





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

Task 1. General Information - Disclaimers and Assurances

---

Page Last Modified: 12/09/2021

**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 may prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the Educator Evaluation plan approved by the Department. The Department reserves the right to







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

Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Weighting

---

Page Last Modified: 12/09/2021

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 3. TEACHERS: Optional Student Performance - Use of the Optional Subcomponent

---

Page Last Modified: 12/09/2021

### 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
- Any other collectively bargained measure of student growth or achievement included in the LEA's evaluation plan.

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: 12/14/2021

## Teacher Observation Category

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

## Teacher Practice Rubric

Select a teacher practice rubric from the menu of State-approved rubrics to assess teacher practice based on the NYS Teaching Standards.

Rubric Name	If more than one rubric is utilized, please indicate the group(s) of teachers each rubric applies to.
Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011 Revised Edition)	(No Response)

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the same rubric(s) is (are) used for all classroom teachers in a grade/subject across the LEA, provided that LEAs may locally determine whether to use different rubrics for teachers who teach different grades and/or subjects during the school year as indicated in the table above.
- Assure that the same rubric(s) is (are) used for all observations of a classroom teacher across the observation types in a given school year.

## Rubric Rating Process

For more information on the Teacher Observation category see NYSED Educator Evaluation Guidance. For a definition of terms used in this section, see the Educator Evaluation Glossary.

The following is one example of how an LEA might score teacher observations using the selected practice rubric: Domains 1-4 of the Danielson rubric have been negotiated as observable. Domains 2 and 3 are weighted as 40% each, and Domains 1 and 4 are weighted as 10% each. For each observation, evidence is collected for all observed subcomponents in a domain. A holistic domain score is then determined for each teacher. These domain scores are weighted as indicated above to reach a final score for each observation. Scores for each observation are weighted equally and averaged to reach a final score for each observation type. The LEA will ensure that all subcomponents designated as observable will be addressed at least once across the observation cycle.

Use the following section to describe the process for rating and scoring the selected practice rubric consistent with the Department's regulations.

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the designation of components of the selected practice rubric as observable is locally negotiated.
- Assure that all components of the selected practice rubric designated as observable are assessed at least once and that each of the NYS Teaching Standards is covered across the total number of annual observations.
- Assure that a component designated as ineffective is rated one (1), a component designated as developing is rated two (2), a component designated as effective is rated three (3), and a component designated as highly effective is rated four (4).
- Assure that the process for assigning scores and/or ratings for each teacher observation is consistent with locally determined processes, including practice rubric component weighting consistent with the description in this plan.

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








---

---

- \_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---



---

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

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Teacher Observations

---

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

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 Undue Burden Hardship Waiver (1)(ii)(b) of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- 
-

---



---



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

Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

---

Page Last Modified: 12/09/2021

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.

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



---

---

### Training Assurance

Please read the assurance below and check the box.

- The LEA assures that all evaluators will be properly trained and lead evaluators will be certified on the below elements prior to completing a teacher's evaluation. Note: independent observers and peer observers need only be trained on, at a minimum, elements 1, 2, and 4 below.

The New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators

Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research

Application and use of any methodology as part of an SLO and any optional second measures of student performance used by the LEA to evaluate its teachers

Application and use of the State-approved teacher rubric(s) selected by the LEA for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of rubrics to observe a teacher's practice

Application and use of any assessment tools that the LEA utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers

Application and use of any locally selected measures of student growth used in the Optional subcomponent of the Student Performance category used by the LEA to evaluate its teachers

Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

The scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the LEA to evaluate a teacher under this Subpart, including the weightings of each subcomponent within a category; how overall scores/ratings are generated for each subcomponent and category and application and use of the evaluation matrix(es) prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's overall rating and their category ratings

Specific considerations in evaluating teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities

### Training of Lead Evaluators, Evaluators, Independent Evaluators, and Peer Observers and Certification of Lead Evaluators

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

Please answer the questions below to describe the training process for all evaluators.

#### Evaluator Training

Please identify the entity responsible for training and retraining evaluators.

Check all that apply.

- District/BOCES

Please read the assurance below and check the box.

- Assure that the duration of training and retraining is sufficient to train on all 9 elements from Section 30-3.10 of the Rules of the Board of Regents (which includes, but is not limited to, training on the proper application or use of the rubric).

#### Initial training

Do all evaluators receive the same initial training?

Check all that apply.

[Redacted area]

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

Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Training

---

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2022

**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.

 Board of Education**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 observation 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 observations 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.

 Data analysis to detect disparities on the part of the evaluators Periodic calibration meetings and/or trainings

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

Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Assurances

---

Page Last Modified: 12/09/2021

## 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: 12/09/2021

**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.

**Required Student Performance Measures**

The required student performance measure for a principal may be either a student learning objective (SLO) or an input model, where the principal's overall rating shall be determined based on evidence of principal practice that promotes student growth related to the Leadership Standards.

**STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

For guidance on SLOs, see NYSED SLO Guidance.

SLO measures may be either individually attributed or collectively attributed.

Individually attributed measures

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

---

Page Last Modified: 12/09/2021

- 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.

HEDI Scoring Bands

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

SLO Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.



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

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

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Weighting

---

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

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 8. PRINCIPALS: Optional Student Performance - Use of the Optional Subcomponent

---

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

### 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.



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

Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring

---

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

**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.

For the school visit category, principals' shall be evaluated based on a State-approved rubric using multiple sources of evidence collected and incorporated into the school visit protocol. Where appropriate, such evidence may be aligned to building or district goals; provided, however, that professional goal-setting may not be used as evidence of teacher or principal effectiveness. Such evidence shall reflect school leadership practice aligned to the Leadership Standards and selected practice rubric.

**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.
Multidimensional Principal Performance Rubric	(No Response) RubriP indice Teratgatosc



Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

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

- Each component is weighted equally and averaged

**Scoring the School Visit Category**

There are two types of school visits within the required school visit subcomponent:

1. School visits by supervisor(s) or other trained administrators
2. School visits by impartial independent trained evaluator(s)

If an evaluator conducts multiple school visits of the same type, how are those school visits weighted? (e.g., If a supervisor conducts two school visits, one announced and one unannounced, are those two school visits weighted equally and averaged to result in one final score for school visits by supervisor(s) or other trained administrators? Or does one of the school visit types receive greater weight, such as the announced school visit is weighted 60% and the unannounced school visit is weighted 40%?)

- Multiple school visits of the same type are weighted equally

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that each set of school visits (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 school visit score will be converted into a HEDI rating using the ranges indicated below.
- Assure that once all school visits are complete, the different types of school visits will be combined using a weighted average consistent with the weights specified in the next section, producing an overall School Visit category score between 0 and 4. In the event that a principal earns a score of 1 on all rated components of the practice rubric across all school visits, a score of 0 will be assigned.

**Principal School Visit Scoring Bands**

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

	Overall School Visit 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 school visits, 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.

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

## Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

	Minimum Rubric Score	Maximum Rubric Score
Highly Effective:	3.62	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:	2.62	3.61

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:	1.62	2.61

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	1.61

---

- 

---

- 

---

- 

---

---





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

Task 10. PRINCIPALS: Overall Scoring - Category and Overall Ratings

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

**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 School Visit category score will be converted into a HEDI rating based on the ranges listed in the tables below.

**Student Performance Category**

HEDI ratings must be assigned based on the point distribution below.

**Principal School Visit Category**

HEDI ratings must be assigned based on locally-determined ranges consistent with the constraints listed below.

Overall Student Performance Category Score and Rating			Overall School Visit Category Score and Rating		
	Minimum	Maximum		Minimum	Maximum
H	18	20	H	3.5 to 3.75	4.0
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 /d (HEo (The overall rating for 02 0 T0 ge over>>BDCerall rating for an educator shall be /d (HEo2ucator5vd5/11)pe






---



---

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

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

---

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

### 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) in the instance of a principal rated Ineffective on the student performance category, but rated Highly Effective on the school visit category based on an anonymous observation as determined locally;

(2) the LEA's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-d;

s)tonsss(es)tavaulalablel -2ective ons <</MCID 7 >>BDC q 5 0 0 5 772nce of th0 I S Q BT d t294.820 1 766 32238t294.820 1 766 32 q 1294.820 1 766 32q 1 0



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

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

---

Page Last Modified: 12/14/2021

Which groups of principals 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 principals selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating.	


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

## Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Training

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2022

## Training Assurance

Please read the assurance below and check the box.

- The LEA assures that all evaluators will be properly trained and lead evaluators will be certified on the below elements prior to completing a principal's evaluation. Note: independent evaluators and peer principals need only be trained on, at a minimum, elements 1, 2, and 4 below.

The Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable

Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research

Application and use of any methodology as part of an SLO and any optional second measures of student performance used by the LEA to evaluate its principals

Application and use of the State-approved principal rubric(s) selected by the LEA for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a principal's practice

Application and use of any assessment tools that the LEA utilizes to evaluate its building principals

Application and use of any locally selected measures of student growth used in the Optional subcomponent of the Student Performance category used by the LEA to evaluate its principals

Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System

The scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the LEA to evaluate a principal under this Subpart, including the weightings of each subcomponent within a category; how overall scores/ratings are generated for each subcomponent and category and application and use of the evaluation matrix(es) prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the principal's overall rating and their category ratings

Specific considerations in evaluating principals of English language learners and students with disabilities

## Training of Lead Evaluators, Evaluators, Independent Evaluators, and Peer Principals and Certification of Lead Evaluators

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

Please answer the questions below to describe the training process for all evaluators.

## Evaluator Training

Please identify the entity responsible for training and retraining evaluators.

Check all that apply.

- District/BOCES

Please read the assurance below and check the box.

- Assure that the duration of training and retraining is sufficient to train on all 9 elements from Section 30-3.10 of the Rules of the Board of Regents (which includes, but is not limited to, training on the proper application or use of the rubric).

## Initial training

Do all evaluators receive the same initial training?

- Yes, all evaluators receive the same initial training.

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

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Training

---

Page Last Modified: 02/24/2022

**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.

 Board of Education**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.

- Data analysis to detect disparities on the part of the evaluators
- Periodic comparisons of an evaluator's assessment of the same building principal
- Periodic calibration meetings and/or trainings



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

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

---

Page Last Modified: 02/25/2022

### 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.

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.

Rockland BOCES Certification.pdf

Teacher Improvement Plan(TIP)

The TIP will be developed as soon as practicable after the final evaluation has been completed, but in no case later than October 1 of the new school year following the receipt of a final APPR composite rating of Developing or Ineffective.

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_ Building: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervising Administrator: \_\_\_\_\_ Union Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Areas in Need of Improvement ±

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



date(s) for the follow-up evaluation(s). The teacher will present documentation and evidence of improvement in the designated area at this time. Additional observations/meetings will take place as needed.

The Teacher Improvement Plan and all records of subsequent observations and meetings will become part of the teacher's record. The teacher should maintain copies of all documentation.

Teacher Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Administrator  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Union Rep  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature does not imply agreement, but acknowledges review and receipt of the plan.  
Written comments may be attached.

**Meeting Log Form**  
**Teacher Improvement Plan**

Log all meetings here. It is understood additional meetings may be necessary. The administrator, teacher, or union representative may request additional meetings. If necessary, a more detailed meeting summary(s) will accompany this form and be given to the teacher in memo form.

A copy of the meeting log will be provided to the teacher following each documented meeting. The original will be retained by administration and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Date	Meeting Summary	Print Names and Positions of Attendees	Signatures of All Attendees

## Principal Improvement Plan(PIP)

The PIP will be developed as soon as practicable after the final evaluation has been completed, but in no case later than **October 1** of the new school year following the receipt of a final APPR composite rating of Developing or Ineffective.

Principal: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_ Building: \_\_\_\_\_

Supervising Administrator: \_\_\_\_\_ Union Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Areas in Need of Improvement – A clear description of the specific behavior(s) which are in need of improvement.
  
2. Statement and Timeline of the Goals – A statement reflecting how the specific behavior will change (how it will look) in order to be deemed acceptable. This will include a description of types of data to be used.
  
3. Evidence of Progress – The principal and his/her administrator and union representative will mutually agree upon artifacts or visible indicators of progress (linked to the APPR rubric selected).
  
4. Action Plan – The principal and his/her administrator and union representative will jointly list differentiated activities and strategies to address the areas in need of improvement. Lack of evidence in progression toward meeting identified goals will result in additional observations. There will be ongoing documented meetings and scheduled observations using the attached Meeting Log Form.
  
5. Resources – The principal and his/her administrator and union representative will jointly list resources, available direct materials, training, workshops, etc. to help improve the principal's practice. Any mandated resources identified for remediation will be at BOCES expense.
  
6. Timeline – The principal and his/her administrator and union representative will discuss and a time line for improvement shall be set forth for the process and a

date(s) for the follow-up evaluation(s). The principal will present documentation and evidence of improvement in the designated area at this time. Additional observations/meetings will take place as needed.

The Principal Improvement Plan and all records of subsequent observations and meetings will become part of the principal's record. The principal should maintain copies of all documentation.

Principal Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Administrator  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Union Rep  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature does not imply agreement, but acknowledges review and receipt of the plan.  
Written comments may be attached.

**Meeting Log Form**  
**Principal Improvement Plan**

Log all meetings here. It is understood additional meetings may be necessary. The administrator, principal, or union representative may request additional meetings. e 018pal,




visits;

- Assure that the LEA shall ensure that the process by which weights and scores for subcomponents and categories is transparent and available to those being rated before the beginning of each school year;
- Assure that if a second measure for the Student Performance category is locally selected, then the measures of student growth or achievement will be used across all classrooms in the same grade/subject, for teachers, or similar building configurations/programs, for principals, in the LEA will be used in a consistent, consistent manner, to the extent practicable;
- Assure that all growth targets represent a minimum of one year of expected growth;
- Assure that any material change in the LEA's student performance measures will be reported to the Department by March 1 of each school year;
- Assure that the LEA will provide the Department with any information necessary to conduct annual monitoring pursuant to Subpart 30-3 of the regulations;
- Assure that the amount of time for each classroom or program of the grade does not exceed the required annual instructional hours for such classroom or program of the grade;
- Assure that the amount of time devoted to test preparation under standard testing conditions for each grade does not exceed, in the aggregate, two percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for such grade. Time devoted to teacher administered classroom quizzes or exams, portfolio review, or other classroom activities towards the limits established by this subdivision and nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to limit the requirements of the individualized education program of a student with a disability.

**Signatures, dates**

*Sarah A. Chauncey*

Superintendent Name (print):

SARAH A. CHAUNCEY

Teachers Union President Signature:

Date: 2-24-22

*Kristin*

Teachers Union President Name (print):

Kristin

Administrative Union President Signature:

Date: 2-24-22

*Pamela S. Charles*

Administrative Union President Name (print):

Pamela S. Charles

Board of Education President Signature:

Date: 2/24/22

*Peggy*

Board of Education President Name (print):

PEGGY