



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Commissioner of Education
President of the University of the State of New York
89 Washington Avenue, Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

E-mail: commissioner@nysed.gov
Twitter: @NYSEDNews
Tel: (518) 474-5844
Fax: (518) 473-4909

July 7, 2022

Educator Evaluation Plan - Variance

Harold Coles, Superintendent
Westchester BOCES
17 Berkley Dr.
Rye Brook, NY 10573

Dear Superintendent Coles:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your educator evaluation plan ('plan') variance application meets the criteria outlined in section 30-3.16 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and has been approved. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided in your variance application, including the narrative descriptions, certifications, and assurances that are included in the application. During the approved term of this variance, your LEA will implement the variance along with all other remaining provisions of your approved plan. If any material changes are made to your approved plan and/or the terms of your approved variance, your LEA must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

Please be advised that, pursuant to Education Law §3012-d, the Department will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may order a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the Student Performance category and the Teacher Observation or Principal School Visits category, and/or if the teachers' or principals' overall ratings and subcomponent scores show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results, and/or if schools or districts show a pattern of anomalous results in the Student Performance category and/or the Observation/School Visits category.

The New York State Education Department and I look forward to continuing our work together, with the goal of ensuring that every school has world-class educators in the classroom, every teacher has a world-class school leader to support their professional growth, and every student achieves success.

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



Betty A. Rosa
Commissioner

NOTE:

Only documents that are incorporated by reference in your plan variance application have been reviewed and are considered as part of your approved plan variance application; therefore, any supplemental documents such as memorandums of agreement or understanding that were uploaded with your plan variance application but are not incorporated by reference have not been reviewed. However, the Department reserves the right to review the uploaded attachments at any time for consistency with your plan and/or to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations; and as a result of such review, the Department may reject your plan or variance and/or require corrective action.

Pursuant to section 30-3.16 of the Rules of the Board of Regents, please note that an LEA with an approved variance shall provide to the Department, upon its request, any documentation related to the implementation and efficacy of the approach proposed in the variance, including but not limited to: reports on the correlation in assigned ratings for different measures of the LEA's evaluation system and differentiation among educators within each subcomponent and category of the evaluation system

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 1. General Information - General Information**

Page Last Modified: 06/23/2022

Annual Professional Performance Review Variance (Education Law 3012-d)

For guidance related to the Annual Professional Performance Review variance, see NYSED APPR Guidance.

At its October 2019 meeting, the Board of Regents amended sections 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents to allow LEAs to apply for a variance from Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) plan requirements to permit them to develop and implement new and innovative approaches to evaluation that meet the specific needs of the LEA, upon a finding by the Commissioner that the new and innovative approach demonstrates how it will ensure differentiated results over time and how the results of the evaluation will be used to provide personalized professional learning opportunities to teachers and principals, while complying with the requirements of Education Law §3012-d. In instances where a variance is approved, the term(s) described in the approved variance will replace the related sections of the LEA's currently approved APPR plan. However, please note that all other terms as are present in the LEA's currently approved plan will remain in effect and must be implemented without modification. Once a variance is approved by the Department, it shall be considered part of the LEA's APPR plan during the approved term of the variance. **In any instance in which there is an approved variance and such variance contains information that conflicts with the information provided in the approved Education Law §3012-d APPR plan, the provisions of the approved variance will apply during the approved term of the variance.**

Variance Application Timeline

Variance applications must be approved by the Department by December 1 of a school year to be implemented in that school year.

Submission by November 1 is suggested to allow time for review, revision and approval in order to meet the approval deadline for implementation in the same school year. **Absent a finding by the Commissioner of extraordinary circumstances, a variance application approved after December 1 of a school year will not be implemented until the following school year.** For more information regarding the variance approval deadline, including a possible extension, please contact APPRVariance@nysed.gov.

Variance Assurances**Please check all of the boxes below**

- ☒ Assure that the contents of this form are in compliance with Education Law Section 3012-d.
- ☒ Assure that a detailed version of the LEA's variance is kept on file and that a copy of such variance will be provided to the Department upon request for review of compliance with Education Law Section 3012-d.
- ☒ Assure that this variance will be posted on the LEA's website, in addition to its current full APPR plan, 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 variance will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website* following approval.

Teacher Variance Please check the appropriate box below.

- ☒ Assure that any task not included in the following variance request(s) for teachers will be carried out in the manner described in the currently approved APPR plan.

Principal Variance Education Law §3012-d requires that the principal evaluation system be aligned to the requirements for teacher evaluation. Therefore, when completing a variance request for the evaluation of principals, the processes identified must be aligned to such requirements. Please check the appropriate box below.

- ☒ A variance is not requested for any subcomponent or category for principals; all principals will be evaluated using the currently approved APPR plan.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Variance Request**

Page Last Modified: 11/18/2020

Required Student Performance Subcomponent

For guidance on the Required subcomponent of the Student Performance category, see NYSED APPR Guidance.

100% of the Student Performance category if only the Required subcomponent is used or locally determined if the Optional subcomponent is selected. Education Law §3012-d requires that each teacher have a Student Learning Objective (SLO) consistent with a goal-setting process based on appropriate growth targets. The process must include, at a minimum, the following elements:

A description of the measure(s) of student growth to be used (e.g., the SLO goal setting process; SLO components),

Applicable evidence of student learning (e.g., how growth will be measured through various forms of assessment, evaluation of student performance),

A method for converting student results to a score on a scale from 0-20,

A scale for conversion of the score of 0 to 20 to a HEDI rating.

This requirement must be met through either the LEA's current APPR plan or this variance. To the extent that the variance does not address a requirement, the currently approved APPR plan will apply.

Variance Request

LEAs may use this variance application to develop an SLO process for a teacher or group of teachers that differs from the process described in the Commissioner's regulations. Any teachers not covered by this variance request will be evaluated under the terms of the LEA's currently approved APPR plan.

Please make the appropriate selection below.

- ☐ A variance is not requested for the required student performance subcomponent for teachers.
- ☒ The details of the variance request for the required student performance subcomponent for teachers is described in the subsequent section.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Applicability**

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

Applicable Teachers

Please indicate all teachers to whom this required student performance variance request applies.

Core Teachers Use the table below to list the core teachers this required student performance variance request is applicable to (teachers of other courses should be listed in the subsequent section).

	All Core Teachers in LEA	Common Branch / Uniform Departmentalized	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies
Courses	☒ All core teachers (K-3; 4-8 ELA, math, science, social studies; high school ELA and Regents courses, as applicable to LEA) [if this option is selected, please do not make selections in subsequent columns]					

Other Teachers

☒ Teachers of other courses included in this required student performance variance request are listed in the table below.

Fill in the following for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that are included in this required student performance variance request:

Column 1: lowest grade that corresponds to the course

Column 2: highest grade that corresponds to the course

Column 3: subject of the course

Follow the examples below to list other courses.

	(1) lowest grade	(2) highest grade	(3) subject
All Other Courses	K	12	All courses not named above
K-3 Art	K	3	Art
Grades 9-12 English Electives	9	12	English Electives

Click "Add Row" to add additional courses. Only list additional courses if they are included in this required student performance variance request.

Grade From	Grade To	Subject
K	12	All courses not named above

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Applicability**

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

Applicable Areas

A variance may be requested for the following areas of the required student performance subcomponent:

- A description of the measure(s) of student growth to be used (e.g., the SLO goal setting process; SLO components)
- Applicable evidence of student learning (e.g., how growth will be measured through various forms of assessment, evaluation of student performance)
- A method for converting student results to a score on a scale from 0-20*
- A scale for conversion of the score of 0 to 20 to a HEDI rating*

Please indicate the area(s) of the required student performance subcomponent for which a variance is being requested.

- ☒ Measures of student growth
☒ Evidence of student learning
☒ HEDI ranges*

*Only select "Conversion to a 20-point score" or "HEDI ranges" if your variance request involves different values than those included in the table below.

Highly Effective			Effective			Developing		Ineffective												
								1119876543210												
								210												
20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	5443322211	9											
97-	93-	90-	85-	80-	75-			5949495173	-	50										
100%	96%	92%	89%	84%	79%	67-74%	60-66%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
								5544332221	1	84										
								9483838406	2	00										
								0000000000	0	00										

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Measures of Student Growth**

Page Last Modified: 02/04/2021

Measures of Student Growth

Describe the measure(s) that will be used to evaluate teachers for the required student performance subcomponent (e.g., the SLO goal setting process; SLO components).

The input model will be used for teachers. Five elements of the 2011 Danielson Rubric have been collaboratively identified as teacher behaviors that contribute to increased student growth. The focus is on research informed best practices which were identified by teachers as essential for student growth. The five elements were chosen because they aligned with the District multi-year professional development plan driven by the two district goals of instructional process and planning and a connected learning environment and were deemed critical for assuring student growth at this point in time. Evidence will be collected on those five elements. While the focus will be on gathering evidence on the behaviors and actions of teachers aligned to research informed practice that leads to student growth, individual learning targets will be set using the data driven instruction model which will identify both exit behaviors and progress toward them using both formative and summative assessments.

Measures Assurance Please check the box below.

☒ Assure that all student growth targets shall measure the change in a student's performance between the baseline and the end of the course.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Evidence of Student Learning**

Page Last Modified: 02/23/2021

Evidence of Student Learning

Please identify any evidence of student learning to be used. A description of how growth will be measured through various forms of assessment should be included in the last section of this variance request.

Type(s) of Evidence☒ Other (add details below)**Other Evidence Identify evidence of student growth used that is not a State, locally-developed, or third party assessment.**

A note catcher aligned to the 2011 Danielson Rubric will be used to gather evidence of teacher practice that improves student achievement. See discussion of notecatcher below.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-dTask 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - HEDI Ranges

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

HEDI Ranges

In the table below, please indicate the locally-determined scoring ranges for each of the rating categories.

	Low Value	High Value
Highly Effective	17	20
Effective	13	16
Developing	10	12
Ineffective	0	9

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d

Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Variance Details, Weighting & Assurances

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

Variance Details

Please read the questions below and answer each prompt in a concise manner.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Variance Details, Weighting & Assurances**

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

Rationale Please provide a rationale for this variance request. > Your rationale should include information regarding the specific, identified needs and/or challenges of the LEA, and how such needs and/or challenges inform development of the required student performance variance request.

Southern Westchester BOCES has been focused on two important goals which were developed collaboratively through district wide Think Tanks that were tasked with using data to identify gaps in the district and then develop action plans to close those gaps. The first district goal is focused on Instructional Process and Planning. Referred to as "Focus On Learning," all action plan items developed throughout the year are targeted to teacher decision making in planning instruction. Professional development includes crafting standards-informed unit outcomes and lesson objectives, crafting engaging activities aligned to those outcomes/objectives, creating opportunities for guided and independent practice and designing quality formative and summative assessments that inform future planning. This goal focuses on the shared belief that creating a common language and understanding of each element of planning for lessons, implementing the lesson and reflecting on the lesson is essential to the success of each student. Cohorts of principals, teachers and teaching assistants attend a five-day training stretched across the school year. The second district goal is Connected Learning Environment. This goal focuses the entire faculty and staff on research informed practices that honor each learner and "connect" them to the school. The SWBOCES professional development plan is built around these two goals and extensive learning opportunities exist for all faculty and staff. The input model allows us to continue to measure what is important to our learning community and keep our focus on closing the identified gaps. Data to illustrate growth will be identified by program and/or classroom and will give a broader perspective than the single data point model used in the past. Following the COVID response period, we have focused on addressing any issues of regression and keeping students on track with IEP and program goals and graduation requirements are a continuous focus. In previous years, we have used Student Learning Objectives with targets that were developed based on a five-year data review. Targets reflected benchmarks that needed to be achieved in order to assure that a high school student reached exit criteria. Our data indicates that student scores improve based on their time in program. Given the challenges of the current year, contact time with students and student time in classrooms has been impacted. SWBOCES educators are tasked with creating connections for students in an ever-changing environment while identifying the most important learning and ways to engage students in achieving the identified outcomes/objectives. Targets in the input model will be student specific and based on benchmarks and summative assessment goals identified by classroom where students are clustered by learning needs and similar goals. Many will be driven by IEP goals, others will be tied to industry exams. The diversity of a BOCES requires that each program and classroom review exit criteria for both the current year and the program and continuously assess against that criteria. Leaders will meet with their staff to review baseline data, classroom/program outcomes and set both short term and long-term goals based on that review. In the current year the focus will include both avoiding regression and closing gaps that are due to regression as well as moving students toward long term goals. Teachers will receive staff development on the goal setting and monitoring process and the district data team will focus on the identified data points which will inform continued work with students. The proposed input model method of evaluation keeps us on our path but uses a richer measurement tool. Traditionally, the SLO used one-time assessment results. The variance identifies the practices that have led to improved results in the past, giving leaders and teachers the opportunity to grow their skill sets in the everchanging environment. Focus on principal and teacher practice in changing environments is essential to minimizing regression of learners and continuing on our trajectory. While the Danielson rubric will continue to be used for observations, it will also be used in conversations/meetings outside of the classroom observations in a conference which will lead to the student growth performance score. Evidence will be gathered and a student growth performance score given for the student growth portion of the APPR based on actions and behaviors that lead to student growth. Data conversations will be part of the teacher meeting. The student growth performance score will be calculated on evidence aligned to the following elements: 1 b demonstrating knowledge of students (focus on SEL, which is critical during the new school model) 1 e designing classroom instruction (aligned to instructional process and planning goal and targeting instruction in the new school model) 2 d managing student behavior (including evidence of developing learning behaviors in hybrid and remote instruction models) 3c engaging students in learning (including evidence of developing learning behaviors in hybrid and remote instruction models) 4a reflection on teaching (including gathering of evidence by teachers on the effectiveness of instruction) These five elements of teacher practice as defined in the 2011 Danielson Rubric have been identified by an advisory team of teachers, chosen because they align with the two district goals. The advisory team believed that teacher behaviors as defined by the standards and illustrated in these elements of the Danielson Rubric will impact student academic growth. While the district establishes a rating of 3 on the rubric as an aspirational goal, teaching in a remote learning or hybrid environment dictates new learning for all educators even those with extensive experience. The proposed HEDI rating allows for up to two areas of the elements to be gaps for educators where they will be focusing on "Developing" those skills. It also sets the bar by requiring several elements be at the Effective range or above. It does not allow for ineffective practice in the overall scoring model. Lack of evidence or evidence that does not meet the criteria of the rubric rating of 1 would result in a score of 0. Each of the five elements is scored individually (0-4) and added together for a possible composite score of 20. Teachers will receive their final score for the student performance category through the assignment of a HEDI score based on the proposed scoring ranges. (H 17-20, E 13-16, D 10-12, I 0-9) In order to gather ongoing evidence, a notecatcher was developed to provide guidance on the expectations for performance. Evidence will be collected in each of the identified five elements of the Danielson Rubric that are focused on improving student performance. Teachers will be asked to provide evidence of the use of district developed tools for planning and instruction and reflective practice. The district currently has a lesson planning tool with a reflection section. The sheet is used to identify a standards-based objective, instructional process or delivery, identify what students should be able to know and do at the conclusion of the learning segment, instructional steps to be taken, formative and summative assessments to identify if the students

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Variance Details, Weighting & Assurances**

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

are successful with the lesson(s) and a reflection section. Teachers will also be asked to provide evidence of student learning through course specific formative and summative assessment data. The note catcher has been distributed to teachers with the following reflection questions aligned to each focus element of the rubric. **1 b demonstrating knowledge of students (focus on SEL, which is critical during the new school model) Reflection**

Questions:

- What pre-assessments/resources/tools did you use to build your understanding of your students?
- How have you worked with students and/or families to encourage them to have a voice in sharing their culture, interests and special needs?
- How did this knowledge influence your lesson planning?

1 e designing classroom instruction (aligned to instructional process and planning goal and targeting instruction in the new school model)**Reflection Questions:**

- How do you assess prior knowledge of students and how does it influence your planning?
- How are you determining the most important learning (standard, objective, etc.) in planning for student learning? How do your decision points fit into long term learning goals?
- How are you helping students apply skills in individual lessons to connected long-term learning goals?
- How are you chunking learning and using time? Where have you had to be flexible? How have the learning models this year influenced your use of instructional time?

2 d managing student behavior (including evidence of developing learning behaviors in hybrid and remote instruction models) Reflection**Questions:**

- How are you building classroom community and a shared understanding of expectations for classroom/learning behaviors? What evidence do you have of students being connected to the classroom and the expectations?
- How have the circumstances of this year influenced your approach to student behavior management?
- How do you gather data on student behavior in order to create individual action plans to support students? Are there trends?
- What tools/resources are you using to help students self-manage behavior? How do you differentiate to meet specific student needs?

3c engaging students in learning (including evidence of developing learning behaviors in hybrid and remote instruction models)**Reflection Questions:**

- How do you scaffold instruction to help students reach a learning outcome or objective?
- How are you differentiating for individual student learning?
- Do the independent activities align to the learning objective?
- Are students learning? How do you know? What formative and summative assessments are you using and how does student performance on those assessments influence your next steps?
- How do you monitor and adjust when there is a lack of engagement?
- How are you making decisions regarding time allotted for independent practice and formative and summative assessment?

4a reflection on teaching (including gathering of evidence by teachers on the effectiveness of instruction) Reflection Questions:

- How do you identify the strengths and weaknesses of lessons? What data do you use?
- What strategies do you use to build on the strengths or address the weaknesses you have identified? (additional learning, collaborating with other educators, etc.)
- What plan have you created for continued growth based on your reflections? How will you know you are successful?

A film with an explanation of the variance including the philosophy which led to seeking this approach as tied to BOCES goals was shown to all instructional staff. The notecatcher and a recording of a conversation between an administrator and a teacher using the notecatcher was shown to all staff. Multiple training sessions with principals are taking place throughout the school year to calibrate use of the tool, quality of feedback, and assignment of scores.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Variance Details, Weighting & Assurances**

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

Standards and Procedures Please provide a description of the standards and procedures that will be used in lieu of those included in the LEA's most recently approved evaluation plan. > This description should include a specific, detailed explanation of the new and innovative approach that the LEA is seeking to implement as part of its variance request. > This description should include, but not be limited to, a description of the alternate measures of student growth and/or evidence of student learning that will be used to evaluate educators.

Please see rationale above: Additionally, as outlined in the Rationale, both the student performance score and the teacher observation score will be calculated using evidence applied to the rubric. Evidence for the teacher observation score will be collected during announced and unannounced observations and evidence will be aligned to all negotiated observable components. Additionally, five elements of the Danielson Teacher rubric identified as being directly tied to student growth will be evaluated through conversations with teachers where they share elements of their practice, aligned to the rubric, which would result in positive student growth. A notecatcher has been developed to assist with the conversation and provide clarity on the expectations. Evidence presented by teachers will vary by program and will include both formative and summative assessments. A process for data conversations to help teachers set short term and long term goals is in place with support from the district wide data team. Goals are student specific and aligned to summative assessment and program exit criteria goals. A scoring tool has been developed to be used to identify a score based on evidence gathered in the notecatcher. The scoring tool identifies the five areas of the rubric that will be used to determine the student performance portion of the APPR score for each teacher.

Rigor Please provide a description of how the LEA will ensure that evaluations are rigorous and enable strong and equitable inferences about the effectiveness of the LEA's educators. > This description should include how rigor is achieved and maintained, including relevant processes and methodologies. > This description may include, but is not limited to, how data will be used to draw inferences, including how the derived data informs decisions and guidance for the LEA's educators.

Please see rationale above. Additionally, while the focus of the variance is on the actions of educators that create the conditions for strong student growth, student growth will be monitored. Individual targets will be set for students using IEP goals, benchmarks and exit criteria. The data team will help monitor progress against these goals. Teacher use of data monitoring will be aligned to the five elements where appropriate. Assuring that the process of gathering evidence of the actions of educators, a schedule has been developed for calibration activities and ongoing conversations both with teachers being evaluated and with principals.

Professional Learning Please provide a description of how the LEA will use the information collected through the evaluation system, including the assigned effectiveness ratings, to provide personalized professional learning opportunities for educators. > This description may include, but is not limited to, methodologies and procedures for:

- collecting information about educator effectiveness to inform professional learning,
- specific details regarding both the type(s) and extent of professional learning opportunities anticipated,
- processes for delivery of personalized learning opportunities, and
- use of data to measure the efficacy of such professional learning.

Please see rationale above: Additionally, our professional development plan continues to focus on our instructional process and planning goal and our connected learning environment goal. This year professional development has shifted to identify the skills needed to continue our work toward those goals in the ever changing school environment including remote and hybrid instruction models. All teachers attended two half days of focused workshops on teaching in a hybrid or remote environment. Early release days and all other professional learning opportunities are aligned with the five areas of the rubric identified as essential in continuing our work toward students meeting benchmarks that will allow them to continue to close gaps and meet graduation exit criteria. The focus of shared learning includes but is not limited to: * a deep examination of the five areas of focus of the Danielson Rubric and identification of evidence that would illustrate all scores from 9-5 * a film was created based on a "live" observation between a teacher and an administrator and shown to all teachers and principals during a staff development day to model the process and identify evidence that would illustrate research informed practice aligned to the rubrics * review and identification of IEP goals, benchmarks and exit criteria and identification and/or development of formative and summative assessments * PD on the use of data driven instruction (based on NYSED DDI Network Team model) for each administrator with turn key materials for use in buildings * PD for all new administrators on Focus On Learning (Instructional Process and Planning) foundational skills - learning aligned to collection of quality evidence * research informed practices which align to each of the elements identified in the note catcher - individual and group meetings with teachers to review the questions in the note catcher and identify quality evidence

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Variance Details, Weighting & Assurances**

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

Effectiveness of Implementation Please provide a description of how the LEA will assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the variance. > This description may include, but is not limited to, processes and procedures for:

- collection and analysis of both short- and long-term data,
- the standard(s) used to measure the effectiveness of implementation, and
- how results will be used to inform future implementation.

Please see rationale above, Additionally, the district is implementing a Data Driven Instruction Model to help every teacher and principal set individual learning targets. The ultimate indicator of effectiveness of implementation will be continued student growth on the SWBOCES established trajectory which is aligned with high school exit criteria. The goal is to make sure that regression is minimal and that growth is continuous. Evidence will be collected at principal/teacher meetings, aligned to the five identified areas of the rubric that will create the conditions for student growth and scored based on the rubric 1-4 scale. While this approach focuses on the behaviors of teachers in creating conditions for student growth, formative and summative assessments specific to each program/classroom that are used to measure student progress will be included in the evidence discussion and collection process and will be analyzed at the district level to assure the effectiveness of the evaluation model. Calibration and review of teacher evaluations will take place periodically throughout the year and will be used to plan for professional development and action plan steps that are part of our strategic planning process.

Use of the Optional Student Performance Subcomponent & Weighting

Please indicate if the Optional subcomponent will be used in the process included in this variance request by making the appropriate selection below.

- ☒ The optional subcomponent is not included in this variance; the required subcomponent will comprise 100% of the Student Performance category.

Required Student Performance Variance Assurances

Please check the box below as applicable to all teachers included in this required student performance variance request.

- ☒ Assure that each teacher covered by this variance request will have an SLO consistent with the process described in the LEA's approved APPR plan and/or this variance application and in compliance with Education Law Section 3012-d.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 3. TEACHERS: Optional Student Performance - Variance Request**

Page Last Modified: 11/18/2020

Variance Request

LEAs may use this variance application to develop an optional second measure for a teacher or group of teachers that differs from the process described in the Commissioner's regulations. Any teachers not covered by this variance request will be evaluated under the terms of the LEA's currently approved APPR plan.

Please make the appropriate selection below.☒ A variance is not requested for the optional student performance subcomponent for teachers.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Variance Request

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

Variance Request

LEAs may use this variance application to evaluate teacher practice in a manner that differs from the process described in the Commissioner's regulations. Any teachers not covered by this variance request will be evaluated under the terms of the LEA's currently approved APPR plan.

Please make the appropriate selection below.

☒ A variance is not requested for the teacher observation category.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 5. TEACHERS: Overall Scoring - Variance Request**

Page Last Modified: 11/18/2020

Category and Overall Ratings

For guidance on APPR scoring, see NYSED APPR Guidance.

Education Law §3012-d requires that each teacher be given a final score for both the Student Performance and Teacher Observation categories, which will be converted to a final category rating based on the HEDI scale, and that these ratings be used to provide an Overall Rating using the prescribed scoring matrix. *These requirements must be met through either the LEA's current APPR plan or this variance. To the extent that the variance does not address a requirement, the currently approved APPR plan will apply.*

Variance Request

LEAs may use this variance application to define the HEDI ranges for the Student Performance and/or Teacher Observation category that is different than those included in the Commissioner's regulations. Any teachers not covered by this variance request will be evaluated under the terms of the LEA's currently approved APPR plan.

Please make the appropriate selection below.

☒ The details of the variance request for category ratings for teachers is described in the subsequent section.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 5. TEACHERS: Overall Scoring - Applicability**

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

Applicable Teachers

Please indicate all teachers to whom this category ratings variance request applies.

Core Teachers Use the table below to list the core teachers this category ratings variance request is applicable to (teachers of other courses should be listed in the subsequent section).

	All Core Teachers in LEA	Common Branch / Uniform Departmentalized	ELA	Math	Science	Social Studies
Courses	☒ All core teachers (K-3; 4-8 ELA, math, science, social studies; high school ELA and Regents courses, as applicable to LEA) [if this option is selected, please do not make selections in subsequent columns]					

Other Teachers

- ☐ Teachers of other courses are not included in this category ratings variance request.
☒ Teachers of other courses included in this category ratings variance request are listed in the table below.

Fill in the following for all other teachers in additional grades/subjects that are included in this teacher observation variance request:

Column 1: lowest grade that corresponds to the course

Column 2: highest grade that corresponds to the course

Column 3: subject of the course

Follow the examples below to list other courses.

	(1) lowest grade	(2) highest grade	(3) subject
All Other Courses	K	12	All courses not named above
K-3 Art	K	3	Art
Grades 9-12 English Electives	9	12	English Electives

Click "Add Row" to add additional courses. Only list additional courses if they are included in this category ratings variance request.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d

Task 5. TEACHERS: Overall Scoring - Applicability

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

Grade From	Grade To	Subject
K	12	All courses not named above

Applicable Areas

A variance may be requested for the following components::

- Student performance category ranges*
- Teacher observation category ranges**

Please indicate the area(s) of teacher evaluation ratings for which a variance is being requested.

☒ Student performance category ranges*

*Only select 'Student performance category ranges' if your variance request involves different values than those included in the table on the left below. **Only select 'Teacher observation category ranges' if your variance request involves different values than those included in the table on the right below.

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

	Overall Student Performance Category Score and Rating
	Minimum
Maximum	H
18	20
E	15
17	D
13	14
I	0

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

	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

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 5. TEACHERS: Overall Scoring - Student Performance Category Ranges**

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

Student Performance Category Ranges*The overall Student Performance category score will be converted into a HEDI rating based on the ranges listed in the tables below.***Please complete the table below to assign student performance category scores from 0 to 20 to HEDI categories.**

	Low Value	High Value
Highly Effective	17	20
Effective	13	16
Developing	10	12
Ineffective	0	9

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 5. TEACHERS: Overall Scoring - Overall Rating, Variance Details & Assurances**

Page Last Modified: 01/07/2021

Variance Details*Please read the questions below and answer each prompt in a concise manner.*

Rationale Please provide a rationale for this variance request. > Your rationale should include information regarding the specific, identified needs and/or challenges of the LEA, and how such needs and/or challenges inform development of the category scoring ranges variance request.

Please see Task 2

Rigor Please provide a description of how the LEA will ensure that evaluations are rigorous and enable strong and equitable inferences about the effectiveness of the LEA's educators. > This description should include how rigor is achieved and maintained, including relevant processes and methodologies. > This description may include, but is not limited to, how data will be used to draw inferences, including how the derived data informs decisions and guidance for the LEA's educators.

Please see section 2

Professional Learning Please provide a description of how the LEA will use the information collected through the evaluation system, including the assigned effectiveness ratings, to provide personalized professional learning opportunities for educators. > This description may include, but is not limited to, methodologies and procedures for:

- collecting information about educator effectiveness to inform professional learning,
- specific details regarding both the type(s) and extent of professional learning opportunities anticipated,
- processes for delivery of personalized learning opportunities, and
- use of data to measure the efficacy of such professional learning.

Please see section 2

Effectiveness of Implementation Please provide a description of how the LEA will assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the variance. > This description may include, but is not limited to, processes and procedures for:

- collection and analysis of both short- and long-term data,
- the standard(s) used to measure the effectiveness of implementation, and
- how results will be used to inform future implementation.

Please see section 2

Category and Overall Rating Assurances

Please check all of the boxes below as applicable to all teachers included in this variance request for category and overall scoring and ratings.

- ☒ Assure that the process by which weights and scoring ranges are assigned to subcomponents and categories is transparent and available to those being rated before the beginning of each school year.
- ☒ Assure that each subcomponent and category score and rating will be calculated pursuant to the LEA's approved APPR plan and/or this variance application and in compliance with Education Law Section 3012-d.
- ☒ Assure that 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 - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Variance Request**

Page Last Modified: 11/23/2020

Additional Requirements for Teachers

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

Education Law §3012-d requires that a complete APPR plan must include a process for teacher improvement plans, appeals, and evaluator training as determined by the Commissioner. The following minimum requirements under Education Law §3012-d are applicable to teachers:

- A form for development of a Teacher Improvement Plan,
- A timely and expeditious process for resolving educator's appeals of APPR ratings,
- A process for training all evaluators of applicable educators.

These requirements must be met through either the LEA's current APPR plan or this variance. To the extent that the variance does not address a requirement, the currently approved APPR plan will apply.

Variance Request

LEAs may use this variance application to develop a process for Teacher Improvement Plans, appeals and/or training in a manner that differs from the process described in the Commissioner's regulations. Any teachers not covered by this variance request will be evaluated under the terms of the LEA's currently approved APPR plan.

Choose the appropriate response below.

- ☒ A variance is not requested for teacher improvement plans, appeals, or training.
- ☐ The details of the variance request applicable to teacher improvement plans, appeals, and/or training is described in the subsequent section.

Educator Evaluation - Variance, Education Law §3012-d**Task 12. Joint Certification of APPR Variance - Applicability and Certification**

Page Last Modified: 07/06/2022

Applicability of Variance

Variance Duration An Annual Professional Performance Review Variance under Education Law §3012-d may be approved for up to THREE (3) years. Please indicate below the school years to which this variance application will apply. One, two, or three consecutive academic years may be selected.

- ☒ 2022-23
- ☒ 2023-24
- ☒ 2024-25

Upload APPR Variance 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 APPR Variance using the "Variance Certification Form" found in the 'Documents' menu on the left side of the page.

APPR Variance Certification Form 7-6-22.pdf

APPR VARIANCE CERTIFICATION FORM: Please download, check the assurances, sign, and upload this form to complete the submission of your LEA's Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) Variance, Education Law §3012-d application.

Assurances: Please check the boxes below

- ☒ Assure that all information provided in this variance application is true and accurate as of the date that the variance application is submitted.
- ☒ Assure that once this application is approved by the Department, it shall be considered part of the LEA's approved APPR plan during the effective term of the variance.
- ☒ Assure that, upon a revocation or non-renewal of a variance application at the end of its effective term, the district shall implement its approved evaluation plan in its entirety and without modification, consistent with all requirements of Subpart 30-3.3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents, and absent any terms of the variance.
- ☒ Assure that, where applicable, collective negotiations have been completed on all provisions of this variance application that are subject to collective bargaining.

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature:

Date:




7/6/22

Superintendent Name (print):

Harold A. Coles

Teachers Union President Signature:

Date:



7/6/22

Teachers Union President Name (print):

Eileen McGarvey

Administrative Union President Signature:

Date:




7/6/22

Administrative Union President Name (print):

Albert Grant-Johnson

Board of Education President Signature:

Date:



7/6/22

Board of Education President Name (print):

Catherine A. Draper



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Commissioner of Education
President of the University of the State of New York
89 Washington Avenue, Room 111
Albany, New York 12234

E-mail: commissioner@nysed.gov
Twitter: @NYSEDNews
Tel: (518) 474-5844
Fax: (518) 473-4909

July 5, 2022

Revised

Harold Coles, Superintendent
Westchester BOCES
17 Berkley Dr.
Rye Brook, NY 10573

Dear Superintendent Coles:

Congratulations. I am pleased to inform you that your educator evaluation plan ("plan") meets the criteria outlined in Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Commissioner's Regulations and has been approved. As a reminder, we are relying on the information you provided on your educator evaluation form, including the certifications and assurances that are part of your approved plan. If any material changes are made to your approved plan, your district/BOCES must submit such material changes to us for approval. Please see the attached notes for further information.

Please be advised that, pursuant to Education Law §3012-d, the Department will be analyzing data supplied by districts, BOCES, and/or schools and may order a corrective action plan if there are unacceptably low correlation results between the Student Performance category and the Teacher Observation or Principal School Visit category, and/or if the teachers' or principals' overall ratings and subcomponent scores show little differentiation across educators and/or the lack of differentiation is not justified by equivalently consistent student achievement results, and/or if schools or districts show a pattern of anomalous results in the Student Performance category and/or the Observation/School Visit category.

The New York State Education Department and I look forward to continuing our work together, with the goal of ensuring that every school has world-class educators in the classroom, every teacher has a world-class principal to support his or her professional growth, and every student achieves college and career readiness.

Thank you again for your hard work.

Sincerely,



Betty A. Rosa
Commissioner

NOTE:

Only documents that are incorporated by reference in your educator evaluation plan have been reviewed and are considered as part of your plan; therefore, any supplemental documents such as memorandums of agreement or understanding that were uploaded with your plan but are not incorporated by reference in your plan have not been reviewed. However, the Department reserves the right to review the uploaded attachments at any time for consistency with your plan and/or to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations; and as a result of such review, the Department may reject your plan and/or require corrective action.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 1. General Information - Disclaimers and Assurances**

Page Last Modified: 05/16/2022

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**

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

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.

Each teacher shall have a locally determined Student Learning Objective (SLO) consistent with the goal-setting process determined by the Commissioner.

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

For guidance on SLOs, see NYSED SLO Guidance.

SLOs shall be used as the required student performance measure for all teachers. The following must be used as the evidence of student learning within the SLO.

MEASURES

SLO measures may be either individually attributed or collectively attributed.

Individually attributed measures

An individually attributed SLO is based on the student population of a course for which the teacher directly contributes to student learning outcomes.

> Individually attributed results: scores and ratings will be based on the growth of students in the teacher's course in the current school year.

Collectively attributed measures

A collectively attributed SLO is based on a student population across multiple sections of the same course or across multiple courses where more than one teacher either directly or indirectly contributes to student learning outcomes. When determining whether to use a collectively attributed SLO, the LEA should consider:

- identifying which measures and assessments could be used to encourage partnerships or teams where teachers have an opportunity to collectively impact student learning;
- identifying which assessments could be used to help foster and support the LEA's focus on a specific priority area(s);
- the impact on the LEA's ability to make strong and equitable inferences regarding an individual educator's effectiveness; and
- when using multiple measures, the appropriate weight of each measure that reflects individually and collectively attributed results.

> Collectively attributed results: scores and ratings will be based on the growth of all students in a school or program or students across buildings/programs in an LEA who take the applicable assessments in the current school year.

> Collectively attributed group or team results: scores and ratings for a group or team of teachers will be based on the growth of students in the group/team of teachers' courses or students in the group/team of teachers' courses across buildings/programs in an LEA in the current school year.

> Collectively attributed linked results: scores and ratings will be based on the growth of students enrolled in the teacher's course in the current school year taking assessments in other grades/subjects.

ASSESSMENTS

Any of the measures above may be used with one or more of the following assessment types.

- **State assessment(s); or**

Assessment(s) that are selected from the list of State-approved:

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Student Learning Objectives**

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

- **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
97-100%	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.**

- ☒ Assure that each teacher has an SLO as determined locally in a manner consistent with the goal-setting process determined by the Commissioner.
- ☒ Assure that all student growth targets represent a minimum of one year of expected growth, as determined locally in a manner consistent with the Commissioner's goal-setting process. Such targets may only take the following characteristics into account: poverty, students with disabilities, English language learner status and prior academic history.
- ☒ Assure that all student growth targets shall measure the change in a student's performance between the baseline and the end of the course.
- ☒ Assure that if a teacher's SLO is based on a small 'n' size population and the LEA chooses not to use the HEDI scoring bands listed above, then the teacher's 0-20 score and HEDI rating will be determined using the HEDI scoring bands specified by the Department in SLO Guidance.
- ☒ Assure that processes are in place for the superintendent to monitor SLOs.
- ☒ Assure that the final Student Performance category rating for each teacher 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.
- ☒ Assure that for any SLO based, in part, on the New York State grade four science assessment, once the assessment is no longer administered the SLO will utilize only the remaining assessments.

Measures and Assessments**Use the table below to list all applicable teachers with the corresponding measure and assessment(s).**

Note on common branch/departmentalized options

Grades 4-8

- If all core content area instruction (ELA/math/science/social studies) is delivered by a single teacher, please select each applicable common branch grade level below.
- If core content area instruction is departmentalized (i.e., separate ELA, math, science, and social studies teachers), please select the applicable grade level/content area combination(s).
- If both common branch and departmentalized instruction occurs in a particular grade level, please select both options for the applicable grade level(s).

Grades K-3 that use both a common branch and departmentalized model

- Check each applicable common branch grade level below.
- On the non-core/elective teachers page, select the "Elementary" option for applicable subjects in the "Subject" column with the corresponding grade(s).

Choose "Add Row" to include an additional group of teachers with a different measure and assessment(s).

Applicable Teachers <i>Select all that apply</i>	Measure	State or Regents Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	Third Party Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>
☒ Global History II	☒ Individually attributed	☒ Global History		

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

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

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

Applicable Teachers <i>Select all that apply</i>	Measure	State or Regents Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	Third Party Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>
	results	Regents		
☒ US History	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ US History Regents		
☒ Living Environment	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ Living Environment Regents		
☒ Earth Science	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ Earth Science Regents		
☒ Chemistry	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ Chemistry Regents		
☒ Algebra I	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ Algebra I Regents		
☒ Geometry	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ Geometry Regents		
☒ Algebra II	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ Algebra II Regents		
☒ Grade 9 ELA ☒ Grade 10 ELA ☒ Grade 12 ELA	☒ Collectively attributed group or team results	☒ Grade 3 ELA ☒ Grade 4 ELA ☒ Grade 5 ELA ☒ Grade 6 ELA ☒ Grade 7 ELA ☒ Grade 8 ELA ☒ Grade 3 Math ☒ Grade 4 Math ☒ Grade 5 Math ☒ Grade 6 Math ☒ Grade 7 Math ☒ Grade 8 Math ☒ Grade 4 Science(until discontinued) ☒ Elementary Science(when available) ☒ Grade 8 Science ☒ All Regents given in LEA ☒ NYSAA		
☒ Grade 11 ELA	☒ Individually attributed results	☒ ELA Regents		
☒ Common Branch Kindergarten ☒ Common Branch Grade 1	☒ Collectively attributed group or team results	☒ Grade 3 ELA ☒ Grade 4 ELA ☒ Grade 5 ELA ☒ Grade 6 ELA		

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Student Learning Objectives**

Page Last Modified: 06/21/2022

Applicable Teachers <i>Select all that apply</i>	Measure	State or Regents Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>	Third Party Assessment(s) <i>Select all that apply</i>
☒ Common Branch Grade 2 ☒ Common Branch Grade 3 ☒ Common Branch Grade 4 ☒ Common Branch Grade 5 ☒ Common Branch Grade 6 ☒ Grade 7 ELA ☒ Grade 7 Math ☒ Grade 7 Science ☒ Grade 7 Social Studies ☒ Grade 8 ELA ☒ Grade 8 Math ☒ Grade 8 Science ☒ Grade 8 Social Studies ☒ Global History I		☒ Grade 7 ELA ☒ Grade 8 ELA ☒ Grade 3 Math ☒ Grade 4 Math ☒ Grade 5 Math ☒ Grade 6 Math ☒ Grade 7 Math ☒ Grade 8 Math ☒ Grade 4 Science(until discontinued) ☒ Elementary Science(when available) ☒ Grade 8 Science ☒ All Regents given in LEA ☒ NYSAA		
☒ All non-core/elective teachers(to list non-core/elective teachers separately, please use the table in the following section)	☒ Collectively attributed results	☒ Grade 3 ELA ☒ Grade 4 ELA ☒ Grade 5 ELA ☒ Grade 6 ELA ☒ Grade 7 ELA ☒ Grade 8 ELA ☒ Grade 3 Math ☒ Grade 4 Math ☒ Grade 5 Math ☒ Grade 6 Math ☒ Grade 7 Math ☒ Grade 8 Math ☒ Grade 4 Science(until discontinued) ☒ Elementary Science(when available) ☒ Grade 8 Science ☒ All Regents given in LEA ☒ NYSAA		

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 2. TEACHERS: Required Student Performance - Weighting

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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 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: 05/18/2022

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 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?

- ☒ Observable components are combined in some other manner (please provide more information below)e.g., domains 2 and 3 are weighted as 40% each, and Domains 1 and 4 are weighted as 10% each.

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

Domain 1 of the Danielson rubric will carry 20% of the weight; Domain 2 - 35%; Domain 3 - 35% and Domain 4 - 10%

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

Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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 equally

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.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

	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 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Teacher Observations**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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%.

Principal/Administrator [Required]	Independent Evaluator(s) [Required]	Peer Observer(s) [Optional]	Group of teachers for which this weighting will apply <i>If only one group of teachers is applicable, please list "All teachers"</i>
90%	10%	0% (N/A)	all teachers

Teacher Observation

The teacher observation category is made up of two (2) required and one (1) optional subcomponents.

- The frequency and duration of observations are locally determined.
- Observations may occur in person, by live virtual observation, or by recorded video, as determined locally.
- LEAs may locally determine whether to use more than one observation by any of the required observers.
- Nothing shall be construed to limit the discretion of administrators to conduct observations in addition to those required by this section for non-evaluative purposes.

Required Subcomponents

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

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

- At least one observation must be conducted by the building principal or other trained administrator.

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

- At least one observation must be conducted by an impartial independent trained evaluator.
- Impartial independent trained evaluators are trained and selected by the LEA.
- They may be employed within the LEA, but may not be assigned to the same school building as the teacher being evaluated. This could include other administrators, department chairs, or peers (e.g., teacher leaders on career ladder pathways), so long as they are not from the same building (defined as same BEDS code) as the teacher being evaluated.

** 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*

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Teacher Observations**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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: Observations by Trained Peer Observer(s)

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

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

- ☒ Assure that the following elements will not be used in calculating a teacher's Observation category score and rating: 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; and/or use of professional goal-setting as evidence of teacher 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 observations for teachers will be conducted pursuant to the locally-determined durations.
- ☒ Assure that at least one of the required observations will be unannounced.

Number and Method of Observation

- **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 use the table below to enter the minimum number of observations and method of observation for each type listed.

	Minimum Number of Observations	Method of Observation <i>Select all that apply</i>
Announced Supervisor Observation (Required Subcomponent 1)	1	☒ In person
Unannounced Supervisor Observation (Required Subcomponent 1)	0	☒ Not applicable
Announced Independent Evaluator Observation (Required Subcomponent 2)	0	☒ Not applicable
Unannounced Independent Evaluator Observation (Required Subcomponent 2)	1	☒ In person
Announced Peer Observation (Optional)	N/A	☒ Not applicable
Unannounced Peer Observation (Optional)	N/A	☒ Not applicable

Does the information in the table above apply to all teachers?

- ☒ No, there are 2 groups of teachers who receive a different number and/or method of observation of each type (e.g., tenured teachers and probationary teachers; identify the first subgroup below).

Please identify the first subgroup of teachers to whom the information in the table above applies.

Tenured

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 4. TEACHERS: Observations - Subgroup 2**

Page Last Modified: 06/07/2022

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.

Probationary 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 <i>Select all that apply</i>
Announced Supervisor Observation (Required Subcomponent 1)	2	☒ In person
Unannounced Supervisor Observation (Required Subcomponent 1)	0	☒ Not applicable
Announced Independent Evaluator Observation (Required Subcomponent 2)	0	☒ Not applicable
Unannounced Independent Evaluator Observation (Required Subcomponent 2)	1	☒ In person
Announced Peer Observation (Optional)	N/A	☒ Not applicable
Unannounced Peer Observation (Optional)	N/A	☒ 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.

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: 05/16/2022

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.

	Overall Student Performance Category Score and Rating	
	Minimum	Maximum
H	18	20
E	15	17
D	13	14
I	0	12

Teacher Observation

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

	Overall Observation Category Score and Rating	
	Minimum	Maximum
H	3.5 to 3.75	4.00
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

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: 05/18/2022

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.

SW BOCES TEACHER TIP 3revised012-d 061516.docx

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Appeals**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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? <i>Select all groups that have the same process as defined in subsequent columns.</i> <i>To add additional groups with a different process, use the "Add Row" button.</i>	Please select the ground(s) on which the teachers selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating. <i>Select all that apply.</i>	What is the maximum length of time for the teachers selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal?
☒ All teachers	☒ The substance of the annual professional performance review [evaluation]; which shall include the following: 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 ☒ The LEA's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-d ☒ 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 ☒ The LEA's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan, as required under Education Law Section 3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents	☒ 0-30 days

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Appeals

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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)

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Training**

Page Last Modified: 06/27/2022

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 such 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?**

- ☒ Yes, all evaluators receive the same initial training.

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

- ☒ 4-6 days

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Training**

Page Last Modified: 06/27/2022

Retraining**Approximately how many hours of re-training (annual, periodic, or other frequency) will evaluators receive?**☒ 1-3 days**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.

☒ Periodic calibration meetings and/or trainings

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 6. TEACHERS: Additional Requirements - Assurances**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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: 05/18/2022

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 An individually attributed SLO is based on the learning outcomes of a student population within the principal's building or program. > *Individually attributed results:* scores and ratings will be based on the growth of students in the principal's building/program in the current school year.

Collectively attributed measures A collectively attributed SLO is based on a student population across multiple buildings/programs of similar grade configuration or across multiple building/programs where the learning activities of one building/program indirectly contribute to student learning outcomes in another building/program. When determining whether to use a collectively attributed SLO, the LEA should consider:

- identifying which measures and assessments could be used to encourage partnerships or teams where there is an opportunity for a collective impact on student learning;
- identifying which assessments could be used to help foster and support the LEA's focus on a specific priority area(s);
- the impact on the LEA's ability to make strong and equitable inferences regarding an individual educator's effectiveness; and
- when using multiple measures, the appropriate weight of each measure that reflects individually and collectively attributed results.

> *Collectively attributed results:* scores and ratings for the selected principals will be based on the growth of students in an LEA who take the applicable assessments in the current school year. > *Collectively attributed group or team results:* scores and ratings for a group or team of principals will be based on the growth of students in the group/team of principals' buildings/programs in an LEA in the current school year. **ASSESSMENTS** *Any of the measures above may be used with one or more of the following assessment types.*

- **State assessment(s);** or

Assessment(s) that are selected from the list of State-approved:

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

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.

☒ Input Model

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 - Input Model

Page Last Modified: 06/23/2022

Input Model Assurance

Please read the assurance below and check the box.

- ☒ For principals evaluated using an input model, assure that all applicable principals will be evaluated using the procedures described herein and approved by the Commissioner.

Input Model Details

Use the table below to list all applicable principals with the corresponding measure and assessment(s). Choose "Add Row" to include an additional group of principals with a different measure.

Building Configuration(s) for Applicable Principals Select all that apply	Describe the areas of principal practice that will be evaluated using an input model.	Describe how the selected areas of principal practice promote student growth.	Describe the evidence of student growth and principal practice that will be collected.	How will data that is collected from this measure be used to provide timely and constructive feedback to principals?	Describe 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. Please complete the chart below to illustrate the conversion to a score from 0-20 points.	Supporting Documents Please include any documents incorporated by reference in previous columns.
☒ All Principals	Measures of student growth; Evidence of student learning; HEDI ranges	The input model will be used for all principals. Five elements of the Multidimensional Rubric have been identified as leader behaviors that contribute to increased student growth. The focus is on research informed best practices which were identified as essential for creating the conditions for continued student growth. The five elements were chosen because they are deemed critical for	Principals will be asked to provide both evidence of student learning as well as evidence of their leadership in leading this initiative in their building. Five elements of the Multidimensional Rubric tied directly to improved student results have been identified. These elements will be used to gather evidence and a score will be given based on the five identified elements..	A Data Driven Instruction model is being implemented to help teachers, with the support of principals, identify student, classroom and program learning targets and use both formative and summative data to measure progress in a timely manner.	Evidence will be collected on the five identified elements using a notecatcher with questions focused on identifying success in leading each element. The notecatcher results in points earned on a 0 to 20 scale that converts to ratings of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, or Ineffective using the HEDI conversion chart below.	swboces note capturer for administrators.docx

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

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Input Model

Page Last Modified: 06/23/2022

Building Configuration(s) for Applicable Principals <i>Select all that apply</i>	Describe the areas of principal practice that will be evaluated using an input model.	Describe how the selected areas of principal practice promote student growth.	Describe the evidence of student growth and principal practice that will be collected.	How will data that is collected from this measure be used to provide timely and constructive feedback to principals?	Describe 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. <i>Please complete the chart below to illustrate the conversion to a score from 0-20 points.</i>	Supporting Documents <i>Please include any documents incorporated by reference in previous columns.</i>
		assuring student growth at this point in time with programs experiencing interruptions and migration to new models due to the pandemic. Evidence will be collected on those five elements using a notecatcher with questions focused on identifying success in leading each element. Additionally, a Data Driven Instruction model is being implemented to help teachers, with the support of principals, identify student, classroom and program learning targets and use both formative and summative data to measure progress.				

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

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Input Model

Page Last Modified: 06/23/2022

Building Configuration(s) for Applicable Principals <i>Select all that apply</i>	Describe the areas of principal practice that will be evaluated using an input model.	Describe how the selected areas of principal practice promote student growth.	Describe the evidence of student growth and principal practice that will be collected.	How will data that is collected from this measure be used to provide timely and constructive feedback to principals?	Describe 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. <i>Please complete the chart below to illustrate the conversion to a score from 0-20 points.</i>	Supporting Documents <i>Please include any documents incorporated by reference in previous columns.</i>
		Principals will be asked to provide both evidence of student learning as well as evidence of their leadership in leading this initiative in their building.				

Conversion Chart Be sure to include each point from 0 to 20.

	Minimum	Maximum
0	Ineffective	Ineffective
1	Ineffective	Ineffective
2	Ineffective	Ineffective
3	Ineffective	Ineffective
4	Ineffective	Ineffective
5	Ineffective	Ineffective
6	Ineffective	Ineffective
7	Ineffective	Ineffective
8	Ineffective	Ineffective
9	Ineffective	Ineffective
10	Developing	Developing
11	Developing	Developing
12	Developing	Developing
13		

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Input Model

Page Last Modified: 06/23/2022

	Minimum	Maximum
	Effective	Effective
14	Effective	Effective
15	Effective	Effective
16	Effective	Effective
17	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
18	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
19	Highly Effective	Highly Effective
20	Highly Effective	Highly Effective

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

Task 7. PRINCIPALS: Required Student Performance - Weighting

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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: 05/18/2022

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.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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)

Please read the assurances below and check each box.

- ☒ Assure that the same rubric(s) is (are) used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the LEA, provided that LEAs may locally determine whether to use different rubrics for a principal assigned to different programs or grade configurations as indicated in the table above.
- ☒ Assure that the same rubric(s) is (are) used for all school visits for a principal across the school visit types in a given school year.

Rubric Rating Process

For more information 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.

The following is one example of how an LEA might score principal school visits using the selected practice rubric: *Domains 1-4 of the MPPR 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 school visit, evidence is collected for all observed subcomponents in a domain. A holistic score is then determined for each domain. These domain scores are weighted as indicated above to reach a final score for each school visit. Scores for each school visit are weighted equally and averaged to reach a final score for each school visit type. The LEA will ensure that all subcomponents designated as observable will be addressed at least once across the school visit 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 ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards (PSEL standards beginning in 2024-25) is covered, across the total number of annual school visits.
- ☒ 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 principal school visit 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)

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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

- ☒ Observable components are combined in some other manner (please provide more information below)e.g., domains 2 and 3 are weighted as 40% each, and Domains 1 and 4 are weighted as 10% each.

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

Domain 1 of the Multidimensional Rubric will carry 16% of the weight; Domain 2 - 26%; Domain 3- 26%; Domain 4 - 16%; Domain 5 - 0%, Domain 6 - 16%

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 2019Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Rubric and Scoring

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

	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

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Principal School Visits**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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 <i>If only one group of principals is applicable, please list "All principals"</i>
90%	10%	0% [N/A]	All Principals

Principal School Visits

The principal school visit category is made up of two (2) required and one (1) optional subcomponents.

- The frequency and duration of school visits are locally determined.
- School visits may not occur by live or recorded video.
- LEAs may locally determine whether to use more than one school visit by any of the required observers.
- Nothing shall be construed to limit the discretion of administrators to conduct school visits in addition to those required by this section for non-evaluative purposes.

Required Subcomponents

- At least one of the required school visits must be unannounced (across both required subcomponents).

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

- At least one school visit must be conducted by the superintendent or other trained administrator.

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

- At least one school visits must be conducted by an impartial independent trained evaluator.
- Impartial independent trained evaluators are trained and selected by the LEA.
- They may be employed within the LEA, but may not be assigned to the same school building as the principal being evaluated. This could include other administrators, department chairs, or peers, so long as they are not from the same building (defined as same BEDS code) as the principal being evaluated.

** 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*

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Principal School Visits**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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)	0
Announced Independent Evaluator School Visits (Required Subcomponent 2)	0
Unannounced Independent Evaluator School Visits (Required Subcomponent 2)	1
Announced Peer School Visits (Optional)	0
Unannounced Peer School Visits (Optional)	0

Does the information in the table above apply to all principals?

- ☒ Yes, all principals receive the same number of school visits of each type.

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 principal(s) they are evaluating.
- ☒ Assure that independent evaluator(s) will be trained and selected by the LEA.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 9. PRINCIPALS: School Visits - Principal School Visits**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 10. PRINCIPALS: Overall Scoring - Category and Overall Ratings**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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.

Overall Student Performance Category Score and Rating		
	Minimum	Maximum
H	18	20
E	15	17
D	13	14
I	0	12

Principal School Visit Category

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

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

Scoring Matrix for the Overall Rating

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

		Principal School Visit 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 principal shall be determined according to the evaluation matrix.

Educator Evaluation - Ed Law §3012-d, amended in 2019**Task 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Principal Improvement Plans**

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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.

SWBOCES November PIP.docx

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

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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? <i>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.</i>	Please select the ground(s) on which the principals selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating. <i>Please select all that apply.</i>	What is the maximum length of time for the principals selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal?
☒ All principals	☒ 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 ☒ The LEA's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-d ☒ 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 ☒ The LEA's issuance and/or	☒ 0-30 days

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

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

Which groups of principals may utilize the appeals process? <i>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.</i>	Please select the ground(s) on which the principals selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating. <i>Please select all that apply.</i>	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 list the corresponding row number and group(s) of principals that may utilize the appeals process.

Row Number	Groups of principals 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 11. PRINCIPALS: Additional Requirements - Training**

Page Last Modified: 05/19/2022

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.

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

- ☒ 4-6 days

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

Page Last Modified: 05/19/2022

Retraining**Approximately how many hours of re-training (annual, periodic, or other frequency) will evaluators receive?**☒ 1-3 days**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.

☒ Periodic calibration meetings and/or trainings

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

Page Last Modified: 05/18/2022

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.

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

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

Page Last Modified: 06/27/2022

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.

LEA Certification Form - 6-27-22.pdf

District Goal: Quality instruction in a connected learning environment

ISLLC Standard	Questions to Ask	Evidence to Collect
 Standard 1: Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared mission and vision B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals D. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans	What steps are you taking to collectively build a viable and shared mission and vision? How are you building your own expertise to help you lead the two district initiatives? 1. Quality instructional planning and implementation 2. Connected Learning Environment How will you use data to inform action plans and measure success? What is needed to be in place for this initiative to be successful? What district tools are you relying on in building this work?	

District Goal: Quality instruction in a connected learning environment

ISLLC Standard	Questions to Ask	Evidence to Collect
 Standard 2: Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth A. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program C. Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students D. Supervise instruction E. Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress F. Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff G. Maximize time spent on quality instruction H. Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning I. Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program <i>Highlighted elements are used for both the student performance and the School visit portion of the evaluation</i>	What steps did you take to identify key areas of focus for staff development? How are the circumstances of this year influencing the learning plan for both students and staff? How are you leading to assure a positive learning experience? How are you collaboratively identifying evidence that would indicate effective implementation? How can you align this evidence with our approved evaluation rubrics? Specifically, What is your plan for • Building capacity within your team? • Identifying the key drivers of successful implementation? • Identifying how to measure successful implementation? • Gathering qualitative and quantitative data as evidence of implementation? • Providing feedback? • Aligning the work to the Danielson rubric where appropriate?	

District Goal: Quality instruction in a connected learning environment

ISLLC Standard	Questions to Ask	Evidence to Collect
 Standard 3: Ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment A. Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems B. Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal, and technological resources C. Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff D. Develop the capacity for distributed leadership E. Ensure teacher and organizational time is focused to support quality instruction and student learning	What resources are most important to successful implementation this year? How are you identifying and securing resources? What structures have you put in place to optimize time spent building expertise and implementing initiatives? How are stakeholders engaged in leading this initiative? How do you identify barriers and needed supports? How do you problem solve to address obstacles? How do you use your time and schedule time with teammates to move this initiative ahead?	

District Goal: Quality instruction in a connected learning environment

ISLLC Standard	Questions to Ask	Evidence to Collect
 Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources A. Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment B. Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social and intellectual resources C. Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers D. Build and sustain productive relationship with community partners	How are you measuring success along the way? What resources have you identified and how are you leveraging them?	

District Goal: Quality instruction in a connected learning environment

ISLLC Standard	Questions to Ask	Evidence to Collect
5 Standard 5: Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practices, transparency, and ethical behavior. C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making E. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling	<i>We are not collecting evidence on this standard during the 2020-2021 school year.</i>	

District Goal: Quality instruction in a connected learning environment

ISLLC Standard	Questions to Ask	Evidence to Collect
 Standard 6: Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political social, economic legal and culture context A. Advocate for children, families and caregivers B. Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning C. Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies	What structures do you have in place to help you understand local state, district and national decisions that may influence the implementation of this initiative? What structures do you have in place to assure district guidance aligned to NYS directives are known and followed by all?	

SW BOCES TEACHER
IMPROVEMENT PLAN:
Revised August 11, 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) is a component of the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) requirements of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education.

In this Plan, “Teacher” refers to any “class room teacher” as defined in the Regulations of the Commissioner. A TIP may be initiated 1) for a teacher receiving **an Annual Professional Performance Review rating of “developing” or “ineffective”**; 2) as the result of an observation with evidence that would fall into the developing or ineffective categories in multiple areas; or 3) at any time at the request of a teacher. The purpose of this process is to assist the teacher to identify, improve and consistently apply the APPR criteria in her/his work.

II. PHASES OF A TIP

A. Awareness Phase

1. Administrator communicates concern to teacher or teacher communicates area in need of assistance to administrator.
2. Teacher and administrator meet to attempt to resolve the concern
This contact is an opportunity to express the concern, get the teacher or administrator’s response, set up an observation or other form of data collection, or give suggestions. (Danielson & McGreal, p. 122)
3. This phase may not apply if a TIP is initiated as the result of the receipt of a rating of developing or ineffective.

B. Teacher Improvement Plan

1. If the concern is not resolved during the Awareness Phase or if a teacher receives a rating of “developing” or “ineffective”, a TIP will be initiated by the administrator. Once a TIP is initiated, the administrator works together with the teacher to develop the TIP.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF A TIP

A. Timing of a TIP

1. Pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-d, a teacher who has received a rating on their Annual Professional Performance Review of “developing” or “ineffective” will be placed on the TIP which must be developed by October 1st

of the school year following the school year in which the educator's performance was rated Ineffective or Developing or as soon as practicable thereafter.

2. In a case of a teacher who is placed on a TIP other than a result of a rating of "developing" or "ineffective", the TIP may be commenced at any time during the school year.
3. The length of the TIP will generally be for the duration of the school year as stated in the TIP except that for a probationary teacher the TIP shall be for three (3) to five (5) months in duration, as determined by the BOCES. The length of the TIP for a tenured teacher shall be no less than five (5) months in duration, as determined by the BOCES. In no event should a TIP go beyond the end of the school year.

B. General Requirements of a TIP

1. The purpose of a TIP is the improvement of teaching practice. The issuance of a TIP is not a disciplinary action.
2. The TIP shall be developed in consultation with the teacher. The Union President shall be informed of the BOCES's intent to issue a TIP to a teacher. Whenever a teacher is placed on a TIP, and with the agreement of the teacher, the Union President shall be provided with a copy of the TIP.
3. A TIP shall clearly specify the following:
 - a. The area(s) in need of improvement
 - b. The performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timeliness the teacher must meet in order to achieve an effective rating.
 - c. How improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress and goal achievements.
 - d. The anticipated frequency and duration of the meetings of the teacher, administrator and, if one is assigned, mentor.
 - e. The appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the BOCES will make available to assist the teacher, including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor teacher.
4. A TIP shall be written on the form annexed in the Appendix.

5. After the TIP is in place, the teacher, administrator and, (if one has been Assigned) mentor, as well as a Union representative, if requested by the teacher, shall meet according to the schedule set forth in the TIP to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the TIP. Any such meeting shall also be for the purpose of assisting the teacher to achieve the goals set forth in the TIP. Based upon the outcome of such assessment(s), the TIP may be modified accordingly.

C. Costs of the TIP: All costs associated with the actions required by the BOCES, including but not limited to, tuition, fees, books and travel shall be borne by the BOCES in their entirety.

Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP)

Teacher: _____

Academic Year: _____

Assignment: _____

Location: _____

Supervising

BTA Administrator: _____

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 teachers, administrator, and union representative will mutually agree upon artifacts or visible indicators of progress (linked to the APPR rubric selected).
4. Action Plan – The teacher, administrator, and union representative will jointly list differentiated activities and strategies to address the area 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 teacher, administrator, and union representative will jointly list resources, available direct materials, training, workshops, etc. to help improve the teacher’s practice. Any mandated resources identified to remediation will be at BOCES expense.

6. Timeline – The teacher, administrator, and union representative will discuss and a timeline for improvement shall be set forth for the process and a 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’s Signature:

_____ Date: _____

Administrator’s Signature:

_____ Date: _____

BTA Representative Signature:

_____ Date: _____

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 principal or teacher in memo form.

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

Date	Meeting Summary	Print Name and Positions of Attendees	Signature of All Attendees

SW BOCES Principal
IMPROVEMENT PLAN:
Revised August 11, 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

The Principal Plan (PIP) is a component of the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) requirements of the Regents Rules, subpart 30-3.11.

A PIP may be initiated 1) for a principal receiving **an Annual Professional Performance Review rating of “developing” or “ineffective”**; 2) as the result of a school visit with evidence that would fall into the developing or ineffective categories in multiple areas; or 3) at any time at the request of the principal. The purpose of this process is to assist the principal to identify, improve and consistently apply the APPR criteria in her/his work.

II. PHASES OF A PIP

A. Awareness Phase

1. Director communicates concern to principal or principal communicates area in need of assistance to the director.
2. Principal and Director meet to attempt to resolve the concern
This contact is an opportunity to express the concern, get the principal or director’s response, set up a school visit or other form of data collection, or give suggestions. (Danielson & McGreal, p. 122)
3. This phase may not apply if a PIP is initiated as the result of the receipt of a rating of developing or ineffective.

B. Principal Improvement Plan

1. If the concern is not resolved during the Awareness Phase or if a principal receives a rating of “developing” or “ineffective”, a PIP will be initiated by the administrator. Once a PIP is initiated, the principal works together with the director to develop the PIP.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF A PIP

A. Timing of a PIP

1. Pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-d, a principal who has received a rating on their Annual Professional Performance Review of “developing” or “ineffective” will be placed on the PIP which must be developed by October 1st of the school year next following the school year in which the educator’s

performance was rated Ineffective or Developing or as soon as practicable thereafter.

2. In a case of a principal who is placed on a PIP other than a result of a rating of “developing” or “ineffective”, the PIP may be commenced at any time during the school year.
3. The length of the PIP will generally be for the duration of the school year as stated in the PIP except that for a probationary principal the PIP shall be for three (3) to five (5) months in duration, as determined by the BOCES. The length of the PIP for a tenured principal shall be no less than five (5) months in duration, as determined by the BOCES. In no event should a PIP go beyond the end of the school year.

B. General Requirements of a PIP

1. The purpose of a PIP is the improvement of leadership practice. The issuance of a PIP is not a disciplinary action.
2. The PIP shall be developed in consultation with the principal. The Union President shall be informed of the BOCES's intent to issue a PIP to an administrator. Whenever an administrator is placed on a PIP, and with the agreement the administrator, the Union President shall be provided with a copy of the PIP.
3. A PIP shall clearly specify the following:
 - a. The area(s) in need of improvement
 - b. The performance goals, expectations, benchmarks, standards and timeliness the administrator must meet in order to achieve an effective rating.
 - c. How improvement will be measured and monitored, and provide for periodic reviews of progress and goal achievements.
 - d. The anticipated frequency and duration of the meetings of the director, administrator and, if one is assigned, mentor.
 - e. The appropriate differentiated professional development opportunities, materials, resources and supports the BOCES will make available to assist the principal, including, where appropriate, the assignment of a mentor principal.

4. A PIP shall be written on the form annexed in the Appendix.
5. After the PIP is in place, the director, administrator and, (if one has been assigned) mentor, as well as a Union representative, if requested by the principal, shall meet according to the schedule set forth in the PIP to assess the effectiveness and appropriateness of the PIP. Any such meeting shall also be for the purpose of assisting the principal to achieve the goals set forth in the PIP. Based upon the outcome of such assessment(s), the PIP may be modified accordingly.

C. Costs of the PIP: All costs associated with the actions required by the BOCES, including but not limited to, tuition, fees, books and travel shall be borne by the BOCES in their entirety.

SOUTHERN WESTCHSESTER BOCES
PRINCIPAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (PIP)

Principal: _____

Location/Program(s): _____

Date of PIP Conference: _____ PIP Implementation School Year _____

1. Areas in Need of Improvement

Refer to the specific domains and describe the specific behavior(s) which are in need of improvement.

2. Improvement Goals/Outcomes

Provide expected outcomes for change. Determine how the expected outcome will be assessed.

3. Corrective/Differentiated Strategies

Provide methods and activities by which improvement can be achieved.

4. Support/Resources

Provide description of support and resources to include district's responsibilities.

5. Timeline

Provide a timeline for improvement.

6. Evidence of Progress to Support Goal Achievement

Describe artifacts or visible indicators of progress linked to the APPR rubric.

Principals' Signature: _____ Date: _____

Director's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Association Rep. Signature: _____ Date: _____

LEA CERTIFICATION FORM: Please download, sign, and upload this form to complete the submission of your LEA's Educator Evaluation plan.

By signing this document, the LEA and its collective bargaining agent(s) certify that the Educator Evaluation plan submitted to the Commissioner for approval constitutes the school LEA's complete Educator Evaluation plan, that all provisions of the plan that are subject to collective negotiations have been resolved pursuant to the provisions of Article 14 of the Civil Service Law, and that such plan complies with the requirements of Education Law §3012-d as amended by the Laws of 2019 and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents, and has been adopted by the governing body of the LEA.

The LEA and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also certify, upon information and belief, that all statements made herein are true and accurate and that any applicable collective bargaining agreements for teachers and principals are consistent with and/or have been amended and/or modified or otherwise resolved to the extent required by Article 14 of the Civil Service Law, as necessary to require that all classroom teachers and building principals will be evaluated using the Educator Evaluation plan submitted to the Commissioner for approval.

The LEA and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also certify that this Educator Evaluation plan is the LEA's complete Educator Evaluation plan and that such plan will be fully implemented by the LEA; that there are no collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or any other agreements in any form that prevent, conflict, or interfere with full implementation of the Educator Evaluation plan; and that no material changes will be made to the Plan through collective bargaining or otherwise except with the approval of the Commissioner in accordance with Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

The school district and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also acknowledge that if approval of this Educator Evaluation plan is rejected or rescinded for any reason, any State aid increases received as a result of the Commissioner's approval of this Educator Evaluation plan may be withheld or forfeited by the State pursuant to Education Law §3012-d(11).

The LEA and its collective bargaining agent(s), where applicable, also make the following specific certifications with respect to their Educator Evaluation plan:

- Assure that the overall Educator Evaluation rating will be used as a significant factor in employment decisions, including but not limited to: tenure determinations and teacher and principal improvement plans;
- Assure that the entire Educator Evaluation will be completed for each teacher or principal as soon as practicable but in no case later than September 1 of the school year following the year in which the classroom teacher or building principal's performance is being measured;
- Assure that the LEA shall compute and provide to the teacher/principal their score and rating on the Student Performance category, if available, and for the Teacher Observation category or Principal School Visit Category of a teacher's or principal's APPR, in writing, no later than the last day of the school year for which the teacher or principal is being measured, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year following the year in which the teacher's or principal's performance is measured;
- Assure that the Educator Evaluation plan will be filed in the LEA's office and made available to the public 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 later occur;
- Assure that complete and accurate teacher and student data will be provided to the Commissioner in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner;
- Assure that the LEA will continue to report to the State individual subcomponent scores and the overall rating for each classroom teacher and building principal in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner;
- Assure that the LEA provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher and building principal to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them;
- Assure that teachers and principals will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process;
- Assure that any training course for lead evaluator certification addresses each of the requirements in the regulations, including specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities;
- Assure that any teacher or principal who receives an Overall Rating of Developing or Ineffective in any school year will receive a Teacher Improvement Plan or Principal Improvement Plan, in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations, by October 1 of the school year following the year in which such teacher's or principal's performance was measured or as soon as practicable thereafter.
- Assure that such improvement plan shall be developed by the superintendent or their designee in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment, and shall be subject to collective bargaining to the extent required under Article 14 of the Civil Service Law;
- Assure that all evaluators and lead evaluators, including independent evaluators and peer evaluators, as applicable, will be properly trained and that lead evaluators will be certified and recertified as necessary in accordance with all applicable statutes and regulations;
- Assure that LEA has collectively bargained appeal procedures that are consistent with the statute and regulations and provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal to the LEA;
- Assure that, for teachers, all observable NYS Teaching Standards/Domains of the selected practice rubric are assessed at least once a year across the total number of annual observations and, for principals, all observable ISLLC 2008 Leadership Standards/Domains of the selected practice rubric are assessed at least once a year across the total number of annual school

visits;

- Assure that it is possible for a teacher or principal to obtain each point in the scoring ranges, including 0, for each subcomponent and that the LEA shall ensure that the process by which weights and scoring ranges are assigned to 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 same locally selected 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 manner to the extent practicable;
- Assure that all growth targets represent a minimum of one year of expected growth;
- Assure that any material changes to this Educator Evaluation plan will be submitted to the Commissioner for approval 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 devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by State or Federal law for each classroom or program of the grade does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum in required annual instructional hours for such classroom or program of the grade; and
- Assure that the amount of time devoted to test preparation under standardized 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 reviews, or performance assessments shall not be counted towards the limits established by this subdivision. In addition, formative and diagnostic assessments shall not be counted towards the limits established by this subdivision and nothing in this subdivision shall be construed to supersede the requirements of a section 504 plan of a qualified student with a disability or Federal law relating to English language learners or the individualized education program of a student with a disability.

Signatures, dates

Superintendent Signature:

Date:


 6/27/22

Superintendent Name (print):

Harold A. Coles

Teachers Union President Signature:

Date:


 6/27/22

Teachers Union President Name (print):

Eileen McGarvey

Administrative Union President Signature:

Date:


 6/27/22

Administrative Union President Name (print):

Albert Grant-Johnson

Board of Education President Signature:

Date:

 6/27/22

Board of Education President Name (print):

Catherine A. Draper