



Field Guide for the 2014-15 Principal Performance Review

A Guide for Principals and Evaluators



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

Table of Contents

| Section | Page |
|---|------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Measures of Leadership Practice | 4 |
| Measures of Student Learning | 6 |
| Early Childhood (K-2) | 9 |
| Elementary, Middle, K-8 | 10 |
| High School and Transfer High School | 11 |
| District 75 | 13 |
| Scoring | 14 |
| Frequently Asked Questions | 18 |
| Appendix A: Principal Practice Observation Tool | 21 |
| Appendix B: State Measures In Detail | 32 |
| Appendix C: Measures of Leadership Practice HEDI Conversion Chart | 35 |
| Appendix D: Local Measures HEDI Conversion Chart | 36 |
| Appendix E: State Measures for DOE-Calculated Growth Scores HEDI Conversion Chart | 37 |

Introduction to the Principal Performance Review

The 2014-15 Principal Performance Review (PPR) is consistent with Education Law 3012-c and agreements between the NYC Department of Education (DOE) and the Council for School Supervisors and Administrators; the framework of the PPR is being used across the State. The Principal Performance Review has been designed to support a common vision: **an effective principal in every school for every student.**

Goals of the Principal Performance Review

The Principal Performance Review aims to measure educator effectiveness consistently, accurately, and fairly through a process that is transparent to educators and is based on multiple measures. The guiding principles are to support educators in making instructional decisions and improving their practice, while supporting school-level autonomy where possible.

Goals of the PPR Field Guide

This document is designed to support principals and evaluators in the implementation of the 2014-15 Principal Performance Review. It outlines:

- ✓ The requirements and structure of supervisory visits that yield Measure of Leadership Practice ratings and feedback
- ✓ The elements of Measures of Student Learning, both State and local measures
- ✓ Overall scoring and rating of principals under the 2014-15 Principal Performance Review
- ✓ The timeline for each stage of the Principal Performance Review

Timeline

- Principal Practice Observations visits began on **September 29, 2014**
- Quality Reviews began on **October 27, 2014**
- Principals will receive ratings for the Measures of Leadership Practice by the **last day of school in June 2015**
- By **September 1, 2015**, principals will receive their PPR Overall Rating for the 2014-15 school year

Contact

Please contact your superintendent or ppr@schools.nyc.gov with any questions or concerns regarding the Principal Performance Review.

Measures of Leadership Practice

The principal evaluation system for the NYC DOE requires that a *minimum* of two supervisory visits in one school inform an overall rating for Measures of Leadership Practice (MOLP), accounting for 60% of a principal's Overall Rating. In 2014-15, there will continue to be two types of supervisory visits rooted in the Quality Review rubric: the Quality Review (QR) and Principal Practice Observation (PPO).

Evaluators

Superintendents are the lead evaluators for the 2014-15 PPR and must conduct at least one of the two supervisory visits required for each principal. Other evaluators may include representatives from the cluster, central staff members, and other Quality Reviewers. By law, all evaluators must hold, at minimum, a School Building Leader license and lead evaluators must be certified annually.

Ratings

During supervisory visits, evaluators gather evidence related to each indicator of the Quality Review rubric. Individual Principal Practice Observations do not culminate in a rating. Evidence collected during the Principal Practice Observation and Quality Review will be considered when determining a principal's MOLP rating for the school year. The lead evaluator (superintendent) will ultimately confer a final rating for MOLP based on evidence gathered across both visits and throughout the rating period that aligns to the Quality Review rubric.

Quality Review

When a school is eligible for a Quality Review (QR), it will satisfy one of the two required supervisory visits for the year. As in previous years, the QR remains an announced visit; schools will receive notice via email several weeks before the visit.

In 2014-15, Quality Reviews will generally take place over the course of one day and will be conducted by an experienced educator. The process will assess all indicators, but the Quality Review report will formally report on five indicators of the Quality Review rubric (1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.4, 4.2). Reviews will culminate in indicator ratings for these five areas and a written report but will not yield an overall rating.

Principal Practice Observation

The Principal Practice Observation is designed to capture low-inference evidence aligned to the ten Quality Review indicators. In general, the PPO process will last no more than one school day and can include:

- Principal interview(s)
- Classroom visitations and debriefs
- Evaluator reflection
- PPO debrief

Each of the components above will follow the Quality Review protocols for the principal interview, classroom visits, and end of day debrief. A conversation between the principal and the evaluator will inform the evaluator's classroom visitation selections.

The debrief that concludes the PPO will include verbal feedback at the end of the day around what was seen and heard regarding the highest leverage quality indicators for principal practice, but it will not include an overall rating for the visit or a rating for any particular indicator on the QR rubric.

A principal may request written feedback from the evaluator after a PPO visit. To receive written feedback, a principal must submit a request in writing through email to the evaluator no more than five business days after the PPO visit. Written feedback will be provided to the principal in a timely fashion. At their discretion, evaluators may also provide written feedback following the visit, even if it has not been requested by the principal.

Beginning **February 3, 2015**, principals will receive written feedback from evaluators following every PPO visit; requests in writing from the principal will no longer be necessary as of that date.

Please note that, with the exception of extreme circumstances, PPOs shall proceed without rescheduling.

Principal Practice Observation Tool

The Principal Practice Observation Tool was created as an evidence gathering tool to be used by evaluators during PPOs. The tool provides examples and questions directly connected to leadership practices embedded in each indicator of the Quality Review rubric, allowing strong leadership practices to be recognized in the context of any school. The questions embedded in the tool can also serve as a reflection exercise for principals. The tool is available in its entirety in Appendix A.

Measures of Student Learning

Forty percent (40%) of a principal’s Overall Rating will be based on Measures of Student Learning (MOSL). Multiple measures allow for a more valid, robust picture of principal performance and provide principals with multiple sources of feedback. Like the School Quality Guide, this 40% includes an emphasis on student growth compared to similar students, though performance measures are also included. Measures of Student Learning consist of:

- **Local Measures** (20%), focused on performance benchmarks and student growth compared to similar students
- **State Measures** (20%), focused on student growth compared to similar students

Principals of K-12 schools, 6-12 schools, and other grade spans that cover multiple school levels will have *all* relevant State and Local Measures included in their PPR ratings. The only exception is principals of schools serving grades K-2 in addition to any additional grades (3-12): in these schools, K-2 assessment metrics will not be included in the principal’s PPR rating.

The following table gives an overview of the State and Local Measures by school level. More detailed descriptions of each metric by school type are available on pages 9-13.

| School Type | Measures of Student Learning Metrics | State or Local | Type of Metric | Weighting |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Early Childhood [grades K-2] | ELA Performance Assessment Math Performance Assessment | Local | Performance | 10% of overall PPR 25% of MOSL |
| | Growth in ELA Performance Assessment Growth in Math Performance Assessment [Students in school’s lowest third] | Local | Growth | 10% of overall PPR 25% of MOSL |
| | Growth in ELA Performance Assessment Growth in Math Performance Assessment [All students] | State | Growth | 20% of overall PPR 50% of MOSL |
| Elementary Middle K-8 | ELA average proficiency Math average proficiency (including Algebra/Geometry Regents for 7 th and 8 th grade) | Local | Performance | 13% of overall PPR 32.5% of MOSL |
| | ELA median adjusted growth percentile Math median adjusted growth percentile (including Algebra/Geometry Regents for 7 th and 8 th grade) [All students] | Local | Growth | 3.5% of overall PPR 8.8% of MOSL |
| | ELA median adjusted growth percentile Math median adjusted growth percentile (including Algebra/Geometry Regents for 7 th and 8 th grade) [Students in school’s lowest third] | Local | Growth | 3.5% of overall PPR 8.8% of MOSL |
| | ELA mean adjusted student growth percentile Math mean adjusted student growth percentile | State | Growth | 20% of overall PPR 50% of MOSL |
| High schools Transfer schools | 4-year and 6-year graduation rates [HS] 6-year graduation rates [Transfer] | Local | Performance | 13% of overall PPR 32.5% of MOSL |
| | Credit accumulation rates | Local | Growth | 7% of overall PPR 17.5% of MOSL |
| | ELA Regents adjusted growth percentile [HS] Integrated Algebra Regents adjusted growth percentile [HS] Comparative growth in Regents exams passed [HS] | State | Growth | 20% of overall PPR 50% of MOSL |

| School Type | Measures of Student Learning Metrics | State or Local | Type of Metric | Weighting |
|---------------------|---|----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| District 75 schools | New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) Percent (%) proficient ELA average proficiency Math average proficiency Regents Performance Index | Local | Performance | 13% of overall PPR 32.5% of MOSL |
| | ELA median unadjusted growth percentile Math median unadjusted growth percentile | Local | Growth | 7% of overall PPR 17.5% of MOSL |
| | ELA mean adjusted student growth percentile Math mean adjusted student growth percentile Growth scores on other State assessments | State | Growth | 20% of overall PPR 50% of MOSL |

Local Measures (20%)

Local Measures are based on a few key School Quality Guide metrics for the vast majority of schools. These metrics vary based on school type as the table above indicates. Local Measures will be calculated according to current School Quality Guide methodology:

1. **Peer Grouping:** Approximately 40 peer schools serving similar student populations are selected for each school. Comparing school performance to that of peer schools helps ensure that student outcomes account for different challenges that schools face. The characteristics used to determine a school’s peer group varies based on school level. Peer schools selected in 2013-14 will be used again for 2014-15.
2. **Calculate and Compare:** As in the School Quality Guide, a school’s metric values are compared to the results of its peer schools (75%) and to a citywide average benchmark (25%).
 - The metric score is calculated by comparing a school’s result on a metric to the performance of its peer schools and to the citywide average for all schools except K-2. The range of performance of a school’s peers (or the City) forms the peer (or City) range. The proportion of this range that the school’s current result covers is the “percent of peer (or City) range”.
 - The percent of peer and City ranges are combined into one score per metric:
$$[\% \text{ of peer range}] \times 75\% + [\% \text{ of City range}] \times 25\% = \text{metric score}$$
3. **Scoring:** Principals’ scores on each metric are assigned the corresponding weights identified in the table above, and then an overall Local Measures score for each principal is determined.
 - If a principal does not have data available for a specific metric, metrics that *are* available are given more weight. For example, a new high school with a 4-year graduation rate but no 6-year graduation rate would have its 4-year graduation rate weighted 32.5% of the overall MOSL scores (rather than 16.25%), and the on-track credit accumulation metrics would continue to be weighted 17.5%.

Due to the September 1st deadline for ratings to be completed for the prior year, summer outcomes, including credit accumulation, assessment results, and graduation results, will not be included in the

Local Measures calculations. For more information, please see the [Technical Guide to 2014-15 PPR Local MOSL Ratings](#).

Full descriptions of the School Quality Guide metrics and methodology are also available on the NYC DOE website at the following link: <http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/tools/report/default.htm>

State Measures (20%)

In 2014-15, the New York State Education Department will continue to use five growth measures based on State assessments for each principal, depending on the grade levels at the principal's school.¹ Each measure will be scored separately and scores will be averaged and weighted by the number of students included in each. See Appendix B for a more detailed description of State-provided measures. Full descriptions of each measure are also available on the SED website at the following links:

- Growth scores overview: <https://www.engageny.org/resource/classification-rules-growth-ratings-and-scores-principals-2014-15>
- Growth scores for Elementary, Middle, and K-8 Schools: <https://www.engageny.org/resource/principal%E2%80%99s-guide-interpreting-state-provided-growth-scores-grades-4-8-2014-15>
- Growth scores for High Schools: Please visit <https://www.engageny.org/resource/resources-about-state-growth-measures> where a full description will be posted in the fall.
- For principals of schools in which fewer than 30% of students are included in the State-provided measures, growth scores will be determined based on available State-provided measures and DOE-provided growth measures based on other State exams (e.g., 3rd grade math and ELA, NYSAA). SED growth scores and NYC growth scores for students taking other State assessments will be weighted proportionally.

For principals without any State-provided growth scores, State Measures will be based entirely on DOE-provided growth scores. These DOE-provided growth measures will use a similar methodology to the NYC School Quality Guides. *Principals of K-2 schools should refer to page 9 of this guide for more information.*

¹ State-provided measures are as follows: 1) Growth Percentile on grade 4-8 State ELA exam; 2) Growth Percentile on grade 4-8 State math exam; 3) Comparative Growth in Regents Exams Passed for students in grades 9-12; 4) Growth Percentile on English Regents (both Common Core Regents and non-Common Core Regents), and 5) Growth Percentile on Integrated Algebra Regents (both Common Core Regents and non-Common Core Regents)

Early Childhood: Measures of Student Learning

Principals of schools serving grades K, 1, and/or 2 only do not administer State assessments. Therefore, State and Local Measures for these principals will be based upon the NYC ELA and Math Performance Assessments.

The specific ELA performance assessment will be the same as the one selected from the below list by the principal for use in *Advance*, the teacher evaluation and development system.

- NYC Performance Assessment: Writing
- NYC Performance Assessment Running Records: Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP)
- NYC Performance Assessment Running Records: Fountas and Pinnell (F&P)
- NYC Performance Assessment Running Records: DRA2

| Metric | Metric Description | Type of Metric | Weighting |
|---|---|-------------------|-----------------------------------|
| NYC ELA and Math Performance Assessments | Performance of all students who took the post-tests of the NYC Performance Assessment | Local-Performance | 10% of overall PPR 25% of MOSL |
| Growth Percentile in ELA and Math Performance Assessments for all students | Growth model that measures student progress on the DOE-approved assessment. The growth model will define similar students using multiple student characteristics, including: academic history, poverty, students with disabilities status, and English language learner status. This metric is calculated for students who took a post-test during the 2014-15 school year | State-Growth | 20% of overall PPR 50% of MOSL |
| Growth in ELA and Math Performance Assessments for school's lowest third | Growth model that measures student progress on the DOE-approved assessment. The growth model will define similar students using multiple student characteristics, including: academic history, poverty, students with disabilities status, and English language learner status. This metric is calculated for students who took a post-test in the school year and who started the year in the lowest third of students at their school based on pre-test scores. | Local-Growth | 10% of overall PPR 25% of MOSL |

Elementary, Middle, and K-8: Measures of Student Learning

| Metric | Metric Description | Type of Metric | Weighting |
|--|--|--------------------------|--|
| <p>ELA average proficiency</p> <p>Math average proficiency</p> | <p>The average (mean) proficiency rating for all students who have taken the ELA and/or math assessments in grades 3-8. 7th and 8th grade students who take Algebra, Geometry, and/or Algebra 2/Trig Regents will be included in this measure.</p> <p>Students are attributed to schools based on the audited register of October 31st.</p> | <p>Local-Performance</p> | <p>13% of overall PPR</p> <p>32.5% of MOSL</p> |
| <p>ELA median adjusted growth percentile for all students</p> <p>Math median adjusted growth percentile for all students</p> | <p>The median (middle) adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same proficiency rating the prior year.</p> <p>Adjustments are made to account for the school's level of economic need (as measured by free lunch, temporary housing, and HRA-eligibility) as well as students' most restrictive special education setting during the past four years.</p> <p>This metric is calculated for all students in grades 4-8 at the school who took a NY State ELA or math assessment one grade level higher this year than the student took the prior year. 7th and 8th grade students who take Algebra, Geometry, and/or Algebra 2/Trig Regents will be included in this measure.</p> | <p>Local-Growth</p> | <p>3.5% of overall PPR</p> <p>8.8% of MOSL</p> |
| <p>ELA median adjusted growth percentile for school's lowest third</p> <p>Math median adjusted growth percentile for school's lowest third</p> | <p>Same metric as the median growth percentile described above except it includes only the lowest-performing third of students within each grade and subject at the school based on students' State assessment from the prior year.</p> | <p>Local-Growth</p> | <p>3.5% of overall PPR</p> <p>8.8% of MOSL</p> |
| <p>Growth in ELA State assessment</p> <p>Growth in math State assessment</p> | <p>Growth scores on State assessments are based on the average of the student growth percentiles (SGPs) of students enrolled in a school.</p> <p>Adjustments are made to account for academic history, poverty, students with disabilities status, and English language learner status.</p> <p>SGPs are calculated for all students in grades 4-8, based on his or her ELA and math State assessment results in the current year compared to the current year results of similar students. Results include up to three years (prior year and two additional years if available) of State assessment data.</p> | <p>State-Growth</p> | <p>20% of overall PPR</p> <p>50% of MOSL</p> |

High Schools and Transfer High Schools: Measures of Student Learning

| Metric | Metric Description | Type of Metric | Weighting |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| <p>4-year and 6-year graduation rates [HS]</p> <p>6-year graduation rates only [Transfer]</p> | <p>The percentage of students in the school’s 4-year and 6-year cohorts that graduated with a Regents or Local diploma through June of the 2014-15 school year. <i>PPRs for transfer high school principals will not include the 4-year graduation rate.</i></p> <p>A high school’s 4-year graduation cohort consists of all students who entered high school four years earlier. A high school’s 6-year graduation cohort consists of all students who were in the school’s 4-year graduation cohort two years prior. For both 4 and 6 year graduation rates, students are attributed to their last diploma-granting school as of June 30 of their fourth year of high school.</p> <p>A transfer high school’s 6-year cohort consists of all students with a transfer school graduation deadline of 2015. This deadline is the end of 6 years of high school except for students who entered the transfer school most-at-risk overage/under-credited in year 5 or 6. Those students count at the end of year 7 instead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a transfer high school’s 6-year cohort, students are attributed to their last diploma-granting school as of June 30, 2015. | <p>Local-Performance</p> | <p>13% of overall PPR</p> <p>32.5% of MOSL</p> |
| <p>Credit accumulation rate</p> | <p>For high schools: the percentage of students who accumulated 10 or more academic credits in the fall and spring of the school year. At least 6 credits must have been earned in three of the four main subjects (English, math, science, and social studies).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are designated as year 1, 2, or 3 based on their 4-year cohort. Students eligible for NYSAA are not included <p>For high schools: students are included based on the last diploma-granting high school responsible as of October 31st. Students who have dropped out or entered non-diploma granting programs are accountable. Students with cohort-removing discharges are excluded. Students who attend multiple DOE schools in the year are attributed to the October 31st school.</p> <p>For transfer high schools: the average credits earned per year for students with different credits at the start of the school year. The point values for these four measures are assigned proportionately based on the number of students in each credit category</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students eligible for NYSAA and students who start the year with more than 38 credits are not included. Attribution is similar to regular high schools but is calculated as of June 30th instead of October 31st. | <p>Local-Growth</p> | <p>7% of overall PPR</p> <p>17.5% of MOSL</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--|
| <p>Growth percentile on English and Integrated Algebra Regents</p> <p>Comparative growth in Regents exams passed</p> | <p>State-provided growth scores on State assessments are based on the average of the Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) of students enrolled in a school.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This measure will compare the performance of students between 8th grade State assessments and the Integrated Algebra and Comprehensive English Regents Exams to the performance of similar students statewide. <p>Student growth based on the number of Regents exams passed annually starting in the year of student entry into 9th grade. Up to eight Regents exams are counted in this measure².</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student growth is determined by comparing to similar students statewide. | <p>State-Growth</p> | <p>20% of overall PPR</p> <p>50% of MOSL</p> |
|--|--|---------------------|--|

² Please note that Regents exams passed prior to entry into 9th grade are not included. For example, if a student passed two Regents exams in middle school, he/she is only required to pass six Regents exams in high school to contribute full credit to this measure. A student is excluded completely if he/she has passed eight Regents before the school year being measured.

District 75: Measures of Student Learning

| Metric | Metric Description | Type of Metric | Weighting |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| <p>NYSAA % Proficient</p> <p>ELA average proficiency</p> <p>Math average proficiency</p> <p>Regents Performance Index</p> | <p>The percent of students rated proficient (Level 3 or 4) on the Alternate Grade-Level Indicators in ELA and math on the New York State Alternate Assessment.</p> <p>The average (mean) proficiency rating for all students who have taken the standard ELA and/or math assessments. The proficiency rating is measured on a scale of 1.00-4.50 based on students' scale scores.</p> <p>The Regents Performance Index is measured on a scale of 0-200: 200 points for a Regents score of 65 or higher, 100 points for a Regents score of 55-64 or a passing RCT score, and 0 points for a Regents score below 55 or a failing RCT score.</p> <p>Students are attributed based on October 31st.</p> | <p>Local-Performance</p> | <p>20%³ of overall PPR</p> |
| <p>ELA median adjusted growth percentile</p> <p>Math median adjusted growth percentile</p> | <p>The median adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same proficiency level the prior year.</p> <p>Adjustments are made to account for the school's level of economic need (as measured by free lunch, temporary housing, and HRA-eligibility) as well as students' most restrictive special education setting during the past four years.</p> <p>This metric is calculated for all students in grades 4-8 at the school who took a NY State ELA or math assessment one grade level higher this year than the student took the prior year.</p> | <p>Local-Growth</p> | <p>50% of MOSL</p> |
| <p>Growth scores on other State assessments</p> | <p>DOE-provided growth scores on other State assessments (e.g., NYSAA) in combination with State-provided growth scores for students in 4-8 ELA and math, and/or high school courses with State or Regents assessments (if available).</p> | <p>State-Growth</p> | <p>20% of overall PPR</p> <p>50% of MOSL</p> |

³ Note that weights for each Local Measures metric for District 75 will be based on number of eligible students.

Principal Performance Review Scoring

Principals will be rated on the following scale for each subcomponent of the PPR: Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective (HEDI). Each eligible principal will also receive an Overall Rating using the same HEDI scale.

Measures of Leadership Practice

The lead evaluator (superintendent) will ultimately confer a rating for Measures of Leadership Practice based on evidence gathered across both visits and throughout the rating period that is rooted in the Quality Review rubric. Scoring for MOLP is as follows:

- The sum of all indicator scores equals the numerical score and the maximum possible numerical score is 100
- Five indicators are weighted more than the other indicators: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, and 4.1. Non-weighted indicators include: 1.4, 3.4, 3.1, 4.2, and 5.1
- Individual indicators will earn numerical point values based on the rating as follows:

| Rating | Weighted Indicator | Non-weighted Indicator |
|----------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Well Developed | 12 points | 8 points |
| Proficient | 9 points | 6 points |
| Developing | 6 points | 4 points |
| Underdeveloped | 3 points | 2 points |

- A principal's Measures of Leadership Practice numerical score will then be converted into an overall rating for MOLP. See Appendix C for a conversion chart between MOLP scores (on a scale of 0-100) and HEDI ratings for Measures of Leadership Practice (on a scale of 0-60).

A rating for Measures of Leadership Practice will be delivered to each principal by the last day of school in June 2015.

Local Measures

Based on calculations using applicable Local Measures, each eligible principal will receive a percentile rank based on a comparison of his or her school's performance to others of the same school type. For most schools, percentile ranks will be calculated within School Quality Guide school type: elementary, middle, K-8, high school, and transfer high school. If a school falls across multiple school types, the HEDI points for the two school types will be calculated separately and weighted by the number of students included.

A principal's percentile rank is converted into a HEDI score of 0-20 according to the *Local Measures HEDI Conversion Chart* in Appendix D.

State Measures

The methodology for determining principal ratings based on State-provided growth measures is described in Appendix B, *State-Provided Growth Measures*.

For schools where State Measures will be based on DOE-calculated growth scores, each eligible principal will receive a percentile rank based on comparison to other principals citywide. This percentile rank will be converted to HEDI score of 0-20 according to the *State Measures for DOE-Calculated Growth Scores HEDI Conversion Chart* in Appendix E. For more information about growth scores, please see the *Measures of Student Learning* section of this guide.

Overall Scoring

Each principal can receive three separate HEDI ratings for the three subcomponents of the PPR: Measures of Leadership Practice, State Measures, and Local Measures. A principal who receives ratings in all three PPR components will receive an Overall Rating.

Based on a principal's numerical score in the Measures of Leadership Practice, the principal receives 0-60 HEDI points and a HEDI rating. Based on a principal's percentile rank for both Measures of Student Learning, the principal receives 0-20 points and a HEDI rating for each subcomponent. Point ranges for each rating are listed in the chart below by subcomponent:

| Rating by Subcomponent | Measures of Leadership Practice (60%) | State Measures of Student Learning (20%) | Local Measures of Student Learning (20%) |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Ineffective | 0 to 38 | 0 to 12 | 0 to 12 |
| Developing | 39 to 44 | 13 to 14 | 13 to 14 |
| Effective | 45 to 54 | 15 to 17 | 15 to 17 |
| Highly Effective | 55 to 60 | 18 to 20 | 18 to 20 |

For each eligible principal, each of the three numerical scores is summed to yield a single overall numerical score; this score is translated to an Overall Rating on the HEDI scale:

| Overall Numerical Score | Overall Rating |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 0 to 64 | Ineffective |
| 65 to 74 | Developing |
| 75 to 90 | Effective |
| 91 to 100 | Highly Effective |

Please note that principals rated as Ineffective on both State and Local Measures of Student Learning will receive an Overall Rating of Ineffective; it is expected that this will apply to very few principals.

Principal Eligibility

In order to receive an Overall Rating, a principal must have served as principal in the same school for at least six cumulative months (183 days) and must receive ratings in all three components of the PPR (MOLP, State Measures, Local Measures).

Principals who receive a minimum of two supervisory visits at the same school between September 2, 2014 and June 30, 2015 will be eligible for an MOLP rating.

Principals who serve in one school for at least six cumulative calendar months (183 days) between September 2, 2014 and June 30, 2015 are eligible to receive Local and State MOSL ratings. Metrics used to calculate a principal's MOSL rating needs to meet minimum reporting requirements⁴ independent of a principal's time served.

Appeals

A principal may appeal an overall Ineffective rating. The appeal must be filed electronically within ten (10) school days of receipt at: OARprincipalAPPRappeals@schools.nyc.gov. A hearing will be scheduled and a hearing officer shall consider: (a) the substance of the Overall Rating and other relevant evidence; (b) the DOE's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews; (c) the adherence to State regulations; (d) compliance with any applicable negotiated procedures; and (e) the DOE's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the Principal Improvement Plan.

The hearing officer shall render a written decision and recommendation to the Chancellor either sustaining the rating or reversing the rating and may recommend a revised rating, with a rationale for the recommendation. The hearing officer's decision and recommendation will be sent to both the DOE and principal. The Chancellor or designee shall either sustain the original Overall Rating or reverse the rating and determine the appropriate rating. If the Chancellor sustains the rating, the Chancellor or designee shall issue a decision with rationale. If the Chancellor reverses the rating and issues a revised Overall Rating, the original rating shall be expunged from the principal's records and the documentation shall be revised to be consistent with the revised rating.

Principal Improvement Plans

Principals with an Overall Rating of Developing or Ineffective will receive a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) developed by their superintendent for the 2015-16 school year.

Principals rated Ineffective, to the extent practicable, will have an in-person meeting with their superintendent within ten (10) school days from the opening of classes for the 2015-16 school year, and in no case will this meeting occur later than ten (10) additional school days.

⁴ Metrics for Local MOSL require a minimum of 15 students to be reported. Metrics for State MOSL require a minimum of 16 students to be reported.

For principals rated Developing, if the principal wants to discuss the PIP with the superintendent, the superintendent will do so by phone or in an in-person meeting within ten (10) school days of the opening of classes for the 2015-16 school year.

Principals with a PIP will have four in-person visits during the 2015-16 school year: two supervisory visits led by the superintendent or superintendent designee and two supplementary visits led by the Network Leader or another member of the network team.

Data Corrections Requests

Principals can make Data Corrections Requests (DCR) in cases where inaccurate student-level data may have been used to calculate State and/or Local Measures of Student Learning ratings. Principals will receive Excel workbooks with information on the students contributing to each of the MOSL ratings.

There are three types of measurements that can be used in the calculation of State and Local MOSL for principals: SED-provided growth scores, DOE-calculated growth metrics, and DOE-calculated performance benchmarks. There are two primary types of corrections that can be requested through the DCR process: student-school linkage corrections and student graduation/credit data corrections. However, the DOE will investigate any requests for changes in other data (e.g., test scores, student-level peering characteristics). All three measurements will be eligible for DCRs on the basis of incorrect linkages, but only DOE-calculated measurements will be eligible for DCRs on the basis of incorrect credit and/or graduation data.

Principals will be able to submit DCRs related to principal ratings via an [online survey tool](#) from September 1st through October 2nd, during the DCR period. Principals whose recalculated State and/or Local MOSL ratings are greater than their original ratings will receive their corrected student-level MOSL workbooks and Overall Ratings in October.

Parent Requests for Principal Ratings

As part of Education Law 3012-c, parents and legal guardians have the option to request the 2014-15 Overall Rating and score for their child's current principal. Principals received implementation instructions in March 2015 via Principals' Weekly for how to receive and respond to requests made by their students' parents and legal guardians, and these instructions are also available on the Principal Evaluation page of the [Principal's Portal](#).

Ratings are provided to parents and legal guardians for informational purposes only, and do not provide any additional right of action (e.g., the DOE will not accept requests for student transfers based solely on this information). All requests must be documented on a centrally-provided form, and principal rating requests must be verified and processed by school staff. Rating information cannot be shared with a parent if the rating is currently under appeal.

Frequently Asked Questions

Measures of Leadership Practice

What role does my network play in supervisory visits?

Where a supervisory visit is a Quality Review, network leaders may be invited to attend the exit conference and utilize existing protocols. For a Principal Practice Observation, networks may be invited at the discretion of the principal to be present during a visit. The conversation during any supervisory visit should take place primarily between the principal and the evaluator. For principals with Principal Improvement Plans, the Network Leader or another member of the network team will conduct two supplementary visits, in addition to the two supervisory visits conducted by the superintendent.

My day is fully scheduled and I have a PPO. What are expectations for how to proceed with the day?

Principals are expected to accommodate the superintendent or trained administrator for supervisory visits. The principal and evaluator should work together to establish a schedule that works for both parties.

Will I receive written feedback from my PPO visit?

Yes—when requested, feedback will be provided to the principal in a timely fashion following the PPO visit. Feedback will align to the [big ideas](#) of the Quality Review rubric and reference areas of celebration and/or areas of focus. Beginning February 3, 2015, principals will receive written feedback from evaluators following every PPO visit.

What will my PPO visit look like?

Time spent on each event during the PPO can vary based on conversations with the evaluator and principal. Events can include classroom visitations and debrief, principal interview, reviewer reflection, and PPO debrief.

Is there a formula for weighting individual supervisory visits? Does the QR count more than a PPO towards my final rating?

No—evidence from both PPOs and Quality Reviews will be considered by the lead evaluator in conferring final MOLP ratings.

Can my superintendent request additional evidence outside of my two supervisory visits towards my Measures of Leadership Practice rating?

Yes—a superintendent may request information or evidence not obtained at the supervisory visit that is aligned to the QR rubric. Superintendents have the discretion to request additional evidence from principals in support of a principal's rating. As the principal's direct supervisor, any superintendent may conduct additional visits at his or her discretion.

What role should documents play during and after supervisory visits?

Principals can point to existing documents in an authentic way during the QR or the PPO to illustrate the impact of their practice but are not required to prepare documents for the sole purpose of the visit.

I am scheduled for an Integrated Intervention Team (IIT) review conducted by NYSED; is this one of my two supervisory visits?

No—the IIT reviews are not conducted by the superintendent or the superintendent's designee and do not use the Quality Review rubric. Supervisory visits include Quality Reviews and Principal Practice Observations.

What happens if I receive a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)?

Principals with a PIP will receive at least four in-person visits during the 2014-15 school year: two supervisory visits led by the superintendent and two supplementary visits led by the Network Leader or another member of the network team.

What is the purpose of a Principal Improvement Plan?

The purpose of a PIP is to assist principals to work to their fullest potential. The plan will identify specific improvement areas as well as a timeline and plan for assessing improvement.

*Measures of Student Learning***Do summer outcomes contribute to my Measures of Student Learning scores?**

Due to the September 1st deadline for ratings to be completed for the prior year, summer outcomes, including credit accumulation, assessment results, and graduation results, will not be included in Local Measures that inform a principal's Overall Rating. However, the official citywide graduation rate will continue to include August graduates. For State-provided State Measures, summer outcomes are included for the following year.

How are Local Measures calculated for principals of new schools that are not eligible for every metric?

Generally, any school ineligible for a given metric will have the points associated with the metric redistributed to the other available metrics. For example, new high schools and secondary schools that do not yet have a graduating class will have the points from the graduation rate metrics redistributed to the on-track credit accumulation metrics. Schools that do not yet have a 6-year graduation rate will have those points redistributed to the 4-year graduation rate metric. Middle schools serving only students in grades 6 and 7 will have all the proficiency and growth metrics of a middle school serving grades 6-8, but calculated only for students in those two grades.

*Principal Eligibility***What are the eligibility requirements for a principal to receive an Overall Rating?**

In order to receive an Overall Rating, a principal must have served in the same school for at least six cumulative months (183 days) between September 2, 2014 and June 30, 2015 and must receive ratings in all three components of the PPR (MOLP, State Measures, Local Measures).

What are the eligibility requirements for a principal to receive an MOLP rating?

If at least two supervisory visits are conducted in the same school, the principal will receive a rating for Measures of Leadership Practice. To the extent practicable, superintendents should ensure that both required supervisory visits are conducted for principals who transfer schools, go on long-term leave or retire.

What are the eligibility requirements for a principal to receive MOSL ratings?

A principal must have 183 active days in one school between September 2, 2014 and June 30, 2015 in order to be eligible for Local and State MOSL. In addition, metrics used to calculate a principal's MOSL rating need to meet minimum reporting requirements⁵.

⁵ Metrics for Local MOSL require a minimum of 15 students to be reported. Metrics for State MOSL require a minimum of 16 students to be reported.

General Questions

Do goals and objectives count towards my Overall Rating?

Goals and objectives do not factor into a principal's Overall Rating. Goal setting continues to be a part of the CEP.

Does the compliance checklist count towards my annual rating?

The compliance checklist does not factor into a principal's Overall Rating, but will continue to be implemented.

How will the PPR account for attendance and/or misconduct issues?

Any misconduct including failure to comply with relevant policies and regulations is still subject to disciplinary action, including letters for file and disciplinary charges.

Does the PPR change the current principal completion of probation (COP) process?

The policy and process that govern principal completion of probation will remain largely the same, though superintendents will have even more data and richer information to inform their recommendations.

Please note that additional FAQs may be added throughout the year.

Appendix A: Principal Practice Observation Tool



Principal Performance Review
Office of School Quality
Division of Teaching and Learning
2014-15

Principal Practice Observation Tool

2014-15

The Principal Practice Observation Tool was created as an evidence gathering tool to be used by evaluators during Principal Practice Observations as part of the Principal Performance Review. The evidence gathered by this tool will be applied to the Quality Review rubric. The tool provides examples and questions directly connected to leadership practices embedded in each indicator of the Quality Review rubric, allowing strong leadership practices to be recognized in the context of any school. The questions embedded in the tool can also serve as a reflection exercise for principals.

Statements that reflect Well Developed practice, as outlined in the Quality Review rubric, are included on each page of the tool as exemplars.

1.1 Ensure engaging, rigorous, and coherent curricula in all subjects, accessible for a variety of learners and aligned to Common Core Learning Standards and/or content standards

- a. **WD:** School leaders and faculty ensure that curricula are aligned to CCLS and/or content standards and strategically integrate the instructional shifts¹, resulting in coherence across grades and subject areas that promotes college and career readiness for all students
- b. **WD:** Rigorous habits and higher-order skills² are emphasized in curricula and academic tasks and are embedded in a coherent way across grades and subjects so that all learners, including ELLs and SWDs, must demonstrate their thinking
- c. **WD:** Curricula and academic tasks are planned and refined using student work and data so that individual and groups of students, including the lowest and highest achieving students, ELLs, and SWDs, have access³ to the curricula and tasks

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Engage teachers in a process of adapting/adopting to ensure that curricula are CCLS aligned and meet all student needs
- Base curricular decisions on research, expertise of teachers, and student needs
- Foster a common understanding of what rigor and planning for cognitive engagement look like in the school community
- Establish a common set of expectations for how curriculum should be adapted to provide access for all learners
- Establish systems and structures within teacher teams to plan and revise curriculum based on common expectations using student work and data
- Monitor revision processes to ensure access and cognitive engagement for all students, including relevant sub-groups
- Articulate a clear vision and set of criteria that is used to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum that is consistently implemented across the school

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What key decisions have you implemented to support your faculty in adapting/adopting CCLS aligned curricula? How do those decisions take into consideration the needs of students and teachers?
- Have you encountered any obstacles in orienting your staff to curriculum implementation? How have you strategically addressed those obstacles?
- How have you approached curriculum refinements as a learning community?
- How do you assess the rigor of curricula and tasks? Can you give an example?
- What processes do you have in place to ensure vertical and horizontal curriculum alignment and coherence?
- What is your school's approach to the integration of the instructional shifts and college and career readiness skills?
- What structures and resources do you provide to support teachers in appropriately modifying and adapting curricula so that all learners have access?

Key Evidence/Notes:

¹Instructional shifts refer to those embedded in the CCLS

²Rigorous habits or higher-order skills: [Webb's Depth of Knowledge \(DOK\) tool](#) and [Hess's Cognitive Rigor Matrix](#) inform the terms "rigorous habits" and "higher-order skills" in this rubric

³Access: Universal Design for Learning (UDL) informs the curricular planning and revisions for access in this rubric

1.2 Develop teacher pedagogy from a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best that is informed by the instructional shifts and Danielson Framework for Teaching⁴, aligned to the curricula, engaging, and meets the needs of all learners so that all students produce meaningful work

- a. **WD:** Across the vast majority of classrooms, teaching practices are aligned to the curricula and reflect a coherent set of beliefs about how students learn best that is informed by the Danielson Framework for Teaching and the instructional shifts, as well as by discussions at the team and school levels
- b. **WD:** Across the vast majority of classrooms, teaching strategies (including questioning, scaffolds in English and/ or native language where appropriate, and routines) strategically provide multiple entry points and high-quality supports and extensions into the curricula so that all learners, including ELLs and SWDs, are engaged in appropriately challenging tasks and demonstrate higher-order thinking skills² in student work products
- c. **WD:** Across the vast majority of classrooms, student work products and discussions reflect high levels of student thinking, participation, and ownership

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Articulate the core beliefs about teaching and learning to the school community and promote investment in those common beliefs
- Point to a clear relationship between core instructional beliefs and practices across classrooms
- Facilitate a normed understanding of rigor* in tasks and student work across classrooms through the use of structured protocols to analyze student work and data
- Promote a shared understanding of multiple access points, scaffolding, and routines across classrooms that address the diverse needs of all students
- Ensure that pedagogical practices across classrooms support discussion and student work products that reflect higher order thinking and are aligned to the school's core beliefs and curricula
- Highlight strong pedagogy that supports the relationship among curricula and student tasks through actionable feedback and coaching

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What are your school's core beliefs about student learning and how are those beliefs reflected across classrooms?
- How have you influenced school-wide investment in your instructional vision?
- Where are the challenges in building teacher capacity to support the school's instructional vision? How have you strategically planned to address those challenges?
- What structures do you have in place to ensure coherent instructional practices that promote higher order thinking across classrooms?
- How have you approached providing access to the curricula to ensure that all student needs are being met?
- What processes do you have in place to support teachers in analyzing student work?
- How do you build teacher and student capacity to engage in rigorous discussions and tasks?

Key Evidence/Notes:

⁴Aligned with the implementation of the new teacher evaluation law in September 2013, "Danielson Framework for Teaching, 2013" replaces the term "common teaching framework." [Webb's Depth of Knowledge \(DOK\)](#) tool and [Hess's Cognitive Rigor Matrix](#) inform the term "rigor" in this tool

1.3 Make strategic organizational decisions to support the school's instructional goals and meet student learning needs, as evidenced by meaningful student work products

- a. **WD:** The use of resources (e.g., budget, space, technology, coaches, partnerships) and other organizational decisions are well-aligned to and support the school's instructional goals and long-range action plans, as evident in meaningful student work products
- b. **WD:** The use of staff time is structured such that teams have substantial and regular meetings that are deliberately structured so that teachers' professional responsibilities align with the school's instructional goals, focusing teacher time on instructional work and resulting in improved instruction that engages all students in challenging academic tasks
- c. **WD:** Hiring practices, teacher assignments (e.g., total student load, effective teachers placed to close the achievement gap), and student program groupings and interventions, including those for ELLs and SWDs, are strategic, promoting access to college and career readiness⁵ as well as accountable collaborations among faculty so that groups of teachers hold themselves accountable for their students' progress

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Establish a process for engaging key stakeholders in organizational decisions
- Establish and articulate clear rationales for the investment of resources in school goals, and directly connect those goals to student achievement
- Build structures to maximize time spent on instructional work across the school community
- Establish clear and purposeful protocols for focused and productive teacher team meetings that are consistently aligned to school goals
- Establish clearly defined goals and benchmarks for leadership roles across the school community (APs, teacher leaders, etc.) and assess/track each leader's progress
- Strategically structure supplemental programs(after school, weekends, web-based, etc.) based on student data and needs
- Articulate a strategy and establish a process for hiring and retaining high quality teachers
- Strategically match student and teacher assignments to meet the needs of students and create collective ownership for student progress

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What adjustments have you made to your budget that reflect your instructional goals and student needs? Can you provide a couple of key examples?
- How have you gotten your faculty on the same page about the value and effective use of teacher team meeting time?
- How have you structured team meetings to yield instructional improvements?
- How do you know your decisions are improving instruction and engaging students in challenging academic tasks?
- What factors do you consider when creating staff and student schedules?
- What accountability structures have you created to build collective ownership for student progress?
- What specific interventions are in place to meet the needs of targeted students and close the achievement gap?

Key Evidence/Notes:

⁵College and Career readiness also includes other post-secondary outcomes such as independent living, mobility, and structured employment options

1.4 Maintain a culture of mutual trust and positive attitudes that supports the academic and personal growth of students and adults

- a. **WD:** The school’s approach to culture-building, discipline, and social-emotional support is informed by a theory of action and results in a safe environment and inclusive culture that support progress toward the school’s goals; the school meaningfully involves student voice in decision-making to initiate, guide, and lead school improvement efforts
- b. **WD:** Structures are in place so that each student is known well by at least one adult who helps to personalize attendance supports and coordinate social-emotional learning, child/youth development, and guidance/advisement supports that impact students’ academic and personal behaviors⁶
- c. **WD:** The school community strategically aligns professional development, family outreach, and student learning experiences and supports, resulting in the adoption of effective academic and personal behaviors

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Model and guide the school community towards a culture of respect and trust
- Lead the implementation of comprehensive strategies that promote a safe climate and the personal and academic growth of students
- Promote meaningful voice of students and adults in school decisions
- Collaborate with key stakeholders to develop a vision of how to best support the social-emotional development of each student within the context of the classrooms and the school-at-large
- Establish a system to actively engage parents, address concerns in a timely fashion, and provide opportunities for parent outreach
- Establish and articulate school-based approaches to the adoption of effective academic and personal behaviors
- Foster professional growth of staff to meet the wide range of social-emotional needs of all students

Suggested Guiding Questions

- How do you build a safe and inclusive school culture? What key strategies have you implemented for discipline and social-emotional support?
- In what ways do you promote student voice? Can you give an example of authentic student involvement in key decision making?
- How have you organized so that student services are well coordinated and align to student needs? Can you give an example of how these services impact student growth?
- What’s your school’s focus on promoting effective academic and personal behaviors for students?
- How have you built staff capacity to meet the social-emotional needs of students in and out of the classroom?
- What does family outreach focused on the needs of students look like?

Key Evidence/Notes:

⁶Academic and personal behaviors encompass a range of indicators that support resilience as well as college enrollment and persistence. These behaviors are disaggregated into five overlapping categories: motivation, engagement, work habits/ organizational skills, communication/ collaboration skills, and self-regulation. For more information, see [\(link\)](#). **1.4**

2.2 Align assessments to curricula, use on-going assessment and grading practices, and analyze information on student learning outcomes to adjust instructional decisions at the team and classroom levels

- a. **WD:** Across the vast majority of classrooms, teachers use or create assessments, rubrics, and grading policies that are aligned with the school’s curricula and offer a clear portrait of student mastery, thus providing actionable and meaningful feedback to students and teachers regarding student achievement
- b. **WD:** The school uses common assessments⁷ to create a clear picture of student progress toward goals across grades and subjects, track progress, and adjust curricular and instructional decisions so that all students, including ELLs and SWDs, demonstrate increased mastery
- c. **WD:** Across the vast majority of classrooms, teachers’ assessment practices consistently reflect the varied use of ongoing checks for understanding and student self-assessment so that teachers make effective adjustments to meet all students’ learning needs and students are aware of their next learning steps

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Ensure that the assessments used in the school community are aligned to standards-based curricula and assess key student knowledge and understanding
- Point to examples of how data drives the refinement of curriculum and instruction
- Engage key stakeholders and tap into teacher expertise regarding school-wide assessment planning and practices
- Track and communicate what ongoing assessment data demonstrates in terms of student progress
- Ensure that assessment choices and practices provide meaningful feedback loops for both teachers and students
- Support and evaluate best practices for frequent assessment strategies across classrooms including checks for understanding and student self-assessment
- Strategize to integrate the use of assessments into teacher team work so that teacher time is spent efficiently and effectively

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What is your approach to the use of assessments in your school community? Can you discuss the rationale behind your approach?
- Have you encountered obstacles in building a shared understanding of assessment use and design? How have you strategically addressed those obstacles?
- What are some examples of what assessment data has revealed in terms of student knowledge and skills?
- How do you build teacher capacity in using different types of data to adjust curriculum and instruction?
- How do you ensure that assessments and rubrics are aligned to standards and yield valuable information?
- How do teachers check for understanding? How do they create structures for students to self-assess and reflect on their own progress? What has been the impact of such assessments on teaching and learning?

Key Evidence/Notes:

⁷**Common assessment:** Teachers use one shared assessment or use different assessments that measure common skills to evaluate student progress across classes and over time. **2.2**

3.1 Establish a coherent vision of school improvement that is reflected in a short list of focused, data-based goals that are tracked for progress and are understood and supported by the entire school community

- a. **WD:** There is a “theory of action,” which includes a rationale for the short list of clear, focused school-level goals and action plans (long-range, annual, and interim) apparent in the CEP and other planning documents; those goals are tracked for progress and thoughtfully adjusted to leverage changes that explicitly link to accelerated student learning and social-emotional growth
- b. **WD:** Goal-setting and effective action planning at the school level, including professional development planning, are informed by a comprehensive, data-driven needs assessment and ongoing data gathering and analysis that improve teacher practice across classrooms and close the achievement gap
- c. **WD:** School leaders effectively involve and communicate with the school community, including teachers, families, and age-appropriate students, regarding school improvement plans and decision-making processes

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Collaborate with the school community to develop a coherent and shared vision and a theory of action for school improvement
- Identify and leverage a focused set of data-based goals to drive coherence across initiatives
- Collect and use data to assess organizational effectiveness, and promote adult and student learning towards meeting instructional goals
- Ensure that action plans are strategic with clear rationales and benchmarks
- Monitor and evaluate progress through tracking, and revise plans as necessary towards meeting school goals
- Point to connections between the data, professional development needs, and other action plans to meet school goals
- Engage key stakeholders in shared leadership and active communication towards school improvement planning

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What are your goals this year? How do they connect to your vision for school improvement and drive coherence across initiatives?
- How do you ensure that goal-setting and action planning is collaborative?
- How do comprehensive, data-based needs assessments drive your goal setting and action planning process?
- How do you track for progress and adjust your goals to accelerate student learning?
- How do you use the data analysis results to improve teacher practices and student outcomes across classrooms? Can you give an example of this process using a specific goal and action plan?
- What school-wide structures have you established for communicating progress towards benchmarks and goals?

Key Evidence/Notes:

3.4 Establish a culture for learning that communicates high expectations to staff, students, and families, and provide supports to achieve those expectations

- a. **WD:** School leaders consistently communicate high expectations (professionalism, instruction, communication, and other elements of the teacher practice rubric) to the entire staff, and provide training, resulting in a culture of mutual accountability for those expectations
- b. **WD:** School leaders and staff effectively communicate expectations connected to a path to college and career readiness and successfully partner with families to support student progress toward those expectations
- c. **WD:** Teacher teams and staff establish a culture for learning that systematically communicates a unified set of high expectations for all students and provide clear, focused, and effective feedback and guidance/advisement supports to ensure that students, including high-need subgroups, own their educational experience and are prepared for the next level

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Model and communicate clear, consistent, and high expectations to the school community
- Identify and promote school-based strategies that engage students in rigorous instructional tasks
- Embed systems and structures such as articulation that make clear the students' path toward the next level of schooling
- Hold the school community accountable for implementing intervention and support strategies for struggling learners across classrooms
- Facilitate a culture of high expectations through a focused set of academic and personal behaviors promoted across the school
- Ensure that best practices from professional development offerings are implemented into practice
- Establish successful partnerships and feedback venues with families to improve student outcomes

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What do high expectations look like in your school?
- In what ways do you communicate your high expectations about teaching and learning?
- What systems of accountability and support have you established for those expectations?
- What do practices connected to college and career readiness look like across classrooms?
- Can you identify one or two key age appropriate college and career readiness practices you are currently implementing? How do those practices impact student progress?
- How do you ensure that teachers provide ongoing feedback to families regarding student progress?
- What feedback venues are in place among teachers, families and student to provide key information and help prepare students for the next level?

Key Evidence/Notes:

4.1 Observe teachers using the Danielson Framework for Teaching along with the analysis of learning outcomes to elevate school-wide instructional practices and implement strategies that promote professional growth and reflection

- a. **WD:** School leaders and teacher peers support the development of teachers, including those new to the profession, with effective feedback⁸ and next steps from the strategic use of frequent cycles of classroom observation and analysis of student work/data
- b. **WD:** Feedback to teachers accurately captures strengths, challenges, and next steps using the Danielson Framework for Teaching; feedback articulates clear expectations for teacher practice, supports teacher development, and aligns with professional goals for teachers
- c. **WD:** School leaders have a strategic, transparent system for managing professional development, make informed decisions, and develop succession plans (assignment, tenure, retention) about teachers, APs, and other staff members; this system is leading to improved quality of student work products

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Systematize a process to conduct frequent, low-inference observations that are aligned to the Danielson Framework for Teaching and build a shared understanding of effective teaching
- Integrate the analysis of student work and data into feedback cycles
- Ensure that the observation and feedback process is yielding improvements in teaching and learning
- Deliver timely feedback and observation reports with clear next steps that accurately capture the strengths and challenges of teacher practice and its impact on student learning
- Implement a system to track teacher feedback, monitor growth over time, and identify needs
- Demonstrate that professional development decisions are based on the identified needs of individual and groups of teachers
- Establish a clear set of criteria for hiring, assignment, leadership development, and tenure decisions

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What are your beliefs about how adults learn best? How do your beliefs drive your teacher feedback cycles?
- How are you establishing trusting relationships with teachers while holding them accountable in order to provide targeted feedback and improve practice?
- What systems have you put in place for conducting teacher observations? How does student work and data analysis support your feedback?
- How do you promote inter-visitation, peer coaching, and collegial support among teachers?
- How have you worked with your school community to norm understanding of the Danielson Framework and effective feedback connected to it?
- What teaching patterns and trends have you observed and how have you addressed those through goal setting and professional development?
- What leadership opportunities have you created in your building? What are your succession plans for key leadership roles?

Key Evidence/Notes:

⁸Effective feedback is specific, actionable, time-bound, and prioritized. It is also aligned to the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2013 version) and to the CCLS, where appropriate.

4.2 Engage in structured professional collaborations on teams using an inquiry approach⁹ that promotes shared leadership and focuses on improved student learning

- a. **WD:** The vast majority of teachers are engaged in inquiry-based, structured professional collaborations that have strengthened teacher instructional capacity and promoted the implementation of CCLS (including the instructional shifts), resulting in school-wide instructional coherence and increased student achievement for all learners
- b. **WD:** Teacher teams systematically analyze key elements of teacher work including classroom practice, assessment data, and student work for students they share or on whom they are focused, resulting in shared improvements in teacher practice and mastery of goals for groups of students
- c. **WD:** Distributed leadership structures are embedded so that there is effective teacher leadership and teachers play an integral role in key decisions that affect student learning across the school

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Build structures for teachers to meet regularly within teacher teams
- Establish, articulate and model a consistent process and protocols for data/work analysis within teacher teams
- Monitor teacher team work to ensure that they lead to instructional and curricular next steps, improve teacher practice, and yield student progress
- Provide targeted professional development and build teacher capacity in data-driven improvement cycles
- Develop teacher leaders within teams who drive key decisions related to the improvement of student achievement and progress towards school goals

Suggested Guiding Questions

- How have you structured your teacher team meetings to ensure that they are effective and productive?
- What do data and student work analysis process look and sound like across teacher teams?
- How do you hold teachers accountable for the implementation of team decisions regarding next steps?
- How do you support teams and build teacher capacity in data-driven inquiry work?
- How does the work of teacher teams strengthen the instructional capacity of your teachers? Can you give an example?
- How does the work of teacher teams improve student outcomes? Can you give an example?
- How have you built distributive leadership to drive teacher team work and ensure teacher voice in key decisions?
- What impact have shared leadership practices yielded thus far?

Key Evidence/Notes:

⁹The term ***inquiry approach*** is defined by the expectations of teacher teams in 4.2b and **4.2** across this rubric

5.1 Evaluate the quality of school-level decisions, making adjustments as needed to increase the coherence of policies and practices across the school, with particular attention to the CCLS

- a. **WD:** School leaders and faculty have an effective and transparent process in place to purposefully evaluate and adjust curricular and instructional practices in response to student learning needs and the expectations of the CCLS, with a focus on building alignment and coherence between what is taught and how it is taught (evaluation of practices of 1.1, 1.2, 2.2)
- b. **WD:** School leaders and faculty have a process in place to purposefully evaluate the quality of school culture and the ways expectations are developed and shared among school constituents, with a focus on making adjustments to support the expectations of the CCLS (evaluation of practices of 1.4, 3.4)
- c. **WD:** School leaders and faculty have a process in place to purposefully evaluate and adjust the use of organizational resources and the quality of teacher team work and professional development practices, with particular attention to what teachers need to learn to support student mastery of the CCLS (evaluation of practices of 1.3, 4.1, 4.2)

Examples of Principal Practice

How effectively does the Principal...

- Embed a system with indicators of success to evaluate school’s instructional core; use findings to communicate examples of strengths, areas of need and clear next steps for adjustments
- Ensure that instruction and tasks are modified based on data analysis to support students in meeting the expectations of the CCLS
- Embed a system with indicators of success to evaluate the school culture and expectations; use findings to communicate examples of strengths, areas of need and clear next steps for adjustments
- Make effective adjustments to increase the quality of school culture and expectations so that all students meet the expectations of the CCLS
- Embed a system with indicators of success to evaluate the systems for improvement; use findings to communicate examples of strengths, areas of need and clear next steps for adjustments.
- Ensure effective adjustments to organizational resource use, teacher team work, and the observation process so that adult learning supports student mastery

Suggested Guiding Questions

- What data do you analyze to regularly evaluate and adjust curricular, instructional, and assessment practices? Can you give an example of a decision made as a result of this process and its impact?
- What process have you established for reviewing lesson plans and student work?
- Can you give an example of recent modification to a unit and speak to how the revisions support student progress towards CCLS?
- What data do you analyze on school environment and culture? How often? Can you give an example of a recent finding and an adjustment you’ve made?
- What data do you analyze to regularly evaluate and adjust teacher team practices? Can you give an example of a recent decision made as a result of this process and its impact?
- What data do you analyze to regularly evaluate and adjust your teacher evaluation process? Can you give an example of a recent change you’ve made as a result of this process and its impact?

Key Evidence/Notes:

Appendix B: State-Provided Growth Measures

Elementary/Middle/K-8 Schools

Growth on grade 4-8 State ELA and math exams

The New York State Education Department (NYSED) will provide growth scores for all principals of schools administering grades 4-8 ELA and/or math State assessments. For each student in grade 4-8, a student growth percentile (SGP) will be calculated based on his or her ELA *and* math State assessment results. The SGP will compare students' growth on State assessments to students with similar achievement results across New York State. Student achievement results will include up to three years (prior year and two additional years if available) of State assessments.

A student must have been enrolled in the same school from BEDS day to the State assessment administration window to be included in the calculation for a principal's growth score in a school with grades 4-8. A principal must have a minimum of 16 student scores to receive an overall adjusted mean growth percentile (MGP).

Adjustments are made to SGPs based on student characteristics, including academic history, student disability status, English Language Learner status, and economic disadvantage status. NYSED has not yet released the full list of student characteristic that will be used in the State growth model in 2014-15. Adjusted SGPs are averaged to determine an overall adjusted MGP, which includes all of a principal's students and takes into account student demographics. These MGPs are also reported with an upper and a lower limit that represent a 95% confidence range. The overall adjusted MGP for the principal is used along with confidence ranges to rate the principal's performance in one of four categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, or Ineffective.

For more information about the State growth model, see <http://www.engageny.org/resource/resources-about-state-growth-measures/>. Please note that the documents currently available on the EngageNY website pertain to the State growth model that was used in 2013-14. The details of the State growth model in 2014-15 have not yet been released.

High School and Transfer High Schools

For high school principals, SED will use two measures to calculate growth scores:

- Growth Percentile on English and Integrated Algebra Regents
- Comparative Growth in Regents Exams Passed

SED will combine these measures into one growth score and rating on the HEDI scale for each principal. This rating will be used as the State Measures for the principal's Overall Rating. Please see page 9 of this document if you are a principal with fewer than 30% of students taking Regents exams.

Growth Percentile on English and Integrated Algebra Regents

SED will provide growth scores for all principals of buildings with grades 9-12. For each student in grades 9-12, a student growth percentile is calculated based on a student's 8th grade math or ELA assessment

and his or her Regents exam in Integrated Algebra or English. For ease of reference, this Guide will refer only to the 8th grade assessment, but please note that if students do not have an appropriate 8th grade assessment, the 7th grade assessment will be used.

To be included in a principal's SGP, a student must have been enrolled in the school on BEDS day and the first day of the Regents exam administration window, in addition to sitting for the English and/or Integrated Algebra Regents exam during the current school year or the prior August. Students are included in this measure up to eight (8) years after first entering 9th grade. However, students who take the English or Integrated Algebra Regents exams prior to high school are not included. Students who transfer into 9th grade from another state or country will also not be included.

The SGP will compare the performance of students between 8th grade State assessments and the Integrated Algebra and English Regents Exams to the performance of students with similar achievement histories. To do so, adjustments are made to SGPs based on student characteristics, including academic history, student disability status, English Language Learner status, and economic disadvantage status. NYSED has not yet released the full list of student characteristic that will be used in the State growth model in 2014-15.

Adjusted SGPs are averaged to determine an overall adjusted Mean Growth Percentile (MGP), which includes all of a principal's students and takes into account student demographics.

For each of the two Regents exams, schools must have at least 16 student SGP scores for the MGP to be calculated for that subject. Note that if a student takes the same exam more than once within the same year, the highest score is counted. August exams will be included, but will count toward the previous school year. The August between grades 8 and 9 is always excluded.

Comparative Growth in Regents Exams Passed

This measure examines the number of Regents exams passed annually starting the year a student enters 9th grade, compared to similar students statewide. The measure will include up to eight total Regents exams per student: five Regents exams required for graduation (English, Global, U.S., one math, one Science), plus up to any three additional Regents exams. At least 16 students must be enrolled in the school for the measure to be calculated.

To be included in a principal's Comparative Growth in Regents Exams Passed measure, a student will have to be enrolled in the same school from BEDS day to the first day of the Regents exam administration window. Students are included in this measure up to eight (8) years after first entering 9th grade. Students who drop out of high school are included until they have reached their fourth year after entering ninth grade. Students who dropped out prior to the 2012-13 school year are not included in this measure. Students who transfer into New York State schools in 9th grade from other states or countries are not counted since the baseline assessments are not available.

SED will calculate the Comparative Growth in Regents Exams Passed by:

1. Determining how many Regents exams each student in the school passed in the current school year
2. Subtracting from that the number of Regents exams passed by similar students statewide in the same cohort year
3. Summing up the difference for every student in the school
4. Dividing the result by the number of students that are included in the measure

The results are reported not as a growth percentile, but as a number. If a school receives a 0, this indicates that the principal's students are passing an *average* number of Regents exams compared to similar students. See below for a sample calculation for Comparative Growth in Regents Exams Passed:

| Student | Number of Regents Passed in Current Year for This Student | Number of Regents Passed This year by Similar Students Statewide | Difference |
|--|---|--|------------|
| Jessica | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Tyler | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Ashley | 1 | 2 | -1 |
| Emily | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Jacob | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Total Difference (Sum of Difference) | | | 1 |
| Average Difference (Total Difference/Number of Students) | | | $1/5=.2$ |

This principal's score on is .2, indicating that her students are passing an average of *.2 more Regents exams* than similar students.

Appendix C: Measure of Leadership Practice HEDI Conversion Chart

| Quality Review Score | HEDI Rating | HEDI Points | Quality Review Score | HEDI Rating | HEDI Points |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| 25 | Ineffective | 0 | 63 | Effective | 44 |
| 26 | | 2 | 64 | | 44 |
| 27 | | 4 | 65 | | 45 |
| 28 | | 6 | 66 | | 45 |
| 29 | | 8 | 67 | | 46 |
| 30 | | 10 | 68 | | 46 |
| 31 | | 12 | 69 | | 46 |
| 32 | | 14 | 70 | | 47 |
| 33 | | 16 | 71 | | 47 |
| 34 | | 18 | 72 | | 48 |
| 35 | | 20 | 73 | | 48 |
| 36 | | 21 | 74 | | 48 |
| 37 | | 23 | 75 | | 49 |
| 38 | | 25 | 76 | | 49 |
| 39 | 27 | 77 | 49 | | |
| 40 | 29 | 78 | 50 | | |
| 41 | 31 | 79 | 50 | | |
| 42 | 33 | 80 | 51 | | |
| 43 | 35 | 81 | 51 | | |
| 44 | 37 | 82 | 51 | | |
| 45 | Developing | 39 | 83 | 52 | |
| 46 | | 39 | 84 | 52 | |
| 47 | | 40 | 85 | 52 | |
| 48 | | 40 | 86 | 53 | |
| 49 | | 40 | 87 | 53 | |
| 50 | | 41 | 88 | 54 | |
| 51 | | 41 | 89 | 54 | |
| 52 | | 41 | 90 | 54 | |
| 53 | | 41 | 91 | 54 | |
| 54 | | 42 | 92 | 55 | |
| 55 | | 42 | 93 | 56 | |
| 56 | | 42 | 94 | 56 | |
| 57 | | 43 | 95 | 57 | |
| 58 | | 43 | 96 | 58 | |
| 59 | | 43 | 97 | 58 | |
| 60 | | 44 | 98 | 59 | |
| 61 | | 44 | 99 | 59 | |
| 62 | | 44 | 100 | 60 | |

Appendix D: Local Measures HEDI Conversion Chart

| D75/ES/MS/K-8 | | | High Schools | | | Transfer High Schools | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Percentile Rank | HEDI Rating | HEDI Points | Percentile Rank | HEDI Rating | HEDI Points | Percentile Rank | HEDI Rating | HEDI Points |
| 0.0 to 0.1 | Ineffective | 0 | 0.0 to 0.1 | Ineffective | 0 | 0.0 to 0.1 | Ineffective | 0 |
| 0.2 to 0.4 | | 1 | 0.2 to 0.4 | | 1 | 0.2 to 0.2 | | 1 |
| 0.5 to 0.6 | | 2 | 0.5 to 0.6 | | 2 | 0.3 to 0.4 | | 2 |
| 0.7 to 0.8 | | 3 | 0.7 to 0.8 | | 3 | 0.5 to 0.5 | | 3 |
| 0.9 to 1.1 | | 4 | 0.9 to 1.1 | | 4 | 0.6 to 0.7 | | 4 |
| 1.2 to 1.3 | | 5 | 1.2 to 1.3 | | 5 | 0.8 to 0.8 | | 5 |
| 1.4 to 1.5 | | 6 | 1.4 to 1.5 | | 6 | 0.9 to 1.0 | | 6 |
| 1.6 to 1.7 | | 7 | 1.6 to 1.7 | | 7 | 1.1 to 1.1 | | 7 |
| 1.8 to 2.0 | | 8 | 1.8 to 2.0 | | 8 | 1.2 to 1.3 | | 8 |
| 2.1 to 2.2 | | 9 | 2.1 to 2.2 | | 9 | 1.4 to 1.4 | | 9 |
| 2.3 to 2.4 | | 10 | 2.3 to 2.4 | | 10 | 1.5 to 1.6 | | 10 |
| 2.5 to 2.7 | | 11 | 2.5 to 2.7 | | 11 | 1.7 to 1.7 | | 11 |
| 2.8 to 2.9 | | 12 | 2.8 to 2.9 | | 12 | 1.8 to 1.9 | | 12 |
| 3.0 to 6.4 | Developing | 13 | 3.0 to 5.4 | Developing | 13 | 2.0 to 4.4 | Developing | 13 |
| 6.5 to 9.9 | | 14 | 5.5 to 7.9 | | 14 | 4.5 to 6.9 | | 14 |
| 10.0 to 27.6 | Effective | 15 | 8.0 to 22.9 | Effective | 15 | 7.0 to 24.9 | Effective | 15 |
| 27.7 to 45.2 | | 16 | 23.0 to 37.9 | | 16 | 25.0 to 42.9 | | 16 |
| 45.3 to 62.9 | | 17 | 38.0 to 52.9 | | 17 | 43.0 to 60.9 | | 17 |
| 63.0 to 75.2 | Highly Effective | 18 | 53.0 to 68.6 | Highly Effective | 18 | 61.0 to 73.9 | Highly Effective | 18 |
| 75.3 to 87.6 | | 19 | 68.7 to 84.2 | | 19 | 74.0 to 86.9 | | 19 |
| 87.7 to 100.0 | | 20 | 84.3 to 100.0 | | 20 | 87.0 to 100.0 | | 20 |

Appendix E: State Measures for DOE-Calculated Growth Scores HEDI Conversion Chart

| 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 |