## Example Model 3(B):

$3^{\text {rd }}$ grade self-contained special education teacher with 12 students, including 7 students who take the NYSAA.

Applying rules about which SLOs must be created for this teacher:

- There is no State-provided growth measure for $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade ELA/Math.
- This teacher will have 1 SLO to cover all 5 students who take the $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade ELA State assessment.
- This teacher will have 1 SLO to cover all 5 students who take the $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade Math State assessment.
- This teacher will have 1 SLO using the NYSAA performance assessment as evidence. This SLO will cover the 7 students who take the NYSAA. It is required because this teacher does not have a State-provided growth measure.

District-Provided Matrix for SLO 1 and SLO 2:

| What Student Progress Meets Expectations |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Performance <br> Level | END: 1 | END: 2 | END: 3 | END: 4 |
| START: 1 | NO | YES | YES | YES |
| START: 2 | NO | YES | YES | YES |
| START: 3 | NO | NO | YES | YES |
| START: 4 | NO | NO | YES | YES |


| Rating <br> Points | Ineffective <br> $0-2$ points | Developing <br> $3-8$ points | Effective <br> $9-17$ points | Highly <br> Effective <br> $18-20$ points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percentage of <br> students whose <br> progress meets <br> expectations |  |  |  |  |

District-Determined Rating Scale for SLO 3:

| Rating <br> Points | Ineffective <br> $0-2$ points | Developing <br> $3-8$ points | Effective <br> $9-17$ points | Highly Effective <br> $18-20$ points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percentage of students who <br> demonstrate growth of at least one |  |  |  |  |
| level on the NYSAA performance <br> assessment | $0-40 \%$ | $41-69 \%$ | $70-89 \%$ |  |


| TARGET (As Approved by Evaluator) | ACTUAL RESULT |  |  | FINAL RATING |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All students will demonstrate the following growth on the $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade State ELA assessment: <br> - Level 1 s will increase at least 1 Level. <br> - Level $2 s$ will increase at least 1 Level. <br> - Level $3 s$ will increase at least 1 Level and/or No Level $3 s$ will decrease. <br> - No Level 4s will decrease. | 1) 1 Level 1 increased at least 1 Level. <br> 2) 1 Level 1 decreased 1 Level. <br> 3) 1 Level 2 increased at least 1 Level. <br> 4) 1 Level 2 remained a Level 2 . <br> 5) 1 Level 3 remained at Level 3 . |  |  | (use District matrix) <br> $\%$ Meets $=60 \%$ <br> 11 points, EFFECTIVE |
| All students will demonstrate the following growth on the $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade State Math assessment: <br> - Level 1 s will increase at least 1 Level. <br> - Level $2 s$ will increase at least 1 Level. <br> - Level $3 s$ will increase at least 1 Level and/or No Level 3 s will decrease. <br> - No Level 4s will decrease. | 1) 2 Level 1 s increased at least 1 Level. <br> 2) 1 Level 2 increased at least 1 Level. <br> 3) 1 Level 3 remained at Level 3 . <br> 4) 1 Level 4 remained at Level 4 . |  |  | (use District matrix) <br> $\%$ Meets $=100 \%$ <br> 20 points, HIGHLY <br> EFFECTIVE |
| All 7 students who take the NYSAA for ELA and Mathematics will demonstrate growth of at least one Level as measured by the NYSAA performance assessment. | 1) 4 students who began on a Level 2 ended on a Level 3. <br> 2) 2 students who began on a Level 3 ended on a Level 4. <br> 3) 1 student who began on a Level 4 ended on a Level 4. |  |  | (use District matrix) <br> \% Meets = 100\% <br> 20 points, HIGHLY EFFECTIVE |
| OVERALL GROWTH COMPONENT RATING | Effective: 16 points (in range of 9-17 points) <br> - SLOs are weighted proportionately based on the number of students included in all SLOs. This will provide for one overall growth component score between 0-20 points. |  |  |  |
|  |  | SLO 1 | SLO 2 | SLO 3 |
|  | Step 1: (assess results of each SLO separately) | - $11 / 20$ points <br> - Effective | - 20/20 <br> points <br> - Highly Effective | - 20/20 points <br> - Highly Effective |
|  | Step 2: (weight each SLO proportionately) | 12 students / 31 TOTAL students = $39 \%$ of overall | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \text { students / } \\ & 31 \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { students = } \\ & 39 \% \text { of } \\ & \text { overall } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7 students/ <br> 31 TOTAL <br> students = <br> $22 \%$ of <br> overall |
|  | Step 3: (calculate proportional points for each SLO) | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \text { points } x \\ & 39 \%= \\ & 4 \text { points } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \text { points } x \\ & 39 \%= \\ & 8 \text { points } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \text { points } X \\ & 22 \%= \\ & 4 \text { points } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | OVERALL GROWTH COMPONENT SCORE: 16 points |  |  |  |

## SAMPLE MODEL 4 (Class Targets):

> Teachers who use a final assessment with a 100 point scale will use the following minimum growth target formula:

$$
\text { Required Growth = (100 - Pre-assessment score) / } 2
$$

> Each student counts as either a "yes" or a "no" as to whether he/she met the goal set in the growth target.
> To calculate the percentage of students who met the SLO target, the total number of students included in the SLO is divided by the number of students who met the target (the "yes" students). The following formula can be used:

Final percentage of students who met SLO = \# of students who met specified growth/total \# of students in SLO
> Tiered growth targets can be used; however, the tiered targets will need to result in one overall score that can be translated into a HEDI rating.
$>$ Districts determine HEDI ratings based on the percentage of students who made half the growth required to score 100.

| Rating <br> Points | Ineffective <br> $0-2$ points | Developing <br> $3-8$ points | Effective <br> $9-17$ points | Highly Effective <br> $18-20$ points |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| \% students who <br> met goal in growth <br> target | $0-29 \%$ | $30-54 \%$ | $55-79 \%$ | $80 \%+$ |

Note: Levels are illustrative

