This shall include scheduling a minimum of three (3) meeting dates mutually agreed upon by the teacher and his/her supervisor within the timeframes set forth below. If the teacher and his/her supervisor are unable to come to agreement on when to meet, the final decision will rest with the supervisor. However, in such instances where the teacher is required to meet outside of normal school day hours, it shall be the responsibility of the district to adequately compensate the teacher for the excess work time.

The focus of this portion of the TIP meeting shall be to discuss how the teacher's performance on the previously outlined activities for achieving improvement will be assessed. This should be a collaborative discussion between the teacher and his/her supervisor. However, in the event the teacher and his/her supervisor cannot come to an agreement on the manner in which improvement will be assessed, the final decision will rest with the supervisor.

TIP Meetings:

Meeting #1: To occur in the same meeting as the initial planning conference

Meeting #2: January 2 – April 30

Meeting #3: To occur in the same meeting as the summative end of year conference

At each one of the scheduled meetings, the teacher is responsible for presenting evidence to his/her supervisor that demonstrates the progress the teacher has made/is making towards achieving improvement on the outlined activities. The evidence may include, but shall not be limited to, teacher artifacts that demonstrate progress towards or completion of, the activities selected for improvement. Upon demonstration of progress satisfactory to the supervisor, using a reasonable prudent person standard, the supervisor will inform the teacher through verbal and written communication that said activity has been successfully completed. It shall be the responsibility of the supervisor to document the completion of each activity for improvement on the TIP form and maintain the documentation in a manner that is accessible to both the supervisor and the teacher.

Upon successful completion of all activities outlined for improvement, and upon conclusion of the final meeting between the teacher and his/her supervisor, the TIP shall be deemed complete.

Section 3: Miscellaneous Processes

In the event that a teacher is unable to successfully satisfy all identified activities for improvement, as outlined in the TIP, prior to the conclusion of the final meeting, the purpose of the final meeting will shift to a discussion on the reasons for non-completion of the activities outlined in the TIP, where the teacher could improve his/her performance, and possible professional development opportunities that the teacher may wish to engage in over the summer recess period to improve his/her performance.

In the event that a teacher successfully completes all activities for improvement outlined in his/her TIP prior to the final meeting date, each subsequent meeting between the teacher and his/her supervisor will serve as a way to identify opportunities to further improve on the teacher's performance. This may include, but is not required to include, adding additional activities that the supervisor and teacher, working in collaboration, feel would benefit the teacher in his/her professional development. This process should mimic the activities process outlined above with the caveat that adding more activities is not necessary, but highly recommended.

For instances in which a teacher has appealed his/her final composite score rating of "developing" or "ineffective," in accordance with the appeals procedures outlined in Task 6.3 of the APPR plan and Education Law §3012-c(5-a), the TIP process outlined above will continue as scheduled (i.e., a TIP must still be developed and implemented). If the final resolution of the teacher's appeal results in the final composite score rating being modified to no longer encompass a rating of "developing" or "ineffective," at that juncture, the TIP will be deemed abandoned and the teacher and supervisor are excused from their responsibilities under the improvement plan process and the improvement plan shall be expunged from the teacher's record. If, however, the teacher wishes to continue the improvement plan, for any reason, the improvement plan process outlined above will remain in effect and the parties will continue with their respective responsibilities under the improvement plan process.

It shall be the responsibility of the supervisor, or his/her designee, to maintain copies of all documents used in the development and implementation of the TIP process while the plan is in progress.

It is the responsibility of the supervisor, or his/her designee, upon completion of the TIP process, to place copies of all documents used in the development and implementation of the TIP in the teacher's personnel file. This shall be completed within ten (10) school days of the completion of the TIP process.

Section 4: Definitions

For purposes of the Teacher Improvement Plan, the following definitions shall be applicable:

- A. "Developed" shall mean created collaboratively between the teacher and the teacher's supervisor.
- B. "Implemented" shall mean placed into effect. This will be the date that the TIP begins.
- C. "School days" shall mean those days in which school is in session.
- D. "Opening of classes" shall mean the first day of the school year in which students are required to report to classes.
- E. "Final Composite Score" shall mean a teacher's APPR rating that is reported to the State as required by §30-2.3(b) of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- F. "Teacher" shall mean the individual who has received a final composite score rating of "developing" or "ineffective."
- G. "Supervisor" shall mean the individual primarily responsible for conducting observations with the teacher as part of the "other measures" subcomponent. If said individual is unavailable, the Superintendent of Schools or his/her designee will be deemed to be the teacher's supervisor for purposes of this section.
- H. "Outline" shall mean a description of the areas in greatest need of improvement with sufficient detail that both the teacher and supervisor are able to easily comprehend what was intended.
- I. "Areas for improvement" shall mean those areas of a teacher's performance that, if improved upon, will have the greatest impact on student learning, educator effectiveness, and ultimately a teacher's APPR rating.
- J. "Action steps/activities" shall mean the specific recommendations for what the teacher is expected to do to improve in the identified areas for improvement. This shall include specific, realistic, achievable activities for the teacher.
- K. "Differentiation of activities to support improvement" shall mean specific practices or professional learning activities designed to aid and assist in the professional development of a teacher who has been rated "developing" or "ineffective" on their APPR. These activities should be directly connected to those areas of the teacher's performance in greatest need of improvement.

- L. "Timeline for completion" shall mean specific dates, or date ranges, in which the achievement of specific standards-based goals are, or should be, completed by. This shall also include any intermediary steps necessary to achieve the outlined improvement areas.
- M. "Assessment of improvement" shall mean the evidence by which achievement of specific standards-based goals is measured in order to determine if adequate improvement has been made in the outlined areas in need of improvement. "Adequate" improvement shall be judged by a reasonable prudent person standard.
- N. "Reasonable" shall mean and shall be judged by a reasonable prudent person standard.
- O. "Adequately compensate" shall mean pay or other form of benefit judged to be reasonable, based on a reasonable prudent person standard.
- P. "Normal school day hours" shall mean the timeframe between the start and end of a typical school day in which students attend their first class and the time in which the last class concludes.
- Q. "Designee" shall mean an individual selected to serve in the stead of the individual to whom authority was granted.
- R. "Completion of the TIP Process" shall mean the time period immediately following the conclusion of the final meeting between the teacher and his/her supervisor.

Annual Professional Performance Review
Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Name of Teacher: _____ School/Building: _____

Tenured: Yes No Probationary Period: (From) ____/____/____ (To) ____/____/____

TIP Timeline: (From) ____/____/____ (To) ____/____/____ Scheduled Meeting Dates: _____

Areas for Improvement: Identify specific areas in need of improvement.

Action Steps/Activities: Identify specific recommendations for what the teacher is expected to do to improve in the identified areas. Delineate specific, realistic, achievable activities for the teacher.

Timeline for Completion: Identify a timeline for achieving the action steps/activities.

Differentiation of Activities to Support Improvement: Identify specific resources and support systems available to assist the teacher to improve performance (e.g., professional development, peer visits, content area specialists, materials, etc.).

Assessment of Improvement: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify next steps to be taken based upon whether the teacher is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful in efforts to improve performance.

Signature of Principal

_____/____/____
Date

Signature of Teacher

_____/____/____
Date

Table of Contents Principals

Task 7 State Growth or Other Comparable Measures	85
Task 8 Locally Selected Measures.....	34
Task 9 - Other Measures Of Effectiveness	37
Task 10 – Composite Scoring Teachers.....	77
Task 11 - Teacher Improvement Plan.....	78

Task 7 – State Growth of Other Comparable Measures

HEDI Score Conversion Chart 5

State growth or other comparable measures subcomponent for principals (20 points)

DOE-CSA Jointly Recommended

Scoring Ranges

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points	
0.0 to 0.3	Ineffective	0	
0.4 to 0.7		1	
0.8 to 1.0		2	
1.1 to 1.4		3	
1.5 to 1.8		4	
1.9 to 2.2		5	
2.3 to 2.5		6	
2.6 to 2.9	Developing	7	
3.0 to 6.4		8	
6.5 to 9.9		9	
10.0 to 20.5	Effective	10	
20.6 to 31.1		11	
31.2 to 41.7		12	
41.8 to 52.3		13	
52.4 to 62.9		14	
63.0 to 69.1		Highly Effective	15
69.2 to 75.2			16
75.3 to 81.4	17		
81.5 to 87.6	18		
87.7 to 93.7	19		
93.8 to 100.0		20	

Commissioner Imposed Scoring Ranges

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.1	Ineffective	0
0.2 to 0.4		1
0.5 to 0.6	Developing	2
0.7 to 0.8		3
0.9 to 1.1		4
1.2 to 1.3	Effective	5
1.4 to 1.5		6

1.6 to 1.7		7
1.8 to 2.0		8
2.1 to 2.2		9
2.3 to 2.4		10
2.5 to 2.7		11
2.8 to 2.9		12
3.0 to 6.4	Developing	13
6.5 to 9.9		14
10.0 to 27.6	Effective	15
27.7 to 45.2		16
45.3 to 62.9		17
63.0 to 75.2	Highly Effective	18
75.3 to 87.6		19
87.7 to 100.0		20

Task 8 – Locally Selected Measures

ATTACHMENT 8.1

Locally-selected measures subcomponent for principals with an approved value-added measure

School Type	Metric	% of Local Measures	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approve Measures	Demographic Controls
Elementary/Middle/K-8	Student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and Math in Grades 3-8	65%	(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming math and English proficiency of students entering the school (middle) Disability status (elementary/middle/K-8) Economic status (HRA-eligible, temporary housing, free lunch-eligible) (elementary/middle/K-8) English language learner status (elementary/K-8)
	Student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level - Growth of all students	17.5%	(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming math and English proficiency of students entering the school (middle) Disability status (elementary/middle/K-8) Economic status (HRA-eligible, temporary housing, free lunch-eligible) (elementary/middle/K-8) English language learner status (elementary/K-8)
	Student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level - Growth of students in the school's lowest third	17.5%	(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming math and English proficiency of students entering the school (middle) Disability status (elementary/middle/K-8) Economic status (HRA-eligible, temporary housing, free lunch-eligible) (elementary/middle/K-8) English language learner status (elementary/K-8)
High School/Transfer School	Four, five and/or six-year high school graduation and/or dropout rate	65%	(e) 4, 5, and/or 6-year high school grad and/or dropout rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming math and English proficiency of students entering the school Disability status Overage and under-credited status
	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	35%	(h) students' progress toward graduation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming math and English proficiency of students entering the school Disability status Overage and under-credited status
District 75 schools (schools	Student achievement levels on State	65%	(d) student	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability status

exclusively serving students with disabilities) with at least 30% of students taking standard State ELA and Math assessments	assessments in ELA and Math in Grades 3-8 and NYSAA		performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures	
	Student growth or achievement on State assessments in ELA and Math in Grades 4-8 for students in each specific performance level - <i>Growth of all students</i>	35%	(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability status

Locally-selected measures subcomponent for principals without an approved value-added measure

School Type	Metric	% of Local Measures	Locally-Selected Measure from List of Approve Measures	Demographic Controls
Early Childhood (without grade 3)	CSA and Doe will come to a mutual agreement, if no agreement is reached by August 1, then the default is NYCDOE-developed performance assessments in ELA and Math	100%	(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming math and English proficiency of students entering the school (middle) Disability status (elementary/middle/K-8) Economic status (HRA-eligible, temporary housing, free lunch-eligible) (elementary/middle/K-8) English language learner status (elementary/K-8)
Early Childhood (with grade 3)	Student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and Math in Grade 3	100%	(d) student performance on any or all of the district-wide locally selected measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incoming math and English proficiency of students entering the school (middle) Disability status (elementary/middle/K-8) Economic status (HRA-eligible, temporary housing, free lunch-eligible) (elementary/middle/K-8) English language learner status (elementary/K-8)
District 75 schools (schools exclusively serving students with disabilities) with >45 students taking NYSAA or <30% taking standard assessments	Student achievement levels on State assessments in ELA and Math in Grades 3-8 and NYSAA	100%	(a) student achievement levels on State assessments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability status
District 75 schools (schools exclusively serving students with disabilities) with >45 students taking Regents	Percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores on Regents examinations and/or Department approved alternative examinations for principals employed in a school with high school grades	100%	(g) percentage of a cohort of students that achieve specified scores	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability status

HEDI Score Conversion Chart 6

Local measures for principals with value-added (15 points)

D75/ES/MS/K-8

DOE-CSA Jointly Recommended

Scoring Ranges

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.4	Ineffective	0
0.5 to 0.9		1
1.0 to 1.4		2
1.5 to 1.9		3
2.0 to 2.4		4
2.5 to 2.9	5	
3.0 to 5.2	Developing	6
5.3 to 7.6		7
7.7 to 9.9		8
10.0 to 27.6	Effective	9
27.7 to 45.2		10
45.3 to 62.9		11
63.0 to 72.2	Highly Effective	12
72.3 to 81.4		13
81.5 to 90.7		14
90.8 to 100.0		15

High Schools

DOE-CSA Jointly Recommended

Scoring Ranges

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.4	Ineffective	0
0.5 to 0.9		1
1.0 to 1.4		2
1.5 to 1.9		3

2.0 to 2.4		4
2.5 to 2.9		5
3.0 to 4.6	Developing	6
4.7 to 6.2		7
6.3 to 7.9		8
8.0 to 22.9	Effective	9
23.0 to 37.9		10
38.0 to 52.9		11
53.0 to 64.7	Highly Effective	12
64.8 to 76.4		13
76.5 to 88.2		14
88.3 to 100.0		15

**Transfer High Schools
DOE-CSA Jointly Recommended
Scoring Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.2	Ineffective	0
0.3 to 0.6		1
0.7 to 0.9		2
1.0 to 1.2		3
1.3 to 1.6		4
1.7 to 1.9		5
2.0 to 3.6	Developing	6
3.7 to 5.2		7
5.3 to 6.9		8
7.0 to 24.9	Effective	9
25.0 to 42.9		10
43.0 to 60.9		11
61.0 to 70.7	Highly Effective	12
70.8 to 80.4		13
80.5 to 90.2		14
90.3 to 100.0		15

D75/ES/MS/K-8**Commissioner Imposed Scoring****Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.2	Ineffective	0
0.3 to 0.5		1
0.6 to 0.8		2
0.9 to 1.1		3
1.2 to 1.4		4
1.5 to 1.7		5
1.8 to 2.0		6
2.1 to 2.3		7
2.4 to 2.6		8
2.7 to 2.9	9	
3.0 to 6.4	Developing	10
6.5 to 9.9		11
10.0 to 36.4	Effective	12
36.5 to 62.9		13
63.0 to 81.4	Highly Effective	14
81.5 to 100.0		15

High Schools**Commissioner Imposed Scoring****Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.2	Ineffective	0
0.3 to 0.5		1
0.6 to 0.8		2
0.9 to 1.1		3
1.2 to 1.4		4
1.5 to 1.7		5

1.8 to 2.0		6
2.1 to 2.3		7
2.4 to 2.6		8
2.7 to 2.9		9
3.0 to 5.4	Developing	10
5.5 to 7.9		11
8.0 to 30.4	Effective	12
30.5 to 52.9		13
53.0 to 76.4	Highly Effective	14
76.5 to 100.0		15

**Transfer High Schools
Commissioner Imposed Scoring
Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.1	Ineffective	0
0.2 to 0.3		1
0.4 to 0.5		2
0.6 to 0.7		3
0.8 to 0.9		4
1.0 to 1.1		5
1.2 to 1.3		6
1.4 to 1.5		7
1.6 to 1.7		8
1.8 to 1.9		9
2.0 to 4.4	Developing	10
4.5 to 6.9		11
7.0 to 33.9	Effective	12
34.0 to 60.9		13
61.0 to 80.4	Highly Effective	14
80.5 to 100.0		15

HEDI Score Conversion Chart 7

Locally-selected measures of student learning for principals without value-added (20 points)

D75/ES/MS/K-8/EC schools

DOE-CSA Jointly Recommended

Scoring Ranges

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.3	Ineffective	0
0.4 to 0.7		1
0.8 to 1.0		2
1.1 to 1.4		3
1.5 to 1.8		4
1.9 to 2.2		5
2.3 to 2.5		6
2.6 to 2.9	Developing	7
3.0 to 6.4		8
6.5 to 9.9		9
10.0 to 20.5	Effective	10
20.6 to 31.1		11
31.2 to 41.7		12
41.8 to 52.3		13
52.4 to 62.9		14
63.0 to 69.1		Highly Effective
69.2 to 75.2	16	
75.3 to 81.4	17	
81.5 to 87.6	18	
87.7 to 93.7	19	
93.8 to 100.0	20	

**High Schools
DOE-CSA Jointly Recommended
Scoring Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points	
0.0 to 0.3	Ineffective	0	
0.4 to 0.7		1	
0.8 to 1.0		2	
1.1 to 1.4		3	
1.5 to 1.8		4	
1.9 to 2.2		5	
2.3 to 2.5		6	
2.6 to 2.9	Developing	7	
3.0 to 5.4		8	
5.5 to 7.9		9	
8.0 to 16.9	Effective	10	
17.0 to 25.9		11	
26.0 to 34.9		12	
35.0 to 43.9		13	
44.0 to 52.9		14	
53.0 to 60.7		Highly Effective	15
60.8 to 68.6			16
68.7 to 76.4	17		
76.5 to 84.2	18		
84.3 to 92.1	19		
92.2 to 100.0		20	

Transfer High Schools

**DOE-CSA Jointly Recommended
Scoring Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.2	Ineffective	0

0.3 to 0.4		1
0.5 to 0.7		2
0.8 to 0.9		3
1.0 to 1.2		4
1.3 to 1.4		5
1.5 to 1.7		6
1.8 to 1.9		7
2.0 to 4.4	Developing	8
4.5 to 6.9		9
7.0 to 17.7	Effective	10
17.8 to 28.5		11
28.6 to 39.3		12
39.4 to 50.1		13
50.2 to 60.9		14
61.0 to 67.4	Highly Effective	15
67.5 to 73.9		16
74.0 to 80.4		17
80.5 to 86.9		18
87.0 to 93.4		19
93.5 to 100.0		20

**D75/ES/MS/K-8/EC schools
Commissioner Imposed Scoring
Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.1	Ineffective	0
0.2 to 0.4		1
0.5 to 0.6		2
0.7 to 0.8		3
0.9 to 1.1		4
1.2 to 1.3		5
1.4 to 1.5		6
1.6 to 1.7		7

1.8 to 2.0		8
2.1 to 2.2		9
2.3 to 2.4		10
2.5 to 2.7		11
2.8 to 2.9		12
3.0 to 6.4	Developing	13
6.5 to 9.9		14
10.0 to 27.6	Effective	15
27.7 to 45.2		16
45.3 to 62.9		17
63.0 to 75.2	Highly Effective	18
75.3 to 87.6		19
87.7 to 100.0		20

**High schools
Commissioner Imposed Scoring
Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.1	Ineffective	0
0.2 to 0.4		1
0.5 to 0.6		2
0.7 to 0.8		3
0.9 to 1.1		4
1.2 to 1.3		5
1.4 to 1.5		6
1.6 to 1.7		7
1.8 to 2.0		8
2.1 to 2.2		9
2.3 to 2.4		10
2.5 to 2.7		11
2.8 to 2.9		12
3.0 to 5.4	Developing	13
5.5 to 7.9		14

8.0 to 22.9	Effective	15
23.0 to 37.9		16
38.0 to 52.9		17
53.0 to 68.6	Highly Effective	18
68.7 to 84.2		19
84.3 to 100.0		20

**Transfer High Schools
Commissioner Imposed Scoring
Ranges**

Local Measures Percentile Rank	HEDI Rating	HEDI Points
0.0 to 0.1	Ineffective	0
0.2 to 0.2		1
0.3 to 0.4		2
0.5 to 0.5		3
0.6 to 0.7		4
0.8 to 0.8		5
0.9 to 1.0		6
1.1 to 1.1		7
1.2 to 1.3		8
1.4 to 1.4		9
1.5 to 1.6		10
1.7 to 1.7		11
1.8 to 1.9		12
2.0 to 4.4	Developing	13
4.5 to 6.9		14
7.0 to 24.9	Effective	15
25.0 to 42.9		16
43.0 to 60.9		17
61.0 to 73.9	Highly Effective	18
74.0 to 86.9		19
87.0 to 100.0		20

Task 9 – Other Comparable Measures

Principals will be rated on the principal practice rubric (the NYC Quality Review Rubric 2012-2013). Principals will receive a rating on each indicator of the Quality Review, which are weight-averaged to produce an overall score. See HEDI score conversion chart 8 in Attachment 9.7 for conversion of scores on the rubric to HEDI points.

Supervisors will use multiple sources of evidence to assign principals a principal practice rubric rating. These sources of evidence will include the results of at least two annual school visits by a supervisor or trained administrator, at least one of which must be from a supervisor, and at least one of which must be unannounced.

For 2014-2015 and beyond:

For principals rated Effective or Highly Effective or who don't have a rating from the prior school year, principal will have two (2) visits. One visit will be conducted by the superintendent, the second visit can be from anyone who has the underlying SBL, or SDL, or equivalent in a non-teaching position who is not part of any Network team.

For principals rated Developing or Ineffective, principal will have two (2) visits. Both supervisory visits must be performed by the superintendent.

NYCDOE shall negotiate any changes to the NYC Quality Review Rubric 2012-2013 with the CSA. In accordance with the design of 3012-c, a principal rated Ineffective in both the State growth or other comparable measures and locally selected measures subcomponents of student learning subcomponents must be rated Ineffective overall.

CSA and DOE jointly request that the Commissioner change the scoring ranges for the 2013-2014 school year. ("Negotiated Cut Scores") In the event the Board of Regents do not approve the changes an alternative scoring methodology is described herein. ("Commissioner Imposed Cut Scores").

Task 10 – Composite Scoring Principals

Please provide the locally-negotiated 60 point scoring bands.

DOE/CSA Jointly recommended Scoring ranges Commissioner Imposed Cut Scores

Highly Effective	45-60		Highly Effective	55-60
Effective	30-44		Effective	45-54
Developing	24-29		Developing	39-44
Ineffective	0-23		Ineffective	0-38

Task 11 – Principal Improvement Plan

Annual Professional Performance Review

Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Name of Principal: _____ School/Building: _____

Tenured: Yes No Probationary Period: (From) ___/___/___ (To) ___/___/___

PIP Timeline: (From) ___/___/___ (To) ___/___/___ Meeting Dates: _____
12 Months

Areas for Improvement: Identify specific areas in need of improvement.

Action Steps/Activities: Identify specific recommendations for what the principal is expected to do to improve in the identified areas. Delineate specific, realistic, achievable activities for the principal.

Timeline for Completion: Identify a timeline for achieving the action steps/activities.

Differentiation of Activities to Support Improvement: Identify specific resources and support systems available to assist the principal to improve performance (e.g., professional development, peer visits, content area specialists, materials, etc.).

Assessment of Improvement: Identify how progress will be measured and assessed. Specify next steps to be taken based upon whether the principal is successful, partially successful or unsuccessful in efforts to improve performance.

The principal gives permission for a copy of this Principal Improvement Plan to be forwarded to the Council of Schools, Supervisors & Administrators.

Signature of Superintendent

_____/_____/_____
Date

Signature of Principal

_____/_____/_____
Date

The principal improvement plan will cover a span of 12 months.

Principals will receive their principal improvement plan (PIP) within ten (10) school days from the opening of classes for the school year following the school year in which the principal was rated “developing” or “ineffective” in accordance with Education Law §3012-c.

For principals rated ineffective, to the extent practicable, the principal shall have an in-person meeting with their supervisor within ten (10) school days, and in no case will this meeting occur later than 10 additional school days. The principal will have four (4) additional in-person visits. Two (2) of these visits will be by the superintendent, and two (2) of these visits will be by someone from the Network team. Two (2) superintendent visits shall satisfy the evaluative supervisory visits pursuant to Education Law §3012-c(2)(h)(4).

For principals rated developing, if the principal wants to discuss the principal improvement plan with the superintendent, the superintendent shall do so by phone or an in-person meeting within ten (10) school days from the opening of classes for the school year following the school year in which the principal was rated developing. The principal will have four (4) additional in-person visits. Two (2) of these visits will be by the superintendent, and two (2) of these visits will be by someone from the Network team. Two (2) superintendent visits shall satisfy the evaluative supervisory visits pursuant to Education Law §3012-c(2)(h)(4).

Following each of the supervisory visits by the superintendent, the superintendent shall issue written feedback to the principal describing progress on the principal improvement plan and APPR rating thus far in the school year.