

### Problems for Negotiation of 60% "Other Measures" Bands

**The New Bands for 2011-12 (and beyond until there is a value-added model); Also for Those For Whom A Value-Added Score will not be generated in future years:**

Level	Measures of Student Growth (20%)	Local measures of student achievement (20%)	*Other 60 Points: Scoring ranges locally negotiated	Overall Composite Score
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	No possibility to move out of Ineffective with two Ineffective achievement scores	0-64
Developing	3-8	3-8	With 6 pts. (3+3) in achievement, 59 needed here to maintain Developing Composite	65-74
Effective	9-17	9-17	With 18 pts. (9+9) in achievement, 57 needed here to maintain Effective Composite	75-90
Highly Effective	18-20	18-20	With 36 pts. (18+18) achievement, 55 needed here to maintain Highly Effective Composite	91-100

\*It is impossible to negotiate bands for the 60 points that provide consistency across all components and the composite bands. It is also difficult to design bands that maintain HEDI ratings with low to mid-range achievement scores in some categories.

**The same issues exist for the new bands when a value added model is adopted with the 25/15 split in achievement points:**

Level	Measures of Student Growth (25%)	Local measures of student achievement (15%)	*Other 60 Points: Scoring ranges locally negotiated	Overall Composite Score
Ineffective	0-2	0-2	Same Issues  As  Above	0-64
Developing	3-9	3-7		65-74
Effective	10-21	8-13		75-90
Highly	22-25	14-15		91-100

**HEDI Scoring Bands for Teachers and Principals:  
Examples of Problems using Negotiated 60 Point Bands Consistent with either  
Achievement Bands or Composite Bands**

Level	Measures of Student Growth (20 points)	Local Measures of Student Achievement (20 points)	*Other Measures of Effectiveness: (60 points): Two possible negotiated bands based on comparable distributions to other bands		Composite Score (100 points)
			Using % comparable to Achievement bands	Using % comparable to Composite Bands	
Ineffective	0-2 (0% to 10% of 20 points)	0-2 (0% to 10% of 20 points)	0-7 (0% to 12%)	0-38 (0% to 63%)	0-64 (0% to 64% of 100 points)
Developing	3-8 (15% to 40% of 20 points)	3-8 (15% to 40% of 20 points)	8-25 (13% to 42%)	39-44 (65% to 73%)	65-74 (65% to 74% of 100 points)
Effective	9-17 (45% to 85% of 20 points)	9-17 (45% to 85% of 20 points)	26-52 (43% to 87%)	45-53 (75% to 88%)	75-90 (75% to 90% of 100 points)
Highly Effective	18-20 (90% to 100% of 20 points)	18-20 (90% to 100% of 20 points)	53-60 (88% to 100%)	54-60 (90% to 100%)	91-100 (91% to 100% of 100 points)

\*It is impossible to negotiate bands for the 60 points that provide consistency across all components and the composite bands. It is also difficult to design bands that maintain HEDI ratings with low to mid-range achievement scores in some categories.

**Sample Scores from Above Bands:**

**Using Left Side Bands Above for 60 Points:**

State Growth Score	12 (middle Effective)	13 (middle Effective)
Local Achievement Score	12 (middle Effective)	13 (middle Effective)
Other Measures Score	40 (middle Effective)	48 (upper Effective)
Composite Score	64 (Ineffective Overall)	74 (Developing Overall)

**Using Right Side Bands Above for 60 Points:**

State Growth Score	13 (middle Effective)	10 (Effective)
Local Achievement Score	13 (middle Effective)	9 (Effective)
Other Measures Score	48 (upper middle Effective)	45 (Effective)
Composite Score	74 (Developing Overall)	64 (Ineffective Overall)



**HEDI Scoring Bands for Teachers and Principals:  
One Possible Set of Negotiated Scoring Bands for the 60% “Other Measures” Component**

The Commissioner may annually after 2012-13 recommend changes to the Board of Regents. \*Be aware that based on the SI prescribed bands for the two student achievement components and the composite score, there are no scoring bands for the 60 % local measures of leadership and management which mathematically assure consistency across the three subcomponents and the overall composite score. Units will have to carefully analyze what scoring bands are most appropriate for the 60% “Other” component.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Measures of Student Growth (25%)</b>	<b>Local Measures of Student Achievement (15%)</b>	<b>*Other 60 Points: Scoring ranges locally negotiated</b>	<b>Overall Composite Score</b>
<b>Ineffective</b>	<b>0-2</b>	<b>0-2</b>	<b>0-57</b>	<b>0-64</b>
<b>Developing</b>	<b>3-9</b>	<b>3-7</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>65-74</b>
<b>Effective</b>	<b>10-21</b>	<b>8-13</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>75-90</b>
<b>Highly Effective</b>	<b>22-25</b>	<b>14-15</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>91-100</b>

These bands allow greatest possibility to maintain Effective and Highly Effective if both achievement scores are in those ranges. For developing, some who receive the lowest developing scores in both achievement components will be forced into the Ineffective rating on the composite score. These bands are best used with an initial holistic approach to the rubric. The supervisor will have to assign a HEDI rating first, then points from the above ranges for the 60% “Other Measures.” If using a scoring mechanism item by item or section by section on the rubric, it will need to produce a HEDI rating first, which will then refer to these bands for a score to be incorporated into the evaluation. Units will need to be careful to assure that the above points for Developing, Effective, and Highly Effective are the end result on the 60% “Other Measures” of Effectiveness.

**If A Value Added Model is NOT Adopted; OR for Those Who Will NOT Get  
A State Value Added Score:**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Measures of Student Growth (20%)</b>	<b>Local Measures of Student Achievement (20%)</b>	<b>*Other 60 Points: Scoring ranges locally negotiated</b>	<b>Overall Composite Score</b>
<b>Ineffective</b>	<b>0-2</b>	<b>0-2</b>	<b>USE</b>	<b>0-64</b>
<b>Developing</b>	<b>3-8</b>	<b>3-8</b>	<b>SAME</b>	<b>65-74</b>
<b>Effective</b>	<b>9-17</b>	<b>9-17</b>	<b>AS</b>	<b>75-90</b>
<b>Highly Effective</b>	<b>18-20</b>	<b>18-20</b>	<b>ABOVE</b>	<b>91-100</b>

**One Approach to "Other Measures" – Rubric Rating and Scoring**

1. The parties agree that Principals shall be evaluated using the Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric for the Other Measures subcomponent. The assessment of Other Measures on the rubric shall account for 60% of a Principal's composite HEDI rating.
2. Each element of the Multidimensional domain shall be rated by the supervisor in a holistic manner, circling the language on the rubric which best matches the performance of the principal for each element. These HEDI ratings shall be converted to a four point scale: Highly Effective = 4 points; Effective = 3 points; Developing = 2 points; and Ineffective = 1 point.
3. The element scores shall be determined according to the RUBRIC SCORE WEIGHTING CHART, then averaged to determine a rubric score which shall be converted to a HEDI rating and points pursuant to the CONVERSION CHART.
4. The HEDI bands for the "Other Measures, 60 points" shall be: H = 60, E = 59, D = 58, I = 0 to 57.

**RUBRIC OVERALL SUBCOMPONENT SCORE - CONVERSION CHART**

<b>Rubric Score (Average)</b>	<b>Subcomponent Points</b>
<b>Ineffective</b>	
1.00	0
1.01	1
1.02	2
1.03	3
1.04	4
1.05	5
1.06	6
1.07	7
1.08	8
1.09	9
1.10	10
1.11	11
1.12	12
1.13	13
1.14	14
1.15	15
1.16	16
1.17	17
1.18	18
1.19	19
1.20	20
1.21	21
1.22	22
1.23	23
1.24	24
1.25	25
1.26	26
1.27	27
1.28	28
1.29	29
1.30	30
1.31	31
1.32	32
1.33	33
1.34	34
1.35	35
1.36	36
1.37	37

1.38	38
1.39	39
1.40	40
1.41	41
1.42	42
1.43	43
1.44	44
1.45	45
1.46	46
1.47	47
1.48	48
1.49	49
1.50	50
1.51	51
1.52	52
1.53	53
1.54	54
1.55	55
1.56	56
1.57	57
<b>Developing</b>	
1.58-2.50	58
<b>Effective</b>	
2.51-3.50	59
<b>Highly Effective</b>	
3.51-4.00	60



**RUBRIC AVERAGE ELEMENT SCORE - WEIGHTING CHART**

<b>DOMAINS &amp; ELEMENTS</b>	<b>HEDI SCORE</b> 1= I 2= D 3= E 4= HE	<b>MULTIPLIER FOR WEIGHTING (AND NUMBER FOR THE DIVISOR TO EQUATE AN AVERAGE)*</b>	<b>TOTAL WEIGHTED POINTS</b>
<b>1. SHARED VISION OF LEARNING</b>			
a. Culture		3.5	
b. Sustainability		1.5	
<b>2. SCHOOL CULTURE &amp; INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM</b>			
a. Culture		2	
b. Instructional Program		4	
c. Capacity Building		2	
d. Sustainability		1	
e. Strategic Planning Process		1	
<b>3. SAFE, EFFICIENT, EFFECTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT</b>			
a. Capacity Building		3	
b. Culture		3	
c. Sustainability		2	
d. Instructional Program		2	
<b>4. COMMUNITY</b>			
a. Strategic Planning Process: Inquiry		3	
b. Culture		1	
c. Sustainability		1	
<b>5. INTEGRITY, FAIRNESS, ETHICS</b>			
a. Sustainability		2	
b. Culture		1	
<b>6. POLITICAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, LEGAL &amp; CULTURAL CONTEXT</b>			
a. Sustainability		1	
b. Culture		1	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>DOES NOT APPLY</b>	<b>35*</b>	
<b>AVERAGE ELEMENT SCORE (TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE DIVIDED BY TOTAL OF MULTIPLIERS) =</b>			
<b>OVERALL RUBRIC SCORE BASED ON THE AVERAGE ELEMENT SCORE =</b>			
<b>OVERALL RUBRIC HEDI RATING BASED ON THE AVERAGE ELEMENT SCORE =</b>			

\*Different weightings could be used which would also change the divisor to determine the average