
Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 1. General Information - Disclaimers and Assurances

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Disclaimers

For guidance related to Educator Evaluation plans, see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance. For a definition of terms related to Educator Evaluation, see the Educator Evaluation Glossary.

The Department will review the contents of each local educational agency's (LEA) Educator Evaluation plan as submitted using this online form, including required attachments, to determine if the plan rigorously complies with Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. Department approval does not imply endorsement of specific educational approaches in an LEA's plan.

The Department reserves the right to request further information from an LEA to monitor compliance with Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents. Each LEA is required to keep detailed records on file for each section of the currently implemented Educator Evaluation plan. Such detailed records must be provided to the Department upon request. The Department reserves the right to disapprove or require modification of an LEA's plan that does not rigorously adhere to the requirements of Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The Department will not review any attachments other than those required in the online form. Any additional attachments supplied by the LEA are for informational purposes only for the teachers and principals reviewed under this Educator Evaluation plan. Statements and/or materials in such additional attachments have not been approved and/or endorsed by the Department. However, the Department considers void any other signed agreements between and among parties in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the Educator Evaluation plan approved by the Department. The Department also reserves the right to request further information from the LEA, as necessary, as part of its review of this plan.

If the Department reasonably believes through investigation, or otherwise, that statements made in this Educator Evaluation plan are not true or accurate, it reserves the right to reject or disapprove this plan at any time and/or to request additional information to determine the truth and/or accuracy of such statements.

Educator Evaluation Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the content of this form represents the LEA's entire Educator Evaluation plan and that the Educator Evaluation plan is in compliance with Education Law Section 3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that a detailed version of the LEA's entire Educator Evaluation plan is kept on file and that a copy of such plan will be provided to the Department upon request for review of compliance with Education Law Section 3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that this Educator Evaluation plan will be posted on the LEA's website no later than September 10th of each school year, or within 10 days after the plan's approval by the Commissioner, whichever shall occur later.
- Assure that it is understood that this LEA's Educator Evaluation plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Student Learning Objectives

P s §30tol0mP <</MCID 0 >>BDC 0 0diD2hohohoh>]TJ ET4t at-.0 g0C EMC BT /P kEdy5e5-3rg /Tmx Oout > 2FBmoutpeMCID

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Student Learning Objectives

Page Last Modified: 04/12/2023

Applicable Teachers Select all that apply	Measure Prior to making a selection, please read the description of each measure provided above.	State or Regents Assessment(s) Select all that apply	Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) Select all that apply	Third Party Assessment(s) Select all that apply	Applicable School or BOCES-Program Please leave blank unless instructed by the Department to complete this column.
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Global History Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> US History Regents			

Optional Student Performance Subcomponent

For guidance on the optional subcomponent of the Student Performance category, see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance.

Percentage of Student Performance category to be locally determined if selected.

Such second measure shall apply in a consistent manner, to the extent practicable, across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the LEA and be a locally selected measure of student growth or achievement based on State-created or -administered assessments or State-designed supplemental assessments.

Options for measures and associated assessments include:

- Option (A) A second SLO, provided that this SLO is different than that used in the required subcomponent;
- Option (B) A growth score based on a statistical growth model, where available, for either State-created or -administered assessments or State-designed supplemental assessments;
- Option (C) A measure of student growth, other than an SLO, based on State-created or -administered assessments or State-designed supplemental assessments;
- Option (D) A performance index based on State-created or -administered assessments or State-designed supplemental assessments;
- Option (E) An achievement benchmark on State-created or -administered assessments or State-designed supplemental assessments; or

Q \ R W K H U F R O O H F W L Y H O \ E D U J D L Q H G P H D V X U H R I V W X G H Q W J U R Z W K R U D F K L H Y H P H Q W L

Please indicate if the optional subcomponent will be used by making the appropriate selection below.

NO, the optional subcomponent WILL NOT be used in the Student Performance category for any teacher.



Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 09/25/2023

At what level are the observable components of the selected rubric(s) rated?

- Subcomponent level (each observable subcomponent receives a rating)

How are the observable components of the selected rubric(s) weighted?

- Each component is weighted equally and averaged

Scoring the Observation Category

If an evaluator conducts multiple observations of the same type, how are those observations weighted?

Examples of observations of the same type include but are not limited to:

Two observations by the principal with one early in the school year weighted at 40% and one late in the school year weighted at 60%.

Two observations by the principal, with one holistic score for each component of the rubric based on the preponderance of evidence over both observations.

Please note: Weighting across observation type (i.e. Principal vs. Independent Evaluator) are described in the following section.

- Multiple observations of the same type are weighted in some other manner (please provide more information below)

In the box below, please describe how multiple observations of the same observation type will be weighted.

For Tenured Teachers weighting is 90% for Principal and 10 % for Independent Evaluators Observations. For Probationary Teachers component scores across both observations by the Principal/Supervisor are weighted equally and averaged. That score is multiplied by 90% to reach the Supervisor score. The same process is used for the Independent Evaluator with the result multiplied by 10% to reach the Independent Evaluator Score.

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that each set of observations (by supervisor/other trained administrator, independent, or peer) will be completed using the selected practice rubric, producing an overall score between 1 and 4. The overall weighted observation score will then be converted into a HEDI rating using the ranges indicated below.
- Assure that once all observations are complete, the different types of observations will be combined using a weighted average consistent with the weights specified in the next section, producing an overall Observation category score between 0 and 4. In the event that a teacher earns a score of 1 on all rated components of the practice rubric across all observations, a score of 0 will be assigned.

Teacher Observation Scoring Bands

The overall Observation score will be converted into a HEDI rating based on locally determined ratings consistent with the ranges listed.

Overall Observation Category		
Score and Rating		
	Minimum	Maximum
H	3.5 to 3.75	4.0
E	2.5 to 2.75	3.49 to 3.74
D	1.5 to 1.75	2.49 to 2.74
I	0.00*	1.49 to 1.74

* In the event that an educator earns a score of 1 on all rated components of the practice rubric across all observations, a score of 0 will be assigned.

HEDI Ranges

Using the dropdown menus below, please indicate the locally-determined rubric scoring ranges based on the constraints prescribed by the Commissioner in Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents for each of the rating categories.

Please select a minimum value between 3.50 and 3.75 and choose 4.00 as the maximum value for the Highly Effective range.

	Minimum Rubric Score	Maximum Rubric Score
Highly Effective:	3.50	4.00

Please select a minimum value between 2.50 and 2.75 and a maximum value between 3.49 and 3.74 for the Effective range.

	Minimum Rubric Score	Maximum Rubric Score
Effective:	2.50	3.49

Please select a minimum value between 1.50 and 1.75 and a maximum value between 2.49 and 2.74 for the Developing range.

	Minimum Rubric Score	Maximum Rubric Score
Developing:	1.50	2.49

Please choose 0.00 as the minimum value and select a maximum value between 1.49 and 1.74 for the Ineffective range.

	Minimum Rubric Score	Maximum Rubric Score
Ineffective:	0.00	1.49



[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

[Redacted text block]

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Subgroup 2

Page Last Modified: 09/19/2023

Number and Method of Observation: Subgroup 2

At least one of the required observations must be unannounced (across both required subcomponents).

Required Subcomponent 1: At least one observation must be conducted by the building principal or other trained administrator (supervisor).

Required Subcomponent 2: At least one observation must be conducted by an impartial independent trained evaluator (independent evaluator).

Optional Subcomponent: If selected, at least one observation must be conducted by a trained peer observer (peer observer).

Please identify the second subgroup of teachers to whom the information in the table below applies.

Non-Tenured Teachers

Please use the table below to enter the minimum number of observations and method of observation for each type listed as applicable to the teachers identified above.

	Minimum Number of Observations	Method of Observation Select all that apply
Announced Supervisor Observation (Required Subcomponent 1)	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In person
Unannounced Supervisor Observation (Required Subcomponent 1)	1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In person
Announced Independent Evaluator Observation (Required Subcomponent 2)	0	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Unannounced Independent Evaluator Observation (Required Subcomponent 2)	2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In person
Announced Peer Observation (Optional)	0	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Unannounced Peer Observation (Optional)	0	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

Independent Evaluator Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that independent evaluator(s) are not employed in the same school building, as defined by BEDS code, as the teacher(s) they are evaluating.
- Assure that independent evaluator(s) will be trained and selected by the LEA.

Please also read the additional assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that if the LEA is granted an annual Rural/Single Building District Independent Evaluator Hardship Waiver by the Department, the terms of such waiver shall apply for the school year during which the waiver is effective; and, that in any school year for which there is an approved waiver, the second observation(s) shall be conducted by one or more evaluators selected and trained by the LEA, who are different than the evaluator(s) who conducted the observation(s) required to be performed by the principal/supervisor or other trained administrator. See Section 30-3.4(c)(1)(ii)(a) of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that if the LEA is granted an annual Undue Burden Independent Evaluator Hardship Waiver by the Department, the terms of such waiver shall apply for the school year during which the waiver is effective; and, that in any school year for which there is an approved waiver and such waiver contains information that conflicts with the information provided in Task 4 of the LEA's approved Section 3012-d Educator Evaluation plan, the provisions of the approved waiver will apply. See Section 30-3.4(c)(1)(ii)(b) of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Subgroup 2

Page Last Modified: 09/19/2023

Peer Observation Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that peer observers, as applicable, will be trained and selected by the LEA.
- Assure that, if observations are being conducted by trained peer observers, these teachers received an overall rating of Effective or Highly Effective in the previous school year.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 5. TEACHERS: Overall Scoring - Category and Overall Ratings

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Category and Overall Ratings

For guidance on Educator Evaluation scoring, see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance.

Category Scoring Ranges

The overall Student Performance category score and the overall Observation category score will be converted into a HEDI rating based on the ranges listed in the tables below.

Student Performance			Teacher Observation		
HEDI ratings must be assigned based on the point distribution below.			HEDI ratings must be assigned based on locally determined ranges consistent with the constraints listed below.		
	Overall Student Performance Category Score and Rating			Overall Observation Category Score and Rating	
	Minimum	Maximum		Minimum	Maximum
H	18	20	H	3.5 to 3.75	4.00
E	15	17	E	2.5 to 2.75	3.49 to 3.74
D	13	14	D	1.5 to 1.75	2.49 to 2.74
I	0	12	I	0.00	1.49 to 1.74

Scoring Matrix for the Overall Rating

The overall rating for an educator shall be determined according to a methodology described in the matrix below.

		Teacher Observation Category			
		Highly Effective (H)	Effective (E)	Developing (D)	Ineffective (I)
Student Performance Category	Highly Effective (H)	H	H	E	D
	Effective (E)	H	E	E	D
	Developing (D)	E	E	D	I
	Ineffective (I)	D	D	I	I

Category and Overall Rating Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that each subcomponent and category score and rating and the Overall rating will be calculated pursuant to the requirements specified in Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that it is possible to obtain a zero in each subcomponent.
- Assure the overall rating determination for a teacher shall be determined according to the evaluation matrix.
- Assure that a student will not be instructed, for two consecutive school years, by any two teachers of the same subject in the same LEA, each of whom received an Ineffective rating under Education Law Section 3012-d in the year immediately prior to the school year in which the student is placed in the teacher's classroom unless the LEA has a Department-approved waiver from this requirement.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Teacher Improvement Plans

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Additional Requirements

For more information on the additional requirements for teachers, see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance.

Teacher Improvement Plan Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the LEA will formulate and commence implementation of a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) for all teachers who receive an overall rating of Developing or Ineffective by October 1 following the school year for which such teacher's performance is being measured or as soon as practicable thereafter.
- Assure that TIP plans developed and implemented by the superintendent or their designee, in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment, and subject to collective bargaining to the extent required under article 14 of the Civil Service Law, shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas.

Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

All TIP plans developed and implemented by the superintendent or their designee, in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment, must include:

- 1) identification of needed areas of improvement;
- 2) a timeline for achieving improvement;
- 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed; and, where appropriate,
- 4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas.

As a required attachment to this Educator Evaluation plan, upload the TIP forms that are used in the LEA.

FCS TIP Plan.pdf

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Appeals Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the LEA has collectively bargained appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.
- Assure that an appeal shall not be filed until a teacher's receipt of their overall rating.

Appeals

Pursuant to Education Law §3012-d, a teacher may only challenge the following in an appeal to their LEA:

- (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review [evaluation]; which shall include the following:
 - (i) in the instance of a teacher rated Ineffective on the Student Performance category, but rated Highly Effective on the Observation category based on an anomaly, as determined locally;
- (2) the LEA's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-d;
- (3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as required under Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents; and
- (4) the LEA's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan, as required under Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

Please review your negotiated appeal process and use the table below to describe the appeal process available to teachers.

Which groups of teachers may utilize the appeals process? Select all groups that have the same process as defined in subsequent columns. To add additional groups with a different process, use the "Add Row" button.	Please select the ground(s) on which the teachers selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating. Select all that apply.	What is the maximum length of time for the teachers selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	based on an anomaly, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

may utilize the appeals process.

Row Number	Groups of teachers not specified in the table above that may utilize the appeals process.
(No Response)	(No Response)



Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Assurances

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Teacher Evaluation Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the LEA shall compute and provide to the teacher their score and rating for the Student Performance category, if available, and for the Teacher Observation category for the teacher's evaluation, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher is being measured, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the teacher's performance is being measured.
- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.
- Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.
- Assure that the following prohibited elements listed in Education Law Section 3012-d(6) are not being used as part of any teacher's evaluation: evidence of student development and performance derived from lesson plans, other artifacts of teacher practice, and student portfolios, except for student portfolios measured by a State-approved rubric where permitted by the Department; use of an instrument for parent or student feedback; use of professional goal-setting as evidence of teacher effectiveness; any locally-developed assessment that has not been approved by the Department; and any growth or achievement target that does not meet the minimum standards as set forth in regulations of the Commissioner. Consistent with Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents, assure that points shall not be allocated based on any artifacts, unless such artifact constitutes evidence of an otherwise observable rubric subcomponent.

Assessment Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.
- Assure that individuals with vested interest in the outcome of their assessments are not involved, to the extent practicable, in the scoring of those assessments.

Data Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that SED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data, and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.
- Assure that the LEA provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.
- Assure that scores for all teachers will be reported to SED for each subcomponent, as well as the overall rating, as per SED requirements.
- Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Information and Assurances

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Required Student Performance Subcomponent

For guidance on the required subcomponent of the Student Performance category, see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance.

100% of the Student Performance category if only the required subcomponent is used or locally determined if the optional subcomponent is selected.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Information and Assurances

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

INPUT MODEL

Selection of the Input Model will require:

- a description of the areas of principal practice that will be evaluated;
- a description of how the selected areas of principal practice promote student growth;
- a description of the evidence of student growth and principal practice that will be collected; and
- a description of how the district will use the evidence to differentiate effectiveness resulting in a score from 0 to 20 and ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, or Ineffective.

Measure Type(s)

Please indicate below which type(s) of measures will be used to evaluate principals. Please check all that apply.

- Student Learning Objective (SLO)

Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that processes are in place for the superintendent to monitor SLOs and/or input models.
- Assure that the final Student Performance category rating for each principal will be determined using the weights and growth parameters specified in Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and the approved Educator Evaluation plan.



Building Configuration(s) for Applicable Principals Select all that apply	Measure	State or Regents Assessment(s) Select all that apply	Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) Select all that apply	Third Party Assessment(s) Select all that apply	Applicable School or BOCES-Program Please leave blank unless instructed by the Department to complete this column.
		Science <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ELA Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Algebra I Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geometry Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Living Environment Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Earth Science Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Global History Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> US History Regents			

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Weighting

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Use of the Optional Subcomponent and Student Performance Category Weighting

If the Optional subcomponent is not used, the Required subcomponent will comprise 100% of the Student Performance category.

If the Optional subcomponent is used, the percentage of the Student Performance category attributed to the Required subcomponent will be locally determined.

Please indicate if the Optional subcomponent will be used by making the appropriate selection below.

NO, the Optional subcomponent WILL NOT be used; the Required subcomponent will comprise 100% of the Student Performance category.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Principal School Visit Category

For guidance on the Principal School Visit category, see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance. For a definition of terms used in this section, see the Educator Evaluation Glossary.

)RU WKH VFKRRO YLVLW FDWHJRU\ SULQFLSDOV& VKDOO EH HYDOXDWHG EDVHG RQ D 6WDWH
LQFRUSRUDWHG LQWR WKH VFKRRO YLVLW SURWRFR :KHUH DSSURSULDWH VXFH HYLGHQFH
SURIHVVLQRDO JRDO VHWWLQJ PD\ QRW EH XVHG DV HYLGHQFH RI WHDFKHU RU SULQFLSDO
SUDFWLFH DOLJQH WR WKH /HDGHUVKLS 6WDQGDUGV DQG VHOHFWHG SUDFWLFH UXEULF

Principal Practice Rubric

Select a principal practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess principal practice based on ISLLC 2008 Standards (PSEL standards beginning in 2024-25).

Rubric Name	If more than one rubric is utilized, please indicate the group(s) of principals each rubric applies to.
Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model (2013)	(No Response)





Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Principal School Visits

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Principal School Visit Subcomponent Weighting

For a definition of terms used in this section, see the Educator Evaluation Glossary.

Required Subcomponent 1: School visits by Supervisor(s) or Other Trained Administrator(s)

- At least 80% of the Principal School Visit category score

Required Subcomponent 2: School visits by Impartial Independent Trained Evaluator(s)*

- At least 10%, but no more than 20%, of the Principal School Visit category score

Optional Subcomponent: School visits by Trained Peer Principal(s)

- No more than 10% of the Principal School Visit category score when selected

Please be sure the total of the weights indicated equals 100%.

* The process selected for conducting school visits, including those conducted by trained, impartial independent evaluators, exists in perpetuity until a new plan is approved by the Commissioner. However, if your LEA applies for and receives approval of an Independent Evaluator Hardship Waiver for a school year, then the terms specified in that waiver application will apply for that school year only. Please note that independent Evaluator Hardship Waiver requests must be submitted and approved on an annual basis.

Please indicate the weight of each school visit type and be sure the total of the weights indicated equals 100%.

Supervisor/Administrator [Required]	Independent Evaluator(s) [Required]	Peer School Visit(s) [Optional]	Group of principals for which this weighting will apply If only one group of principals is applicable, please list "All principals"
80%	20%	0% [N/A]	All Principals

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Principal Improvement Plans

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2023

Additional Requirements

For guidance on additional requirements for principals, see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance.


Principal Improvement Plan Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the LEA will formulate and commence implementation of a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) for all principals who receive an overall rating of Developing or Ineffective by October 1 following the school year for which such principal's performance is being measured or as soon as practicable thereafter.
- Assure that PIP plans developed and implemented by the superintendent or their designee, in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment, and subject to collective bargaining to the extent required under article 14 of the Civil Service Law, shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

Principal Improvement Plan Forms

All PIP plans developed and implemented by the superintendent or their designee, in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment, must include:

- 1) identification of needed areas of improvement;
 - 2) a timeline for achieving improvement;
 - 3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed; and, where appropriate,
 - 4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.
-
- 

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

Page Last Modified: 04/12/2023

Appeals Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the LEA has collectively bargained appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.
- Assure that an appeal shall not be filed until a principal's receipt of their overall rating.

Appeals

Pursuant to Education Law §3012-d, a principal may only challenge the following in an appeal to their LEA:

- (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review [evaluation]; which shall include the following:
 - (i) in9 substance of adherecipa (1)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

Page Last Modified: 04/12/2023

rtB8:r0l8:r3(Ns1 apeals)process.rRow NumberNsat tB8:r0l8:r3(Ns1 apeals)process.E(NoReqspnse)E(NoReqspnse)

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Training

Page Last Modified: 02/27/2023

Approximately how many hours of initial training will new evaluators receive?

 1-3 days

Retraining

Approximately how many hours of re-training (annual, periodic, or other frequency) will evaluators receive?

 2-6 hours

Certification of Lead Evaluators

How often are lead evaluators certified?

 Annually

Please identify the party responsible for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators.

 BOCES

Inter-rater Reliability

Inter-rater reliability refers to the extent to which different evaluators produce similar ratings in judging the same abilities or characteristics in the same target person or object. Within the context of educator evaluation, inter-rater reliability requires all evaluators trained in the school visit process to reach independent consensus on observable behaviors to ensure the accuracy, consistency, and precision of the implementation of the chosen evaluation rubric(s). It also requires administrators to analyze and track educator evaluation data and ensure that school visits are being completed with fidelity.

Select the option(s) below that best describe the process in place for maintaining inter-rater reliability.

Please check all that apply.

 Periodic comparisons of an evaluator's assessment of the same building principal



Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019

Task 12. Joint Certification of Educator Evaluation Plan - Upload Certification Form

Page Last Modified: 10/06/2023

Upload Educator Evaluation LEA Certification Form

Please Note: SED Monitoring timestamps each revision and signatures cannot be dated earlier than the last revision. To ensure the accuracy of the timestamp on each task, please submit from Task 12 only.

Implementation of the Evaluation Plan

Please indicate below the first academic year to which this evaluation plan will be applicable.

2023-24

Please obtain the required signatures, create a PDF file, and upload your joint certification of the Educator Evaluation plan using the "LEA Certification Form" found in the "Documents" menu on the left side of the page.

LEA Cert Form Ed Eval Plan 10-06-2023.pdf

Friendship Central School District

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Implementation Dates

Where

To

1

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Friendship Central School District
Principal Improvement Plan (PIP)

Name: _____ School: _____

Assignment: _____

1. Indicator(s) in need of improvement:

2. Specific behavior(s), techniques, criteria, and standards-based goals desired for the demonstration of acceptable performance:

3. Out581N0nt (,)-1 (iq)2.f7.8 (p)rcoif imue(r)4g4 (a4)13.1 se, t.2 (ro) a7.9 (c)-1.2 (d)20nt (,)4.3 (v)-5.-rof ic1.9 (

