


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

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

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

- third party assessments; or
- locally-developed assessments (district-, BOCES-, or regionally-developed).

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-	93-	90-	85-	80-	75-	67-	60-	5yr6C5d0												
100%	96%	92%	89%	84%	79%	74%	66%	100%												

dHeopn2u(66%)2_0 C96 enSpan <</MCID 49 >>BDCs6CpoA71.5 Td (93)Tj3)2_ (85)Tj EMC ng (-)Tj EMC /TD <</MCID 38 >>BDC IP CID 22 >>BDC 3.tude-



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

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

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

Applicable Teachers 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
levels, subjects and courses)	attributed results	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Algebra I Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> US History Regents		

Non-core/Elective Teachers

Please only check the box below if none of the options for non-core/elective teachers in the table above are applicable (e.g., teachers of art, music, and physical education use different measures and assessments).

Individual non-core/elective teachers are listed in the next section with corresponding measures and assessments.



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

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 09/22/2022

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 State-approved rubrics

Page Last Modified: 09/22/2022

In the box below, please describe how the observable components of the rubric are combined.

Domains 1 & 3 are both weighted at 42% each. Domains 2 & 4 are each weighted at 8% for a total weight of 100%. Each subcomponent is weighted individually within each domain. For example, in domain 1, subcomponents B, C, D, E are all weighted at 16% each, while A & F are weighted at 18% each. In domain 2, subcomponents A, B, C, D, E are weighted at 20% each. In domain 3, subcomponents A, C, & E are weighted at 18%, subcomponents C & D are weighted at 23% each. In domain 4, subcomponents A, B, C, D, & F are all weighted at 16%, while subcomponent E is weighted at 20%.

Scoring the Observation Category

There are two types of observation within the required observation subcomponent:

1. Observations by principal(s) or other trained administrators
2. Observations by impartial independent trained evaluator(s)

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

- 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.

The announced observation is weighted at 90% of the total evaluation, while the unannounced is weighted at 10%.

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

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

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Teacher Observations

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

Teacher Observation Subcomponent Weighting

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

Required Subcomponent 1: Observations by Principal(s) or Other Trained Administrator(s)

- At least 80% of the Teacher Observation category score

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

- At least 10%, but no more than 20%, of the Teacher Observation category score

Optional Subcomponent: Observations by Trained Peer Observer(s)

- No more than 10% of the Teacher Observation category score when selected

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

* The process selected for conducting observations, 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 observation type and be sure the total of the weights indicated equals 100%.

- _____

- _____

- _____



		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		<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 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Teacher Observations

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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.

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: 02/28/2022

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

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

Teacher Observation

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: 02/28/2022

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.

TEACHERIMPROVEMENTPLAN.pdf

Page Last Modified: 04/11/2022

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 use the table below to describe the appeal(s) process(es) 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 annual professional performance review?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <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 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

Page Last Modified: 04/11/2022

If "Other" was selected in the table above, please list the corresponding row number and group(s) of teachers that 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)

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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 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.

- BOCES (for component districts)
 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.

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

- 1-3 days

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

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.

Required Student Performance Subcomponent

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

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

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

- 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.



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

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Weighting

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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: 02/28/2022

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 programs or buildings with the same grade configuration 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;
- Option (F) Four, five, or six-year high school graduation rates;
- Option (G) 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; 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 principal.



Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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.

	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

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

Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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

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

Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Principal School Visits

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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.

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

- **If selected, at least one school visit must be conducted by a trained peer principal.**
- Peer principals are trained and selected by the LEA.
- Trained peer principals must have received an overall rating of Effective or Highly Effective in the prior school year.

School Visit Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that the following elements will not be used in calculating a principal's school visit category score and rating: evidence of student development and performance derived from lesson plans, other artifacts of principal 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; and/or use of professional goal-setting as evidence of principal effectiveness. 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.
- Assure that the length of all school visits for principals will be conducted pursuant to the locally-determined durations.
- Assure that at least one of the required school visits will be unannounced.
- Assure that school visits will not be conducted via video.

Number of School Visits

- **At least one of the required school visits must be unannounced (across both required subcomponents).**
- **Required Subcomponent 1: At least one school visit must be conducted by the superintendent or other trained administrator (supervisor).**
- **Required Subcomponent 2: At least one school visit must be conducted by an impartial independent trained evaluator (independent evaluator).**
- **Optional Subcomponent: If selected, at least one school visit must be conducted by a trained peer principal (peer principal).**

Please use the table below to enter the minimum number of school visits for each type listed.

	Minimum Number of School Visits
Announced Supervisor School Visits (Required Subcomponent 1)	1
Unannounced Supervisor School Visits (Required Subcomponent 1)	1
Announced Independent Evaluator School Visits (Required Subcomponent 2)	1
Unannounced Independent Evaluator School Visits (Required Subcomponent 2)	N/A
Announced Peer School Visits (Optional)	N/A
Unannounced Peer School Visits (Optional)	N/A



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

Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Principal School Visits

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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 school visit(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 school visit(s) required to be performed by the Superintendent/supervisor or their designee. See Section 30-3.5(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 9 of the LEA's approved Section 3012-d Educator Evaluation plan, the provisions of the approved waiver will apply. See Section 30-3.5(c)(1)(ii)(b) of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

Peer School Visit Assurances

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- Assure that peer principals, as applicable, will be trained and selected by the LEA.
- Assure that, if school visits are being conducted by trained peer principal(s), these principal(s) received an overall rating of Effective or Highly Effective in the previous school year.

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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.



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

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Principal Improvement Plans

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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.

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

PRINCIPALIMPROVEMENTPLAN.pdf

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

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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 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 principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

Please use the table below to describe the appeal(s) process(es) available to principals.

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. Please select all that apply.	What is the maximum length of time for the principals selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All principals	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The substance of the annual professional performance review [evaluation]; which shall include the following: 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 anomaly, as determined locally <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The LEA's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-d <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as required under Education Law Section 3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The LEA's issuance and/or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0-30 days

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

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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. Please select all that apply.	What is the maximum length of time for the principals selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal?
	implementation of the terms of the principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law Section 3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents	

If "Other" was selected in the table above, please provide a description of the process in the following row.

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.

- BOCES (for component districts)
- 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.

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

- 1-3 days

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

Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Training

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

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.

- Superintendent/District Superintendent

Please read the assurance below and check the box.

- If the Superintendent/District Superintendent or other party is the entity certifying evaluators, and also acts in the capacity of an evaluator, please assure that the certification process, including such self-certification, is implemented with fidelity.

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

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Assurances

Page Last Modified: 02/28/2022

Principal Evaluation Assurances**Please read the assurances below and check each box.**

- Assure that the LEA shall compute and provide to the principal their score and rating for the Student Performance category, if available, and for the Principal School Visit category for the principal's evaluation in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the principal is being measured, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the principal's performance is being measured.
- Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.
- Assure that principals 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 principal's evaluation: evidence of student development and performance derived from lesson plans, other artifacts of principal 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 principal 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 principals 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.



\$VVHVVP HQW 6XPPDU\ 3ULQFLSDO LV WR DWWDFK D QDUUD
LQFOXGLQJ YHULILFDWLRQ RI WKH SURYLVLHQ RI VXSSRUW
GD\ V DIWHU WKH LGHQWLILHG FRPSOHWLRQ GDWH 6XFK
WHDFKHU ZLWK WKH RSSRUWXQLW\ IRU WKH WHDFKHU WR D

RTK E RCN'KO RTQXGO GP V'RNCP

P co g"qh'Rtlpek r cmaaa

"Uej qqri'Dwrf lpi "aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa"Cecf go ke"l gct"aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

F ghelepek'uj cv'eqpvtldwgf "v"y g"ökpghgevxgö"qt"öf gxgmr lpi ö'r gthqto cpeg'tcvlpi <

Kö r tqxgo gpv'I qcnlQweqo g<

Cevkqp"Ugr ulCevxklgu<

Vko gikpg'hqt"eqo r rgvkqp<

Tgs wktgf "cpf "Ceeguukdrng" Tguqwtegu. lpenwf lpi 'kf gpwkecvkqp"qh'tgur qpukdkkx' hqt'r tqxkukqp
Fcvgu'qh'hqto cvkxg" gxcnvcvqp"qp'r tqi tguu"rgcf "gxcnvcvqt"cpf 'r tlpek rnlpkkn'gcej "fcvg"vq"eqphko "vj g
o ggkpi +<

F gego dgt<

O ctej <

Qj gt<

Gxkf gpeg'vq"dg'r tqxkf gf 'hqt'I qcnlCej kxgo gpv<

Cuuguo gpvUwo o ct { <Uwr gtlpvgpf gpvku'vq"cwcej "c"pcttcvkg'uwo o ct { "qh'ko r tqxgo gpv
r tqi tgu. 'lpenf lpi "xgthecvqp"qh'y g'r tqxkukqp"qh'uwr r qt v'cpf "tguqtegu"cu"qwrkpgf "cdqyg'pq
nvgf"y cp"32"fc { u'chgt"y g'kf gpvkgf "eqo r ngvqp"fcvg0Uwej "uwo o ct { "uj cm'dg"uki pgf "d { "y g
uwr gtlpvgpf gpv'cpf "r tlpek cnly kj "y g"qr r qtwpk' "hqt"y g'r tlpek cn'vq"cwcej "eqo o gpv0

