**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

March 24, 2023

**Revised**

Tonia Thompson, Superintendent
Binghamton City School District
164 Hawley Street
Binghamton, NY 13901

Dear Superintendent Thompson:

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

Attachment

c. Rebecca Stone

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.

Page Last Modified: 08/01/2022

## 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.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

## Required Student Performance Subcomponent

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

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

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

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

## 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

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

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

- **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

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

**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 *Select all that apply* | Measure *Prior to making a selection, please read the description of each measure provided above.* | State or Regents Assessment(s) *Select all that apply* | Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) *Select all that apply* | Third Party Assessment(s) *Select all that apply* | Applicable School or BOCES-Program *Please leave blank unless instructed by the Department to complete this column.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☑ Grade 8 Science<br>☑ Grade 11 ELA<br>☑ All High School Regents Math Courses<br>☑ All High School Regents Science Courses<br>☑ Global History II<br>☑ US History | ☑ Individually attributed results | ☑ Course-Specific State/Regents Assessment (do not use this option in conjunction with any of the assessments above) | | | (No Response) |

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

| Applicable Teachers *Select all that apply* | Measure *Prior to making a selection, please read the description of each measure provided above.* | State or Regents Assessment(s) *Select all that apply* | Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) *Select all that apply* | Third Party Assessment(s) *Select all that apply* | Applicable School or BOCES-Program *Please leave blank unless instructed by the Department to complete this column.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☑ All teachers not currently listed in one of the rows above (do not use this option in row 1) | ☑ Collectively attributed results (program, school or district-wide measure) | ☑ Grade 8 Science<br>☑ All Regents given in LEA | | | (No Response) |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## Use of the Optional Subcomponent and Student Performance Category Weighting

- If the Optional subcomponent is not used, the Required subcomponent will comprise 100% of the Student Performance category.
- If the Optional subcomponent is used, the percentage of the Student Performance category attributed to the Required subcomponent will be locally determined.

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

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

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## 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.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

## 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.** |
|---|---|
| NYSTCE Framework for the Observation of Effective Teaching | (No Response) |

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

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

☑ Assure that the same rubric(s) is (are) used for all observations of a classroom teacher across the observation types in a given school year.

## Rubric Rating Process

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

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

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

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

☑ Assure that the designation of components of the selected practice rubric as observable is locally negotiated.

☑ Assure that all components of the selected practice rubric designated as observable are assessed at least once and that each of the NYS Teaching Standards is covered across the total number of annual observations.

☑ Assure that a component designated as ineffective is rated one (1), a component designated as developing is rated two (2), a component designated as effective is rated three (3), and a component designated as highly effective is rated four (4).

☑ Assure that the process for assigning scores and/or ratings for each teacher observation is consistent with locally determined processes, including practice rubric component weighting consistent with the description in this plan.

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

☑ Subcomponent level (each observable subcomponent receives a rating)

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

☑ Each component is weighted equally and averaged

## Scoring the Observation Category

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

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

- **Two observations by the principal with one early in the school year weighted at 40% and one late in the school year weighted at 60%.**
- **Two observations by the principal, with one holistic score for each component of the rubric based on the preponderance of evidence over both observations.**

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

☑ Multiple observations of the same type are weighted 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**

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

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

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

| | Minimum Rubric Score | Maximum Rubric Score |
|---|---|---|
| Highly Effective: | 3.50 | 4.00 |

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

| | Minimum Rubric Score | Maximum Rubric Score |
|---|---|---|
| Effective: | 2.50 | 3.49 |

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

| | Minimum Rubric Score | Maximum Rubric Score |
|---|---|---|
| Developing: | 1.50 | 2.49 |

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

| | **Minimum Rubric Score** | Maximum Rubric Score |
|---|---|---|
| Ineffective: | 0.00 | 1.49 |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## 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** ***If only one group of teachers is applicable, please list "All teachers"*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 80% | 20% | 0% (N/A) | All teachers |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## 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 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** *Select all that apply* |
|---|---|---|
| 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) | 0 | ☑ Not applicable |
| Unannounced Peer Observation (Optional) | 0 | ☑ Not applicable |

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

☑ Yes, all teachers receive the same number of observations of each type by the same method(s).

---

**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.

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

***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.

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## Category and Overall Ratings

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

## Category Scoring Ranges

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

**Student Performance**

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.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

## Additional Requirements

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

## Teacher Improvement Plan Assurances

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

☑ Assure that the LEA will formulate and commence implementation of a Teacher Improvement Plan (TIP) for all teachers who receive an overall rating of Developing or Ineffective by October 1 following the school year for which such teacher's performance is being measured or as soon as practicable thereafter.

☑ Assure that TIP plans developed and implemented by the superintendent or their designee, in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment, and subject to collective bargaining to the extent required under article 14 of the Civil Service Law, shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas.

## Teacher Improvement Plan Forms

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

1) identification of needed areas of improvement;

2) a timeline for achieving improvement;

3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed; and, where appropriate,

4) differentiated activities to support a teacher's improvement in those areas.

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

Binghamton CSD TIP Form.pdf

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## Appeals Assurances

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

☑ Assure that the LEA has collectively bargained appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.

☑ Assure that an appeal shall not be filed until a teacher's receipt of their overall rating.

## Appeals

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

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

(i) in the instance of a teacher rated Ineffective on the Student Performance category, but rated Highly Effective on the Observation category based on an anomaly, as determined locally;

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

(3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as required under Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents; and

(4) the LEA's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher improvement plan, as required under Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.

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

| **Which groups of teachers may utilize the appeals process?**<br>*Select all groups that have the same process as defined in subsequent columns.*<br>*To add additional groups with a different process, use the "Add Row" button.* | Please select the ground(s) on which the teachers selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating.<br>*Select all that apply.* | What is the maximum length of time for the teachers selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal? |
|---|---|---|
| ☑ Probationary teachers who received a rating of Ineffective<br>☑ Tenured teachers who received a rating of Developing<br>☑ Tenured teachers who received a rating of Ineffective | ☑ 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<br>☑ The LEA's adherence to the standards and methodologies | ☑ 1-3 months |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

| **Which groups of teachers may utilize the appeals process?**<br>*Select all groups that have the same process as defined in subsequent columns.*<br>*To add additional groups with a different process, use the "Add Row" button.* | Please select the ground(s) on which the teachers selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating.<br>*Select all that apply.* | What is the maximum length of time for the teachers selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal? |
|---|---|---|
| | required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-d<br>☑ 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<br>☑ 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 | |

**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 utlize the appeals process.** |
|---|---|
| (No Response) | (No Response) |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## 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.

1. The New York State Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators
2. Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research
3. 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
4. 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
5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the LEA utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers
6. 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
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
8. 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
9. 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 describe how training and retraining evaluators is conducted.**

***Check all that apply.***

☑ As a component district, training is conducted by, or in conjunction with, a BOCES

☑ As an LEA, we conduct our own training

**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.

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

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

☑ 1-3 days

***Retraining***

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

☑ 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.***

☑ Data analysis to detect disparities on the part of the evaluators

☑ Periodic comparisons of an evaluator's assessment of the same classroom teacher

☑ Periodic calibration meetings and/or trainings

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

### Teacher Evaluation Assurances

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

☑ Assure that the LEA shall compute and provide to the teacher their score and rating for the Student Performance category, if available, and for the Teacher Observation category for the teacher's evaluation, in writing, no later than the last school day of the school year for which the teacher is being measured, but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the teacher's performance is being measured.

☑ Assure that the evaluation system will be used as a significant factor for employment decisions.

☑ Assure that teachers will receive timely and constructive feedback as part of the evaluation process.

☑ Assure that the following prohibited elements listed in Education Law Section 3012-d(6) are not being used as part of any teacher's evaluation: evidence of student development and performance derived from lesson plans, other artifacts of teacher practice, and student portfolios, except for student portfolios measured by a State-approved rubric where permitted by the Department; use of an instrument for parent or student feedback; use of professional goal-setting as evidence of teacher effectiveness; any locally-developed assessment that has not been approved by the Department; and any growth or achievement target that does not meet the minimum standards as set forth in regulations of the Commissioner. Consistent with Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents, assure that points shall not be allocated based on any artifacts, unless such artifact constitutes evidence of an otherwise observable rubric subcomponent.

### Assessment Assurances

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

☑ Assure that the amount of time devoted to traditional standardized assessments that are not specifically required by state or federal law for each classroom or program within a grade level does not exceed, in the aggregate, one percent of the minimum required annual instructional hours for the grade.

☑ Assure that individuals with vested interest in the outcome of their assessments are not involved, to the extent practicable, in the scoring of those assessments.

### Data Assurances

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

☑ Assure that SED will receive accurate teacher and student data, including enrollment and attendance data, and any other student, teacher, school, course, and teacher/student linkage data necessary to comply with regulations, in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.

☑ Assure that the LEA provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.

☑ Assure that scores for all teachers will be reported to SED for each subcomponent, as well as the overall rating, as per SED requirements.

☑ Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

### Required Student Performance Subcomponent

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

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

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

## 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).

---

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

**INPUT MODEL**

*Selection of the Input Model will require:*

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

**Measure Type(s)**

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

☑ Student Learning Objective (SLO)

## Assurances

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

☑ Assure that processes are in place for the superintendent to monitor SLOs and/or input models.

☑ Assure that the final Student Performance category rating for each principal will be determined using the weights and growth parameters specified in Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents and the approved Educator Evaluation plan.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

### 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 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.

☑ For principals evaluated using an SLO, assure that such SLO is determined locally in a manner consistent with the goal-setting process determined by the Commissioner.

☑ For principals evaluated using an SLO, 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.

☑ For principals evaluated using an SLO, assure that all student growth targets shall measure the change in a student's performance between the baseline and the end of the course.

☑ For principals evaluated using an SLO, assure that if the principal'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 principal's 0-20 score and HEDI rating will be determined using the HEDI scoring bands specified by the Department in SLO Guidance.

### Measures and Assessments

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

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

| **Building Configuration(s) for Applicable Principals** ***Select all that apply*** | Measure | State or Regents Assessment(s) ***Select all that apply*** | Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) ***Select all that apply*** | Third Party Assessment(s) ***Select all that apply*** | Applicable School or BOCES-Program *Please leave blank unless instructed by the Department to complete this column.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☑ K-5<br>☑ 6-8 | ☑ Collectively attributed results | ☑ Grade 8 Science<br>☑ All Regents | | | (No Response) |

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

| **Building Configuration(s) for Applicable Principals** ***Select all that apply*** | Measure | State or Regents Assessment(s) ***Select all that apply*** | Locally-developed Course-Specific Assessment(s) ***Select all that apply*** | Third Party Assessment(s) ***Select all that apply*** | Applicable School or BOCES-Program *Please leave blank unless instructed by the Department to complete this column.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | given in LEA | | | |
| ☑ 9-12 | ☑ Individually attributed results | ☑ All Regents given in LEA | | | (No Response) |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## Use of the Optional Subcomponent and Student Performance Category Weighting

- If the Optional subcomponent is not used, the Required subcomponent will comprise 100% of the Student Performance category.
- If the Optional subcomponent is used, the percentage of the Student Performance category attributed to the Required subcomponent will be locally determined.

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

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

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## 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.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

## Principal School Visit Category

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

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.** |
|---|---|
| Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model (2013) | (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.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

**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)

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

☑ Each component is weighted equally and averaged

## Scoring the School Visit Category

**If an evaluator conducts multiple school visits of the same type, how are those school visits weighted?**

**Examples of school visits of the same type include but are not limited to:**

- **Two school visits by the superintendent with one early in the school year to discuss organizational goals and areas for progress weighted at 40% and one late in the school year to present evidence aligned to goals and areas for progress weighted at 60%**
- **Several school visits by the principal with one holistic score for each component of the rubric based on evidence collected and observed over the course of the school year.**

***Please note: Weighting across school visit type (i.e. Supervisor vs. Independent Evaluator) are described in the following section.***

☑ 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.

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

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

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

**HEDI Ranges**

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

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

| | Minimum Rubric Score | Maximum Rubric Score |
|---|---|---|
| Highly Effective: | 3.50 | 4.00 |

**Please select a minimum value between 2.50 and 2.75 and a maximum value between 3.49 and 3.74 for the Effective 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 |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## Principal School Visit Subcomponent Weighting

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Supervisor/Administrator [Required] | Independent Evaluator(s) [Required] | Peer School Visit(s) [Optional] | **Group of principals for which this weighting will apply** ***If only one group of principals is applicable, please list "All principals"*** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 90% | 10% | 0% [N/A] | N/A |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## 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 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.

***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.

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

**Peer School Visit Assurances**

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

☑ Assure that peer principals, as applicable, will be trained and selected by the LEA.

☑ Assure that, if school visits are being conducted by trained peer principal(s), these principal(s) received an overall rating of Effective or Highly Effective in the previous school year.

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## Category and Overall Ratings

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

## Category Scoring Ranges

*The overall Student Performance category score and the overall 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.

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## Additional Requirements

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

## Principal Improvement Plan Assurances

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

☑ Assure that the LEA will formulate and commence implementation of a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) for all principals who receive an overall rating of Developing or Ineffective by October 1 following the school year for which such principal's performance is being measured or as soon as practicable thereafter.

☑ Assure that PIP plans developed and implemented by the superintendent or their designee, in the exercise of their pedagogical judgment, and subject to collective bargaining to the extent required under article 14 of the Civil Service Law, shall include: identification of needed areas of improvement, a timeline for achieving improvement, the manner in which the improvement will be assessed, and, where appropriate, differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

## Principal Improvement Plan Forms

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

1) identification of needed areas of improvement;

2) a timeline for achieving improvement;

3) the manner in which the improvement will be assessed; and, where appropriate,

4) differentiated activities to support a principal's improvement in those areas.

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

Principal Improvement Plan and Process.pdf

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

## Appeals Assurances

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

☑ Assure that the LEA has collectively bargained appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.

☑ Assure that an appeal shall not be filed until a principal's receipt of their overall rating.

## Appeals

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

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

(i) 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 review your negotiated appeal process and use the table below to describe the appeal process available to principals.**

| **Which groups of principals may utilize the appeals process?** *Select all groups that have the same process as defined in subsequent columns. To add additional groups with a different process, use the "Add Row" button.* | Please select the ground(s) on which the principals selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating. *Please select all that apply.* | What is the maximum length of time for the principals selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal? |
|---|---|---|
| ☑ All principals who received a rating of Ineffective | ☑ 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<br>☑ The LEA's adherence to the standards | ☑ 1-3 months |

Page Last Modified: 02/17/2023

| **Which groups of principals may utilize the appeals process?** *Select all groups that have the same process as defined in subsequent columns. To add additional groups with a different process, use the "Add Row" button.* | Please select the ground(s) on which the principals selected are permitted to appeal their overall evaluation rating. *Please select all that apply.* | What is the maximum length of time for the principals selected to receive a final decision from the filing of the appeal? |
|---|---|---|
| | and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law Section 3012-d<br>☑ 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<br>☑ The LEA's issuance and/or 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) |

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

## 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.

1. The Leadership Standards and their related functions, as applicable
2. Evidence-based observation techniques that are grounded in research
3. 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
4. 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
5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the LEA utilizes to evaluate its building principals
6. 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
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System
8. 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
9. 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 describe how training and retraining evaluators is conducted.**

***Check all that apply.***

☑ As a component district, training is conducted by, or in conjunction with, a BOCES

☑ As an LEA, we conduct our own training

**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.

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

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

☑ 1-3 days

***Retraining***

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

☑ 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.**

☑ Superintendent/District Superintendent

**Please read the assurance below and check the box.**

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

**Inter-rater Reliability**

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

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

***Please check all that apply.***

☑ Data analysis to detect disparities on the part of the evaluators

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

☑ Periodic calibration meetings and/or trainings

Page Last Modified: 02/02/2023

### 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.

Page Last Modified: 03/14/2023

## Upload Educator Evaluation LEA Certification Form

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

**Implementation of the Evaluation Plan**

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

☑ 2022-23

**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.**

Binghamton CSD APPR Certification Form - 3.1.2023.pdf

**Binghamton City School District**
**Teacher Improvement Plan**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Teacher's Name:** | **School:** |
| **Grade and/Subject Area:** | **School Year to Commence:** |
| **Evaluator(s) Developing the Plan:** | **APPR Area(s) of Concern:** |

**Briefly describe areas of strength the teacher brings to the plan:**

**Briefly describe areas in need of improvement:**

**Note:** Only state goals for which the teacher has received a 1 or 2 overall category rating. Delete all areas not being addressed through this plan.

| Goals | Action Steps (Provide detailed description) | Needed Support/Resources | Who is responsible for implementation and collection of evidence? | Expected dates of completion | Evidence of Goal being met |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. Plan and organize the lesson | | | | | |
| II. Promote Student Interest and Engagement | | | | | |
| III. Demonstrate High Expectations for Student Learning | | | | | |
| IV. Respond to Diverse Student Characteristics and Needs | | | | | |
| V. Make Ideas Clear, Connected and Assessable to students | | | | | |
| VI. Ask Questions and Lead Discussions and | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| to Promote Learning | | | | | |
| VII. Maintain a Positive Emotional Climate | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VIII. Manage the Classroom to Maximize Productivity | | | | | |
| IX. Manage the Classroom to Promote Learning | | | | | |
| X. Assess Student Performance and Progress | | | | | |
| State Growth Model/SLO | | | | | |

**Strategies for Implementing the Plan:**

_____ _____

**Signature of Evaluator(s)** **Date**

_____ _____

**Signature of Teacher** **Date**

## Principal Improvement Plan

Improvement plans for principals with developing or ineffective ratings shall be according to the following format and process. Such plans shall be mutually agreed upon within 10 district work days following the issuance of the final summative evaluation and overall rating.

Improvement plans shall include:

- A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing assessment.
- Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
- Specific improvement action steps/activities.
- A reasonable time line for achieving improvement.
- Required and accessible resources to be provided by the district to achieve goals. These may include resources made available through the administrator's collective bargaining association.
- A formative evaluation process documenting meetings strategically scheduled throughout the year to assess progress. These meetings shall occur at least twice during the year: the first between December 1 and December 15 and the second between March 1 and March 15. A written summary of feedback on progress shall be given within 5 business days of each meeting.
- A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
- A formal, final written assessment delineating progress made with an opportunity for comments by the principal.

Date

**Binghamton City School District**
**Principal Improvement Plan**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Principal's Name:** | **School:** |
| **Grade and/Subject Area:** | **School Year to Commence:** |
| **Supervisory Developing the Plan:** | **APPR Summative Evaluation Category:** |

**Briefly describe areas of strength the principal brings to the plan:**

**Briefly describe areas in need of improvement:**

| Goals | Action Steps (Provide detailed description) | Needed Support/ Resources, including provider | Who is responsible for implementation and collection of evidence? | Expected dates of completion | Evidence of Goal being met |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Domain I: Data Driven Focus on Student Achievement<br><br>Goal(s) Statement - | | | | | |
| Domain II: Continuous Improvement of Instruction<br><br>Goal(s) Statement - | | | | | |
| Domain III: A guaranteed and Viable Curriculum<br><br>Goal(s) Statement - | | | | | |
| Domain IV: Cooperation and Collaboration<br><br>Goal(s) Statement - | | | | | |
| Domain V: School Climate<br><br>Goal(s) Statement - | | | | | |
| State Growth Model/SLO<br><br>Goal(s) Statement - | | | | | |

**Strategies for Implementing the Plan:**

**Dates of formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):**

**December:**

**March:**

**Other:**

**Assessment Summary:** Superintendent is to attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above no later than 10 days after the identified completion date. Such summary shall be signed by the superintendent and principal with the opportunity for the principal to attach comments.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Signature of Evaluator** | **Date** |
| **Signature of Principal** | **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 statues 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: 2/21/2023

Tonie Thompson

Superintendent Name (print):

Tonie Thompson

Teachers Union President Signature: * Date: 02/21/2023

Kevin T Pendergast

Teachers Union President Name (print):

Kevin T Pendergast

Administrative Union President Signature: * Date: 02/27/2023

Tia Rodriguez

Administrative Union President Name (print):

Tia Rodriguez

Board of Education President Signature: * Date: 3/1/2023

Brian D Whalen

Board of Education President Name (print):

BRIAN D. WHALEN