

Clarence Central School District and Clarence Administrators' Association



Principal's Annual Professional Performance Review Plan Revised §3012-d

Ratified by Clarence Administrators' Association: November, 2015
Approved by Board of Education: 06/13/2016
Electronically Submitted to NYSED via Review Room Portal: 06/17/2016
Resubmitted and Accepted by NYSED: 03/15/2023

Contents of the Plan - §3012-d

School District Information	3
Task 1.1: Submission Status	3
Task 1.2: Submission Assurances	3
Education Law 3012-d	3-4
Student Performance – Required Subcomponent – Principals	5
Task 2.1: Student Performance Assurances	5-6
Task 7: Original Required Student Performance Subcomponent	6
Task 7.1: State Provided Measure of Student Growth (Original)	6-8
Task 7.1: Assurances for State Provided Measure of Student Growth	8
Task 7.2: Student Learning Objectives (Original)	8-9
Task 7.3: HEDI Scoring Bands for Student Performance Measure (Original)	10
Task 7.4: Principals with More Than One Growth Measure	10
Task 7.5: SLO Assurances	10-11
Task 7.6: Student Performance Subcomponent Weighting	11
Task 7: Required Student Performance Subcomponent (Transition Period 2016-17 thorough 2018-19)	11-12
Task 7.3: HEDI Scoring Bands for Student Performance Measure (Transition)	13
Task 7.4: Principals With More Than One Growth Measure (Transition)	13
Task 8: Optional Student Performance Subcomponent	13-14
Task 8.1: Use of the Optional Student Performance Subcomponent	14
Principal School Visit Category	14
Task 9.1: Principal Practice Rubric	14
Task 9.2: Rubric Assurances	14
Task 9.3: Process for Weighting Rubric Domains/Subcomponents	14
Principal Visit Category Elements	14-15
Task 9.4: Calculating School Visit Ratings	15-16
Task 9.5: Principal School Visit Subcomponent Weighting	16
Principal School Visit Elements & Timelines	16
Task 9.6: Assurances School Visits	17
Task 9.7: Number of School Visits	17
Overall Scoring for Principals	18
Task 10.1: Scoring Ranges	18
Task 10.2: Scoring Matrix for overall Rating	18
Task 10.3: Scoring & Rating Assurances	18-19
Additional Requirements Principals	19
Task 11.1: Principal Improvement Plan Assurances	19
Task 11.2: Principal Improvement Plan Process	19
Task 11.3: Appeals Assurances	20
Task 11.4: Appeals Process	20-23
Task 11.5: Evaluators Assurances	23
Task 11.6: Training of Lead Evaluators, Evaluators, Independent Evaluators & Certification	23-25
Task 11.7: Principal Evaluation Assurances	25-26
Task 11.8: Assessments Assurances	26
Task 11.9: Data Assurances	26
Reporting Subcomponent & Composite Scores	27
Assessment Development, Security & Scoring Procedures	27
Appendix A: Principal Improvement Plan Form	28-29
Appendix B: NYS Student Learning Objective Template	30
Appendix C: Summary of Regulations to Implement Ed Law 3012-d	32-37
Appendix D: Certification Form	38

School District Information

Clarence Central School District
BEDS 140801060000

Task 1.1: Submission Status

First-time submission under Education Law §3012-d

Task 1.2: Assurances

- Assure that the content of this form represents the district's/BOCES' entire APPR plan and that the APPR plan is in compliance with Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that a detailed version of the district's/BOCES' entire APPR 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 §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that this APPR plan will be posted on the district/BOCES 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 it is understood that this district's/BOCES' APPR plan will be posted in its entirety on the NYSED website following approval.

Pursuant to Section 3012-d of the Education Law, the Clarence Central School District and the Clarence Teachers' Association have established a comprehensive evaluation system for classroom teachers. The District and Association will continuously evaluate this new system. Changes to this agreement may be effected with the mutual agreement of the parties.

Education Law 3012-d

On April 13, 2015, the Governor signed Chapter 56 of the Laws of 2015 to add a new Education Law §3012-d to establish a new evaluation system for classroom teachers and building

principals. The new law requires teachers and principals to be evaluated based on two categories:

the Student Performance Category and the Observation/School Visit Category, each of which are

explained in further detail throughout this document. Under the new law, New York State continues to differentiate teacher and principal effectiveness using four rating categories – Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective. Education Law §3012-d requires APPRs to result in a single composite teacher or principal effectiveness rating that incorporates

multiple measures of effectiveness. As in the past, the results of the evaluations shall be a significant factor in employment decisions, including but not limited to promotion, retention, tenure determination, termination, and supplemental compensation, as well as teacher and principal professional development (including coaching, induction support, and differentiated professional development).

As a result of the new legislation, during the June 2015 meeting of the Board of Regents, Subpart 30-2 was amended and a new Subpart 30-3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents was added as an emergency adoption in order to implement Education Law §3012-d. Since the Board

of Regents meets at fixed intervals, the earliest the proposed rule can be presented for regular (non-emergency) adoption, after expiration of the required 45-day public comment period provided for in the State Administrative Procedure Act (SAPA) sections 201(1) and (5), would be the September 16-17, 2015 Regents meeting. Furthermore, pursuant to SAPA section 203(1),

the earliest effective date of the proposed rule, if adopted at the September meeting, would be October 7, 2015, the date a Notice of Adoption would be published in the State Register.

The title of Section 30-2 and Section **30-2.1** are amended to clarify that Subpart 30-2 only applies to APPRs conducted prior to the 2015-16 school year or APPRs conducted pursuant

to a CBA entered into on or before April 1, 2015 which remains in effect on or after April 1, 2015 until a subsequent agreement is reached.

The amendments to Subpart 30-2 of the Rules of the Board of Regents are organized as follows:

Section 30-2.1(d) is amended to clarify that a school district or BOCES has an unfettered statutory right to terminate a probationary teacher or principal for any statutorily and constitutionally permissible reason, including but not limited to misconduct, and until a tenure decision is made, the performance of a teacher or principal in the classroom or school.

Section 30-2.11 also clarifies that a school district or BOCES may terminate a probationary teacher or principal during an appeal for any statutorily and constitutionally permissible reason, including a teacher's or principal's performance.

A new **Subpart 30-3** is added to implement the new evaluation system.

Section 30-3.1 clarifies that the new evaluation system only applies to CBA's entered into after April 1, 2015 unless the agreement relates to the 2014-15 school year only. It further clarifies that nothing in the new Subpart shall be construed to abrogate any conflicting provisions of any CBA in effect on effect on or after April 1, 2015 during the term of such agreement and until entry into a successor CBA agreement. It further clarifies that APPRs shall be a significant factor

for employment decisions and teacher and principal development, consistent with the prior law. It also clarifies the unfettered right to terminate a probationary teacher or principal for any statutorily and constitutionally permissible reason. This section also provides that the Board will

convene workgroup(s) comprised of stakeholders and experts in the field to provide recommendations to the Board on assessments and metrics that could be used for APPRs in the

future.

Section 30-3.2 defines several terms used in the Subpart.

Section 30-3.3 prescribes the requirements for APPR plans submitted under the new Subpart

Section 30-3.4 describes the standards and criteria for conducting APPRs of classroom teachers under the new law. The new law requires teachers to be evaluated based on two categories: the

Student Performance – Required Subcomponent (Principals)

The first category has two subcomponents, one mandatory and the other optional. For the first mandatory component, principals shall be evaluated as follows:

- For principals with at least 30% of their students covered under a State-provided growth measure, such principal shall have a State-provided growth score based on such model.
- For principals where less than 30% of their students are covered under a State-provided growth measure, such principals shall have a SLO consistent with a goal setting process determined or developed by the Commissioner that results in a student growth score; provided that for any teacher whose course ends in a State created or administered assessment for which there is no State-provided growth model, such assessment must be used as the underlying assessment for such SLO.

If the district opts to use the second optional subcomponent, it shall be comprised of one or more of the following measures:

- A second State-provided growth score on a State-created or administered test; provided that the State provided growth measure is different than that used in the required subcomponent of the student performance category, which may include one or more of the following measures:
 - a principal-specific growth score computed by the State based on percentage of students who achieve a State-determined level of growth (e.g., percentage of students whose growth is above the median for similar students); and/or
 - school-wide, group, team, or linked growth results using available State- provided growth scores that are locally-computed
- A growth score based on a state designed supplemental assessment calculated using a State provided or approved growth model.

The law requires the Commissioner to establish weightings and scoring ranges for the subcomponents of the student performance category. The proposed amendment applies the following weights to each of the subcomponents:

- If a district does not locally select to use the optional second student growth subcomponent, then the mandatory subcomponent shall be weighted at 100%.
- If the optional second student growth subcomponent is selected, then the weightings shall be established locally, provided that the mandatory student growth subcomponent shall be weighted at a minimum of 50% and the optional student growth subcomponent shall be weighted no more than 50%.

Task 2.1: Assurances

- Assure that the growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where required.
- Assure that, starting in the 2019-20 school year, back-up SLOs will be set by the superintendent or another trained administrator for all 4-8 ELA and Math teachers in the event that a State-provided growth score cannot be generated for that teacher.
- For the 2019-20 school year and thereafter, for any grade/subject that requires a back-up SLO, but for which there are not enough students, not enough scores, or data issues

that prevent a teacher-specific SLO from being created, the superintendent or another trained administrator shall develop a school-wide back-up SLO using available State/Regents assessments.

- Assure that, during the 2015-16 through 2018-19 school years, the results of the NYS Grades 3-8 ELA/Math assessments and State-provided growth scores will continue to be used to calculate an original score and rating for advisory purposes only.

Please note: NYS Grades 3-8 ELA/Math Assessments and State-provided growth scores cannot be used for the purposes of providing transition scores and ratings during the 2015-16 through 2018-19 school years, and should be used for advisory purposes only until the 2019-20 school year. Alternate SLOs to be used during the 2016-17 through 2018-19 transition period should be entered in Task 2 (Transition).

Task 7: Original Required Student Performance Subcomponent

100% of Student Performance category if only the Required subcomponent is used or at least 50% when used with Optional subcomponent

(A) For a principal of a building which includes grades 4-8 ELA, math and/or high school courses with State or Regents assessments (or principals of programs with any of these assessments) who have at least 30% of his/her students covered under a State-provided growth measure, such principal shall have a State-provided growth score based on such model.

(B) For a principal where less than 30% of his/her students are covered under the State-provided growth measure, such principal shall have a Student Learning Objective (SLO), consistent with the SLO process determined or developed by the Commissioner, that results in a student growth score; provided that, for any principal whose building or program includes courses that end in a State-created or administered assessment for which there is no State-provided growth model, such assessment must be used as the underlying assessment for such SLO.

Task 7.1: State-Provided Measure of Student Growth (Original)

For principals with at least 30% of their students covered under a State-provided growth measure, such principal shall have a State-provided growth score based on such model. Please list the grade configurations of the school(s)/program(s) in your district/BOCES where it is expected that 30-100% of a principal's students are taking assessments with a State-provided growth measure, (e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12, etc.).

For principals where less than 30% of their students are covered under a State-provided growth measure, such principals shall have an SLO consistent with a goal setting process determined or developed by the Commissioner that results in a student growth score; provided that for any grade-level/course that ends in a State-created or administered assessment for which there is no State-provided growth model, such assessment must be used as the

underlying assessment for such SLO. (See Guidance for more detail on principals with State-provided measures and SLOs.)

For the 2019-20 school year and thereafter, for those principals who would typically receive a State-provided growth score, the district/BOCES must also include a back-up SLO in the event that there are not enough students, not enough scores, or data issues that prevent a State-provided growth score from being calculated for that principal.

Please list the grade configurations of the schools or principals where State-provided growth measures will apply beginning in the 2019-20 school year (please list, e.g., K-5, PK-6, 6-8, 6-12, 7-12, 9-12). For each configuration, also indicate assessment(s) used for the back-up SLO beginning in the 2019-20 school year.

For each grade configuration indicate the following:

- Column 1: lowest grade that corresponds to the building or program
- Column 2: highest grade that corresponds to the building or program
- Column 3: assessment(s) used

	Lowest Grade	Highest Grade	Assessments
Grades K-5 Building	K	5	NYS Grade 3 ELA NYS Grade 4 ELA NYS Grade 5 ELA NYS Grade 3 Math NYS Grade 4 Math NYS Grade 5 Math
Grades 6-8 Building	6	8	NYS Grade 6 ELA NYS Grade 7 ELA NYS Grade 8 ELA NYS Grade 6 Math NYS Grade 7 Math NYS Grade 8 Math
Grades 7-12 Building	9	12	All Regents assessments which are used to generate the principal's state-provided Growth Score

Using the table below, please select the assessment(s) that will be used for the back-up SLOs beginning in the 2019-20 school year for each grade configuration listed. The SLO will be based on the largest grades/courses in the principal's school building, using State or Regents assessments as the underlying evidence for such SLOs where they exist.

	Lowest Grade	Highest Grade	Assessments
Grades K-5 Building	K	5	NYS Grade 3 ELA NYS Grade 4 ELA NYS Grade 5 ELA NYS Grade 3 Math NYS Grade 4 Math NYS Grade 5 Math
Grades 6-8 Building	6	8	NYS Grade 6 ELA

			NYS Grade 7 ELA NYS Grade 8 ELA NYS Grade 6 Math NYS Grade 7 Math NYS Grade 8 Math
Grades 7-12 Building	9	12	All Regents assessments which are used to generate the principal's state-provided Growth Score

Task 7.1: Assurances

- Assure that the growth score provided by NYSED will be used, where required.
- Assure that, starting in the 2019-20 school year, back-up SLOs will be set by the superintendent or another trained administrator for all principals who receive a State-provided growth score in the event that a State-provided growth score cannot be generated for that principal.
- Assure that, during the 2015-16 through 2018-19 school years, the results of the NYS Grades 3-8 ELA/Math assessments and State-provided growth scores will continue to be used to calculate an original score and rating for advisory purposes only.

Task 7.2: Student Learning Objectives (Original)

SLOs must be used for principals in buildings or programs in which fewer than 30% of students take Grades 4-8 ELA, math, and/or high school courses with State or Regents assessments. SLOs will be developed using the grades/courses covering the most students in the school or program and continuing until at least 30% of students in the school or program are covered by SLOs. The district/BOCES must select the type of assessment that will be used with the SLO from the options below.

- If any grade/course in the building has a State-provided growth measure AND the principal must have SLOs because fewer than 30% of students in the building are covered, then the SLOs must begin first with the SGP results.
- Additional SLOs must then be set based on grades/subjects with State assessments for which there is no State-provided growth measure, where applicable.
- If additional SLOs are necessary, principals must begin with the grade(s)/course(s) that have the largest number of students using school-wide student results from one of the following assessment options:
 - State-approved 3rd party assessment; or
 - State-approved district, regionally, or BOCES-developed course-specific assessment.

For each grade configuration indicate the following:

- Column 1: lowest grade that corresponds to the building or program
- Column 2: highest grade that corresponds to the building or program
- Column 3: measure used
- Column 4: assessment(s) used

	Lowest Grade	Highest Grade	Assessments
Grades K-5 Building	K	5	NYS Grade 3 ELA NYS Grade 4 ELA NYS Grade 5 ELA NYS Grade 3 Math NYS Grade 4 Math NYS Grade 5 Math NYS Grade 4 Science Assessment NYSSA NYSESLAT
Grades 6-8 Building	6	8	NYS Grade 6 ELA NYS Grade 7 ELA NYS Grade 8 ELA NYS Grade 6 Math NYS Grade 7 Math NYS Grade 8 Math NYS Grade 8 Science Assessment NYSSA NYSESLAT Common Core Algebra Regents Exam Earth Science Regents Exam
Grades 7-12 Building	9	12	All Regents assessments which are used to generate the principal's state-provided Growth Score NYSSA NYSESLAT

Using the table below, please select the measure and assessment(s) that will be used for the SLOs for each grade configuration listed. During the 2016-17 through 2018-19 school years, SLOs that use

Grade From	Grade To	Measure	State or Regents Assessment	Locally-Developed Course Specific Assessment	Third Party Assessment
K	5	District-wide results	Common Core English Common Core Algebra Common Core Geometry Common Core Algebra II Living Environment Earth Science Chemistry Physics Global 2 US History	N/A	N/A

Grade From	Grade To	Measure	State or Regents Assessment	Locally-Developed Course Specific Assessment	Third Party Assessment
6	8	District-wide results	Common Core English Common Core Algebra Common Core Geometry Common Core Algebra II Living Environment Earth Science Chemistry Physics Global 2 US History	N/A	N/A
9	12	District-wide results	Common Core English Common Core Algebra Common Core Geometry Common Core Algebra II Living Environment Earth Science Chemistry Physics Global 2 US History	N/A	N/A

Task 7.3 HEDI Scoring Bands

20 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion

0 - 59%		60-74%		75-89%		90-100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	0-4%	13	60-66%	15	75-79%	18	90-92%
1	5-8%	14	67-74%	16	80-84%	19	93-96%
2	9-12%			17	85-89%	20	97-100%
3	13-16%						
4	17-20%						
5	21-24%						
6	25-28%						
7	29-33%						
8	34-38%						
9	39-43%						

10	44-48%
11	49-54%
12	55-59%

Task 7.4: Principals with More Than One Growth Measure

If educators have more than one State-provided growth score and rating, those scores and ratings will be combined into one score and HEDI rating for the Required Student Performance subcomponent provided by the Department. (Examples: Principals of K-8 schools with growth measures for ELA and math grades 4-8.)

Task 7.5: Assurances

- Assure that the principal has an SLO or a back-up SLO, where applicable, consistent with the goal setting process developed by the Commissioner that results in a student growth score.
- Assure that all growth targets represent a minimum of one year of expected growth, as determined by the superintendent or another trained administrator. Such targets, as determined by the superintendent or another trained administrator, may only take the following characteristics into account: poverty, students with disabilities, English language learners status and prior academic history.
- Assure that all growth targets are approved by the superintendent or another trained administrator.
- Assure that any disagreement between parties regarding the content of the SLO, including the growth target, will be resolved by the superintendent or another trained administrator.
- Assure that if a principal's SLO is based on a small n size population and the district/BOCES chooses not to use the HEDI scoring bands listed in task 7.3, then the principal's 0-20 score and HEDI rating will be determined using the HEDI scoring bands specified by the Department in APPR Guidance.
- Assure that processes are in place for the superintendent to monitor SLOs.
- 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 APPR plan.

Task 7.6: Student Performance Subcomponent Weighting

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

Task 7: Required Student Performance Subcomponent (Transition Period, 2016-17 through 2018-19)

100% of Student Performance category if only the Required subcomponent is used or at least 50% when used with Optional subcomponent

(A) For a principal of a building which includes grades 4-8 ELA, math and/or high school courses with State or Regents assessments (or principals of programs with any of these assessments) who have at least 30% of his/her students covered under a State-provided growth measure, such principal shall have a State- provided growth score based on such model.

(B) For a principal where less than 30% of his/her students are covered under the State-provided growth measure, such principal shall have a Student Learning Objective (SLO), consistent with the SLO process determined or developed by the Commissioner, that results in a student growth score; provided that, for any principal whose building or program includes courses that end in a State-created or administered assessment for which there is no State-provided growth model, such assessment must be used as the underlying assessment for such SLO.

During the 2016-17 through 2018-19 school years, pursuant to the requirements of §30-3.17 of the Rules of the Board of Regents, if excluding grade 3- 8 ELA/math State assessments and any State-provided growth scores results in no remaining student performance measures, districts/BOCES must develop alternate SLOs based on assessments that are not grade 3-8 ELA/math State assessments for the Required subcomponent of the Student Performance Category during the transition to higher standards through new State assessments aligned to revised learning standards and a revised State-approved growth model.

Grade From	Grade To	Measure	State or Regents Assessment	Locally-Developed Course Specific Assessment	Third Party Assessment
K	5	District-wide results	Common Core English Common Core Algebra Common Core Geometry Common Core Algebra II Living Environment Earth Science Chemistry Physics Global 2 US History	N/A	N/A
6	8	District-wide results	Common Core English Common Core Algebra Common Core Geometry Common Core Algebra	N/A	N/A

			II Living Environment Earth Science Chemistry Physics Global 2 US History		
9	12	District-wide results	Common Core English Common Core Algebra Common Core Geometry Common Core Algebra II Living Environment Earth Science Chemistry Physics Global 2 US History	N/A	N/A

Task 7.3: HEDI Scoring Bands

20 Point HEDI Scale for SLO Conversion

0 - 59%		60-74%		75-89%		90-100%	
INEFFECTIVE		DEVELOPING		EFFECTIVE		HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	
Results are well-below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are below state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results meet state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)		Results are well-above state average for similar students (or District goals if no state test)	
0	0-4%	13	60-66%	15	75-79%	18	90-92%
1	5-8%	14	67-74%	16	80-84%	19	93-96%
2	9-12%			17	85-89%	20	97-100%
3	13-16%						
4	17-20%						
5	21-24%						
6	25-28%						
7	29-33%						
8	34-38%						
9	39-43%						
10	44-48%						
11	49-54%						
12	55-59%						

Task 7.4: Principals with More Than One Growth Measure (Transition)

If educators have more than one alternate SLO, the measures will each earn a score from 0-20 points which districts/BOCES must weight proportionately based on the number of students in each SLO.

Task 8: Optional Student Performance Subcomponent

Up to 50% of Student Performance category, if selected.

Such second measure shall apply in a consistent manner, to the extent practicable, across all buildings with the same grade configuration or program in the district/BOCES and be either:

(A) a second State-provided growth score on a State-created or administered test, provided that a different measure is used than that for the Required subcomponent in the Student Performance category, or

(B) a growth score based on a State-designed supplemental assessment, calculated using a State-provided or approved growth model.

Task 8.1: Use of the Optional Student Performance Subcomponent

NO, the Optional subcomponent WILL NOT be used in the Student Performance category for any principal. YES, the Optional subcomponent WILL be used in the Student Performance category.

Task 9.1: Principal Practice Rubric

Rubric Name: Marzano's School Leader Evaluation Model

Leadership Standards and their related functions that are part of the rubric but not observable during the course of the school visit may be observed through other natural conversations between the principal and the evaluator and incorporated into the school visit score.

Organizational goal-setting may be used to the extent that it is evidence from the school visit and related to a component of the selected practice rubric.

Task 9.2: Assurances

- Assure that 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 the process for assigning points for the Principal School Visit category will be in compliance with the locally-determined subcomponent weights and overall School Visit category score and rating based on the constraints prescribed by the Commissioner in Subpart 30- 3 of the Rules of the Board of Regents.
- Assure that the same rubric(s) is used for all principals in the same or similar programs or grade configurations across the district/BOCES, provided that districts/BOCES may locally determine whether to use different rubrics for a principal assigned to different grade level configurations or building types.
- Assure that the same rubric(s) is used for all school visits for a principal across the school visit types in a given school year.

Task 9.3: Process for Weighting Rubric Domains/Subcomponents

All observable components will be weighted equally and averaged.

Principal School Visit Category

The principal school visit category is comprised of three subcomponents; two mandatory and one optional. The two mandatory subcomponents shall be based on:

- one observation shall be conducted by the principal's supervisor or other trained administrator; and
- a second observation shall be conducted by one or more impartial independent trained evaluator(s) selected and trained by the district. An independent trained evaluator may be employed within the district, but may not be assigned to the same school building as the principal being evaluated.
- One of the mandatory school visits must be unannounced.

The third optional subcomponent may include:

- School visits conducted by a trained peer administrator rated Effective or Highly Effective on his or her overall rating in the prior school year from observations to be set locally. the same school or from another school in the district.

The law also requires the Commissioner to establish the frequency and duration of school visits in regulations. The proposed amendment requires the frequency and duration of visits to be set locally.

The section also requires all observations to be conducted using a principal practice rubric approved by the commissioner pursuant to a Request for Qualification ("RFQ") process, unless the district has an approved variance from the Commissioner.

This section further prescribes parameters for the school visits category. The law requires the Commissioner to establish weightings and scoring ranges for the subcomponents of the school visits category. The proposed amendment provides that the weighting of the subcomponents within the principal school visits category shall be established locally within the following constraints:

- School visits conducted by the principal's supervisor or other trained administrator shall be weighted at a minimum of 80%.
- School visits conducted by independent impartial trained evaluators shall be weighted at a minimum of 10%.
- If a district selects to use the optional third observation subcomponent, then the weighting assigned to the optional school visits conducted by

Task 9.4: Calculating School Visit Ratings

Assurances

- 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 task 9.5 below, 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 observations, a score of 0 will be assigned.

Principal Visit Scoring Bands – HEDI Ranges (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.)

Overall School Visit Score & Rating		
	Minimum	Maximum
H	3.50	4.0
E	2.50	3.49
D	1.50	2.49
I	0	1.49

Rounding - Any number than the values listed in the maximum score column will move up to the next level. For example, a score of 3.491 is greater than 3.49, and therefore it will be rounded up to 3.50.

Task 9.5: Principal School Visit Subcomponent Weighting

Required Subcomponents:

- School Visits by Supervisor(s) or other Trained Administrator(s): At least 80% of the Principal School Visit category score
- 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 Observer(s): No more than 10% of the Principal School Visit category score when selected

Required – Supervisor/Administrator	Required Independent Evaluator	Option – Peer Observers
90%	10%	N/A

Principal School Visit Elements & Timelines

Four (4) school visits annually:

- Superintendent does ALL observations
- Tenured Principals: 2 sit-downs visit with 2 unannounced visits/activities.

- Non-Tenured Principals: minimum of 2 sit-down visits with 2 unannounced visits/activities.
- Observation length will be a minimum of 30 minutes.

The focus of the school visits will alternate by quarter, with one visit constituting a formal meeting between the principal and the superintendent and the next visit consisting of a direct observation of a school event that the principal is participating in or leading.

This does not preclude the superintendent from visiting the building or meeting with the building principal for non-evaluative purposes.

Task 9.6: Assurances

- 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, if school visits are being conducted by trained peer observer(s), these principal(s) received an overall rating of Effective or Highly Effective in the previous school year.
- 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; use of professional goal-setting as evidence of principal effectiveness.
- Assure that the length of all school visits for principals will be conducted pursuant to the locally-determined durations.
- Assure that independent evaluator(s) will be trained and selected by the district/BOCES.
- Assure that peer observer(s), as applicable, will be trained and selected by the district/BOCES.
- Assure that at least one of the required school visits will be unannounced.
- Assure that school visits will not be conducted via video.

Task 9.7: Number Of School Visits

Indicate the minimum number of unannounced and announced observations for each type of observer, as well as the method of observation, in the tables below.

Tenured Principals

	Required Principal Minimum: School Visits	Required Independent Evaluator(s): Minimum School Visits	Optional Peer Minimum School Visits
Unannounced	1	1	0

Announced	1	1	0
-----------	---	---	---

Probationary Principals

	Required Principal Minimum: School Visits	Required Independent Evaluator(s): Minimum School Visits	Optional Peer Minimum School Visits
Unannounced	1	1	0
Announced	1	1	0

Task 10.1: Scoring Ranges

Student Performance – Assigned based on point distribution provided by SED

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

Principal School Visits – HEDI ratings assigned based on locally-determined ranges consistent with constraints

Overall Observation Category Score		
	Minimum	Maximum
H	3.50	4.0
E	2.50	3.49
D	1.50	2.49
I	0	1.49

Task 10.2: Scoring Matrix for the Overall Rating

		Principal School Visit Category			
		H – Highly Effective	E – Effective	D – Developing	I – Ineffective
Student Performance Category	H – Highly Effective	H	H	E	D
	E – Effective	H	E	E	D
	D – Developing	E	E	D	I
	I – Ineffective	D*	D*	I	I

** If a principal is rated Ineffective on the Student Performance category, and a State-designed supplemental assessment was included as an Optional subcomponent of the Student Performance category, the teacher can be rated no higher than Ineffective overall (see Education Law §3012-d (5)(a) and (7)).*

Task 10.3: Assurances

- 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.

Task 11.1: Assurances – Principal Improvement Plans

- Assure that the district/BOCES will formulate and commence implementation of a Principal Improvement Plan (PIP) for all principals who receive a Developing or Ineffective rating 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 his/her designee, in the exercise of his/her pedagogical judgment, 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.

Task 11.2: Principal Improvement Plan Forms

All TIP plans developed and implemented by the superintendent or his/her designee, in the exercise of his/her 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.

Upon rating a principal as ineffective or developing, an improvement plan designed to rectify perceived or demonstrated deficiencies must be developed and commenced not later than ten (10) days after the start of a school year. The Superintendent or designee, in conjunction with the principal and possibly a colleague of choice, must develop an improvement plan that contains:

1. A clear delineation of the deficiencies that resulted in the ineffective or developing assessment.
2. Specific improvement goal/outcome statements.
3. Specific improvement action steps/activities.
4. A reasonable time line for achieving improvement.
5. Required and accessible resources to achieve goal.
6. 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.
7. The principal may request the attendance of the Principal of Choice from the Appeal Process if appropriate or a colleague if an appeal was not submitted.
8. A clear manner in which improvement efforts will be assessed, including evidence demonstrating improvement.
9. A formal, final written summative assessment delineating progress made with an opportunity for comments by the principal.

Task 11.3: Assurances - Appeals

Assure the district/BOCES has collectively bargained appeal procedures that are consistent with the regulations and that they provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of an appeal.

Task 11.4: Appeals

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

- (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review; 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 school district's/BOCES' adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-d; and

(3) the adherence to the regulations of the Commissioner and compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures, as well as the school district's/BOCES' issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan, as required under Education Law §3012-d.

- A. A principal who receives a "Developing or Ineffective" rating on his/her APPR shall be entitled to appeal this rating. This appeal must be done in written form and submitted to the Superintendent of Schools who has been trained in accordance with the requirements of the statute and regulation. An APPR shall not be placed in a principal's personnel file until either the expiration of the fifteen (15) business day period during which an appeal could be filed by the principal or the conclusion of the appeal process described herein, whichever is later.
- B. The principal must submit a written description which must explain in detail the specific areas which are the basis for the appeal. The performance review and/or improvement plan being challenged must also be submitted with the appeal. Any information not submitted at the time the appeal is filed shall not be considered. Appeals are limited to those matters that may be appealed as prescribed in Section 3012-c of the Education Law:
 - (1) The substance of the annual professional performance review;
 - (2) The District's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-c;
 - (2) The adherence to the Commissioner's regulations, as applicable to such reviews;
 - (3) Compliance with any applicable locally negotiated procedures applicable to annual professional performance reviews or improvement plans; and
 - (4) The District's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of a principal's improvement plan under Education Law §3012-c.
- C. A principal may not file more than one appeal on the same APPR or improvement plan. All grounds for an appeal of an APPR or improvement plan must be raised with specificity as a part of the initial submission of the appeal. Any grounds not raised at the time the appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.
- D. The principal initiating the appeal has the burden of demonstrating a clear legal right to the relief requested and the burden of establishing the facts upon which relief is sought.
- E. An appeal must be filed in writing within fifteen (15) calendar days of the presentation of the document (yearly evaluation and/or improvement plan) to the principal or the right to appeal shall be deemed as waived in all regards.
- F. The Superintendent or designee will respond to the appeal with a written response acknowledging the appeal and directing further administrative action. This correspondence will be made within fifteen (15) calendar days of the receipt of the appeal. The response will include all additional documents or written materials relevant to the point (s) of disagreement that support the district's response. Any such information that is not

submitted at the time the response is filed shall not be considered on behalf of the district in the deliberations related to the resolution of the appeal.

G. Appeal Process:

Step One

Administrator will officially appeal to Superintendent.

Appellant and Superintendent to meet to discuss appeal.

Appellant must follow appeal process and present written appeal response.

Step Two

In the event first step does not change rating, appellant will have the right to access the Appeal Panel

Panel*:

- District Office Representative (selected by Superintendent)
- Outside Evaluator* (selected by Superintendent)
- Outside Evaluator* (selected by Appellant)

*A pool of 5 evaluators will be mutually selected in the beginning of the school year from the BOCES list of available outside evaluators.

- H. The Appeal Process shall provide the principal with the opportunity to meet with the panel within 7 business days of the date of the principal's request was received (or such other convenient time as may be determined by the panel) and shall render a final recommendation on the appeal within seven (7) business days after the principal was provided the opportunity to meet with the Panel.
- I. Nothing in this appeals process shall in any way restrict or affect the District's non-reviewable authority to terminate the appointment of or deny tenure to a probationary principal, and any such termination or denial shall not in any way be subject to challenge through the grievance and arbitration provisions of the collective negotiations agreement between the Parties or in any other forum.
- J. A written decision on the merits of the appeal shall be rendered no later than ten (10) calendar days from the close of the hearing. The appeal shall be based on a written record, comprised of the principal's appeal papers and any documentary evidence accompanying the appeal, as well as the school district's response to the appeal and additional documentary evidence submitted with such papers. The decision shall set forth the reasons and factual basis for each determination on each of the specific issues raised in the principal's appeal. If the appeal is sustained, the reviewer may set aside or modify a rating. The decision of the appeal panel is final. A copy of the decision shall be provided to the principal, the Superintendent and all members of the Appeal Panel.
- K. The above appeals procedure shall constitute the exclusive means for initiating, reviewing, and resolving any and all challenges and appeals related to principal's APPR or

Improvement Plan. A principal may not resort to any other grievance or arbitration procedures contained within the collective bargaining agreement or to any administrative or judicial forum for the resolution of challenges and appeals related to the APPR or Improvement Plan.

- L. A challenge or determination under this appeal process shall not be the subject of a grievance, and the arbitration provisions of the Collective Negotiations Agreement shall not apply to any such challenge or determination. The principal retains any defenses he or she may have in the event the APPR or PIP is utilized in a subsequent 3020-a proceeding.
- M. Upon request by either the District or the Association, this appeal process will be annually reviewed to assess its effectiveness. Any changes will be mutually agreed to in writing by both parties.
 - (1) the substance of the annual professional performance review; which shall include the following:
 - (i) in the instance of a teacher or principal rated Ineffective on the Student Performance Category but rated Highly Effective on the Observation/School Visit Category based on an anomaly, as determined locally.
 - (2) the district's adherence to the standards and methodologies required for such reviews, pursuant to Education Law §3012-d and Subpart 30-3 of Commissioner's regulations;
 - (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
 - (4) the school district's issuance and/or implementation of the terms of the teacher or principal improvement plan under Education Law §3012-d and this Subpart.

Appeal procedures shall provide for the timely and expeditious resolution of any appeal. An evaluation that is the subject of an appeal shall not be sought to be offered in evidence or placed in evidence in any proceeding conducted pursuant to Education Law §3020-a and §3020-b or any locally negotiated alternate disciplinary procedure until the appeal process is concluded.

Nothing shall be construed to authorize a teacher or principal to commence the appeal process prior to receipt of his or her rating from the district.

For APPR composite scores and ratings that were received during the 2014-15 school year and thereafter, teachers and principals that meet the criteria below can submit an appeal to the Department using the application available at:
<https://www.engageny.org/resource/appr-3012-d>.

This application, and all corresponding evidence, must be submitted to the Department within 20 days of receipt of an overall APPR rating or within 20 days of the effective date of the amended regulation, whichever is later.¹ For SPGS for the 2014-15 school year, the deadline for submitting an appeal is October 19, 2015.² A copy of this appeal

must be provided to the teacher's/principal's school district or BOCES, who shall have ten days from receipt to submit a reply to the Department.

Eligible applicants include:

1. A teacher or principal who was rated:
 - Ineffective on his/her SPGS in the current year;
 - Highly Effective on his/her Other Measures of Educator Effectiveness Subcomponent OR Observation/School Visit Category in the current year; and
 - Effective or better on his/her SPGS in the previous year.

Task 11.5: Assurance – Evaluators

The district/BOCES 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 elements 1, 2, and 4 below.

Task 11.6: Training of Lead Evaluators, Evaluators, Independent Observers & Certification of Lead Evaluators

The process for training evaluators, including impartial and independent observers and peer observers, and certifying and re-certifying lead evaluators must include:

- 1) the process for training lead evaluators and evaluators, including impartial independent observers and peer observers;
- 2) the process for the certification and re-certification of lead evaluators;
- 3) the process for ensuring inter-rater reliability; and
- 4) the nature (content) and the duration (how many hours, days) of such training.

The District will establish procedures to train and certify lead evaluators. The District will use a combination of the training programs listed below to establish proficiency and certify lead evaluators:

- Direct training contracted from Learning Sciences International on the Marzano Causal Teaching Rubric and Art & Science of Teaching Framework.
- Direct training from Learning Sciences International on Domain 1 Rubrics and Framework for entire teaching and administrative staff.
- Direct training on the iObservation web-based utility for archiving and communicating APPR ratings from Learning Sciences International.
- Summer training from District-level administrators and Erie 1 BOCES on the Art & Science of Teaching Framework, and the Marzano Administrator Evaluation System, including the use of Clarence teaching videos compiled during the 2011-12 school year.

- Continued training on inter-rater reliability during monthly administrative meetings over the course of each school year.
- Training on Marzano Framework at particular faculty meetings held in all school buildings.
- Online training on the Marzano Causal Teaching Rubric and Marzano Administrator Evaluation System provided by Learning Sciences International (8 specific 30-hour online courses, two of which will be available to all staff).
- The following books were purchased for administrators/lead evaluators and used in training sessions and book study sessions that have occurred from the 2012-13 school year through the 2015-16 school year.
 - The Art & Science of Teaching
 - Handbook for the Art and Science of Teaching
 - Designing & Teaching Learning Goals & Objectives
 - Formative Assessment & Standards-Based Grading
 - The Highly Engaged Classroom
 - Teaching & Assessing 21st Century Skills
 - Becoming a Reflective Teacher
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Processing New Information
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Creating and Using Learning Targets and Performance Scales
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Examining Similarities and Differences
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Examining Reasoning
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Organizing for Learning
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Engaging in Cognitively Complex Tasks
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Revising Knowledge
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Recording and Representing Knowledge
 - Marzano Center Essentials for Achieving Rigor: Identifying Critical Content

Inter-rater reliability for all lead evaluators will be facilitated by individual and small group scoring of teacher videos provided by the District, ASCD, Learning Sciences International, and SED. Principals will practice utilizing rubrics associated with the Marzano Causal Teaching Evaluation System to judge videos of lessons. The scores will be calibrated and practice will continue until inter-rater reliability is assured. Inter-rater reliability training has taken place in summer administrative retreats from 2012 until the present and will continue in future summer administrative retreats.

At each August Board of Education meeting, the Board will formally resolve to insure that lead evaluators have been certified and are qualified. The Board of Education will receive a log of all training activities and events that have occurred during the prior school year. The log will

contain a description of the training activities and/or events, the time spent on each training activity, and the training elements from Education Law §30-2.9 that the training activity exemplifies.

Section 30-2.9 of the Rules of the Board of Regents provides that, in order to be certified as lead evaluators, administrators must be trained in the following nine elements:

1. NYS Teaching Standards, and their related elements and performance indicators or ISLLC standards and their related functions;
2. Evidence-based observation techniques grounded in research;
3. Application and use of the student growth percentile model and the value-added growth model;
4. Application and use of approved teacher or principal practice rubric(s) selected by the district or BOCES for use in evaluations, including training on the effective application of such rubrics to observe a teacher's or principal's practice;
5. Application and use of any assessment tools that the school district or BOCES utilizes to evaluate its classroom teachers or building principals, including but not limited to, structured portfolio reviews; student, parent, teacher and/or community surveys; professional growth goals and school improvement goals, etc.;
6. Application and use of any State-approved locally-selected measures of student achievement used by the school district or BOCES to evaluate its teachers or principals;
7. Use of the Statewide Instructional Reporting System;
8. Scoring methodology utilized by the Department and/or the district or BOCES to evaluate a teacher or principal under this Subpart, including how scores are generated for each subcomponent and the composite effectiveness score and application and use of the scoring ranges prescribed by the Commissioner for the four designated rating categories used for the teacher's or principals' overall rating and their subcomponent ratings; and
9. Specific considerations in evaluating teachers and principals of English language learners and students with disabilities.

Task 11.7: Assurances – Principal Evaluation

- Assure that the district/BOCES 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 Annual Professional Performance Review, 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 §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 district or regionally-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.

Task 11.8: Assurance – Assessments

- Assure that, where applicable, if students in Common Core courses are taking both the 2005 Learning Standards and Common Core versions of the Regents Assessment, then the district/BOCES will use the higher of the two scores to determine whether a student has met his/her growth target.
- 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 administration and scoring of those assessments.

Task 11.9: Assurance – Data

- 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 district/BOCES provides an opportunity for every classroom teacher to verify the subjects and/or student rosters assigned to them.
- Assure scores and ratings for all teachers will be reported to NYSED for each category, as well as the overall rating, as per NYSED requirements.
- Assure that enrolled students in accordance with teacher of record policies are included and may not be excluded.
- Assure that procedures for ensuring data accuracy and integrity are being utilized.

Reporting Subcomponent & Composite Scores

The Data Coordinator shall be responsible for reporting to the SED the individual subcomponent scores and the total composite effectiveness score for each covered classroom teacher in the District and shall do so in a format and timeline prescribed by the Commissioner.

Assessment Development, Security & Scoring Procedures

The District's Director of Curriculum or his/her designee is responsible for ensuring that all security requirements set forth in the SED Administrative Manuals are strictly followed for NYS Assessments administered in the District. The established protocols for storage, distribution, and administration of the assessments prohibit the possible dissemination to students before administration of the assessments.

The District's Director of Curriculum or his/her designee is also responsible for organizing scoring procedures in order to ensure that District scorers are trained to score the assessments and that they have no vested interest in the outcome of the assessments they score and to ensure that students have no knowledge of assessment tasks.

Assessments will be developed in accordance with guidance provided by the Commissioner and New York State Education Department.

The Commissioner's Regulations prohibit teachers and principals from distributing any test items to students that will later contribute to the teacher's/principal's annual performance evaluation. As such, the District can release sample items and sample test forms that will help familiarize students with the testing format; however, the District cannot release actual operational test items, including performance tasks and writing prompts, to students ahead of time.

Commissioner's Regulations prohibit teachers and principals from scoring assessments where they have a vested interest in the outcome, even in cases where the teacher is the only one in the District with the specific content expertise. Teachers should not score their own students' assessments, and a principal should not score the assessments that are part of their own evaluations. Teachers and principals may only view students' assessments after the assessment scores have been finalized.

Commissioner's Regulations prohibit teachers and principals from distributing any test items to students that will later contribute to the teacher's/principal's annual performance evaluation. As such, the District can release sample items and sample test forms that will help familiarize students with the testing format; however, the District cannot release actual operational test items, including performance tasks and writing prompts to students, ahead of time.

The District's Director of Curriculum or his/her designee will create security processes for ensuring that any assessments and/or measures used to evaluate teachers and principals are not disseminated to students before administration, and that any assessments or measures, including those used for performance-based or performance task assessments that are used

to establish a baseline for student growth are not disseminated to students before administration, and that teachers and principals do not have a vested interest in the outcome of the assessments they score.

Appendix A: Principal Improvement Plan Form

NAME _____

SCHOOL BUILDING _____

ACADEMIC YEAR _____

Deficient areas that promulgated the “developing or ineffective” performance rating:

Improvement
Goal/Outcome: _____

Action Steps/Activities:

Timeline for completion: _____

Required and Accessible Resources(including responsibility for provision): _____

Date(s) for formative evaluation on progress (lead evaluator and principal initial each date to confirm the meeting):

December _____

March _____

Other if needed _____

Evidence of Goal Achievement:

Assessment Summary: Superintendent or his designee will attach a narrative summary of improvement progress, including verification of the provision of support and resources as outlined above.

Principal Signature: _____

Date: _____

Superintendent Signature: _____

Date: _____

Complete this form for each area identified as needing improvement

Indicator (a)(3) – New York must indicate that the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student

Appendix B: New York State Student Learning Objective Template

<u>All SLOs MUST include the following basic components:</u>	
Population	<i>These are the students assigned to the course section(s) in this SLO - all students who are assigned to the course section(s) must be included in the SLO. (Full class rosters of all students must be provided for all included course sections.)</i>
Learning Content	<i>What is being taught over the instructional period covered? Common Core/National/State standards? Will this goal apply to all standards applicable to a course or just to specific priority standards?</i>
Interval of Instructional Time	<i>What is the instructional period covered (if not a year, rationale for semester/quarter/etc)?</i>
Evidence	<i>What specific assessment(s) will be used to measure this goal? The assessment must align to the learning content of the course.</i>

Baseline	<i>What is the starting level of students' knowledge of the learning content at the beginning of the instructional period?</i>																				
Target(s)	<i>What is the expected outcome (target) of students' level of knowledge of the learning content at the end of the instructional period?</i>																				
HEDI Scoring	<i>How will evaluators determine what range of student performance "meets" the goal (effective) versus "well-below" (ineffective), "below" (developing), and "well-above" (highly effective)?</i>																				
	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
	91-100%	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%
Rationale	<i>Describe the reasoning behind the choices regarding learning content, evidence, and target and how they will be used together to prepare students for future growth and development in subsequent grades/courses, as well as college and career readiness.</i>																				

New York State Teacher and Principal Evaluation
2015-16 and thereafter

Summary of regulations approved by the Board of Regents on June 16, 2015 to implement
Education Law 3012-d

Student Performance Category: Teachers		
	ELA/Math 4-8	All Other Classroom Teachers
Required - State-provided Growth Score on State Assessments¹ <i>100% (At least 50%, locally determined, if an optional student performance measure is selected)</i>	- State-provided teacher growth scores comparing student growth to those with similar past test scores and includes considerations for poverty, ELL, and SWD status² - Policies on Teacher of Record and linked students - See below for teachers whose State-provided growth scores do not cover at least 50% of all students on the teacher's course rosters.	Additional grades/subjects covered by growth scores, as measures become available, based on existing and new State assessments
Required - Growth Using Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)³ <i>100% (At least 50%, locally determined, if an optional student performance measure is selected)</i>	- All teachers who receive a State-provided growth score must also have a back-up SLO set by the Superintendent or his/her designee in case there are not enough students, not enough scores, or other unforeseen data issues that will not allow the Department to generate a growth score. - Where the State-provided growth score covers less than 50% of a teacher's students, SLOs must be developed following the rules and options set forth for "all other classroom teachers."	For subjects associated with a State assessment or Regents exam (or, in the future, with any new State assessments): State/Regents assessment(s) must be used as the evidence for the SLO where they exist. For other grades/subjects where no State assessment or Regents exam currently exists, SLOs based on district-determined assessments from the options below: - State-approved assessment consisting of the following: - State-approved third-party assessment⁴ - State-approved district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment⁵ - School- or BOCES-wide, group, team, or linked results based on State/Regents assessments

¹ All measures must result in a 0-20 HEDI point score following the State's scoring ranges.

² For the 2015-16 school year, State-provided growth scores will be calculated using the existing growth model. Factors may be updated in future school years depending on decisions by the Board of Regents. The Department will consult with stakeholders and technical experts on recommendations for future school years.

³ Student Learning Objectives shall be developed and approved by the Superintendent or his/her designee. All measures must result in a 0-20 HEDI point score following the State's scoring ranges.

⁴ 3rd party assessments that are currently approved for use under Education Law §3012-c may be re-submitted by their providers, in an expedited manner, to be considered for use with SLOs. These assessments must be able to measure one year of expected growth.

⁵ Assessments will be approved by the Department through an RFQ. All assessments that are submitted for use with SLOs must be able to measure one year's expected growth.

Optional - Locally Selected Measures of Student Growth⁶ <i>Up to 50%, locally determined</i>	The same locally selected measures of student growth across all classrooms in the same grade/subject in the district/BOCES must be used in a consistent manner to the extent practicable. Growth measures from these options: • A second State-provided growth score on a State-created or administered test, provided that this is different than the measure used for the required student performance subcomponent: ○ Teacher-specific growth score computed by the State based on the percentage of students who achieve a State-determined level of growth (e.g., the percentage of students whose growth is above the median for similar students); ○ School-wide growth results based on a State-provided school-wide growth score for all students attributable to the school taking the State ELA or math assessment(s) in grades 4-8; ○ School-wide, group, team, or linked growth results using available State-provided growth scores computed in a manner determined locally. • Growth scores based on a State-designed supplemental assessment, calculated using a State-provided or approved growth model.⁷ ○ Such growth score may include teacher-specific growth scores or a school or BOCES-wide, group, team, or linked results where a State-provided or approved growth model is capable of generating such a score.
--	---

Teacher Observation Category	
Menu of State-approved rubrics ⁸ (or State-approved variance to use alternative rubric) to assess performance based on the NYS Teaching Standards	
Requirements and options based on practice rubric: All observations for a teacher for the school year, and across observer types, must use the same approved rubric; provided that districts may locally determine whether to use different rubrics for teachers who teach different grades and/or subjects during the school year.	
Required - Observation by principal or other trained administrator <i>At least 80%, locally determined</i>	• At least one observation by building principal or other trained administrator: ○ Observations may occur live or by live or recorded video, as determined locally. ○ Districts/BOCES may locally determine whether to use more than one observation by principal or other trained administrator. ○ Nothing shall be construed to limit the discretion of management to conduct observations in addition to those required by this section for non-evaluative purposes. ○ At least one of the required observations must be unannounced. ○ The frequency and duration of observations are locally determined.

⁶ All measures must result in a 0-20 HEDI point score following the State's scoring ranges.

⁷ Assessments on this list must be approved by the Department pursuant to an RFQ/RFP. These assessments must have a corresponding growth model that meets the requirements specified in the RFQ/RFP.

⁸ Rubrics approved for use under Education Law §3012-c will be available for use under §3012-d. Additional rubrics may be approved by the Department through an RFQ process.

	• Evaluators may select a limited number of observable rubric subcomponents for focus within a particular observation so long as all <u>observable</u> Teaching Standards/domains of the selected practice rubric (e.g., Domains 2 and 3 of the Danielson’s 2013 Framework for Teaching) are addressed across the total number of observations. ○ New York State Teaching Standards/domains that are part of the rubric but not observable during the classroom observation may be observed during any optional pre-observation conference or post-observation review or other natural conversations between the teacher and evaluator and incorporated into the observation score. ○ Points shall not be allocated based on any artifacts, unless such artifact constitutes evidence of an otherwise observable rubric subcomponent (e.g., a lesson plan viewed during the course of the classroom observation may constitute evidence of professional planning).
Required - Observation by impartial independent trained evaluator <i>At least 10%, locally determined</i>	• At least one observation by impartial independent trained evaluator(s): ○ Observations may occur live or by live or recorded video, as determined locally. ○ Impartial independent trained evaluators are trained and selected by district/BOCES. ○ May be employed within the district, 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. ○ Districts/BOCES may locally determine whether to use more than one observation by impartial independent trained evaluator(s). ○ At least one of the required observations must be unannounced. ○ The frequency and duration of observations are locally determined. • Evaluators may select a limited number of observable rubric subcomponents for focus within a particular observation so long as all <u>observable</u> Teaching Standards/domains of the selected practice rubric (e.g., Domains 2 and 3 of the Danielson’s 2013 Framework for Teaching) are addressed across the total number of observations. ○ New York State Teaching Standards/domains that are part of the rubric but not observable during the classroom observation may be observed during any optional pre-observation conference or post-observation review or other natural conversations between the teacher and evaluator and incorporated into the observation score. ○ Points shall not be allocated based on any artifacts, unless such artifact constitutes evidence of an otherwise observable rubric subcomponent (e.g., a lesson plan viewed during the course of the classroom observation may constitute evidence of professional planning).
Optional – Observation by trained peer teacher <i>Locally determined, consistent with the</i>	• May include at least one observation by trained peer teacher: ○ Trained peer teacher must have been rated Effective or Highly Effective on his or her overall rating in the prior school year. ○ Observations may occur live or by live or recorded video, as determined locally.

If principal has less than 30% of his/her students covered by the State-provided growth score <i>100% (At least 50%, locally determined, if an optional student performance measure is selected)</i>	<i>students, not enough scores, or other unforeseen data issues that will not allow the Department to generate a growth score.</i> Where the State-provided growth score covers less than 30% of a principal's students, SLOs must be developed following the rules and options set forth for "all other building principals."	For other grades/subjects where no State assessment or Regents exam currently exists, SLOs based on district-determined assessments from the options below: - State-approved assessment consisting of the following: - State-approved third-party assessment¹¹ - State-approved district, regional, or BOCES-developed assessment¹² - School- or BOCES-wide, group, team, or linked results based on State/Regents assessments
Optional Subcomponent: Locally Selected Measures of Student Growth¹³ <i>Up to 50%, locally determined</i>	The same locally selected measures of student growth across all buildings with the same grade configuration or program in district/BOCES must be used. Growth measures from these options: - A second State-provided growth score, provided that this is different than the measure used for the required student performance subcomponent: - Principal-specific growth computed by the State based on the percentage of students who achieve a State-determined level of growth (e.g., percentage of students whose growth is above the median for similar students). - School-wide growth results using available State-provided growth scores computed in a manner determined locally. - Growth scores based on a State-designed supplemental assessment, calculated using a State-provided or approved growth model¹⁴	

Teacher and Principal Category and Overall Ratings

Teacher and Principal Performance Scoring Ranges¹⁶: SLOs

Highly Effective	Effective	Developing	Ineffective
18-20 points	15-17 points	13-14 points	0-12 points
90-100% of students meeting or exceeding expected growth targets determined by	75-89% of students meeting or exceeding expected growth targets determined by	60-74% of students meeting or exceeding expected growth targets determined by	0-59% of students meeting or exceeding expected growth targets determined by

the superintendent

the superintendent

the superintendent

the superintendent

- Each performance measure (State-provided growth, SLO using State assessments, other SLOs, State-designed supplemental assessments, other additional measures using State-provided or approved growth model scores) must result in a score between 0-20.
- Multiple measures will be combined using a weighted average to produce an overall Student Performance category score between 0-20.
- This overall Student Performance score will be converted into a HEDI rating based on the ranges listed below:

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

Teacher Observation/Principal School Visit Scoring Ranges:

	Overall Observation/School Visit Category Score and Rating	
	Min	Max
H	3.50 to 3.75	4.0
E	2.50 to 2.75	3.49 to 3.74
D	1.50 to 1.75	2.49 to 2.74
I	0 ¹⁷	1.49 to 1.74

- Each set of observations/school visits (by supervisor/other trained administrator, independent, or peer) will be completed using a rubric with rating categories that are aligned to HEDI ratings and 1-4 levels. Each observation/school visit will be scored between 1 and 4.
- Once all evaluations are complete, the different types of observations/school visits will be combined using a weighted average, producing an overall Observation/School Visit category score between 1-4.
- This overall Observation/School Visit score will be converted into a HEDI rating based on locally determined ratings consistent with the ranges listed above.

What is State-determined:

- Scoring ranges for the Required and Optional subcomponents of the Student Performance to determine an educator's rating category of Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective (HEDI)
- The minimum and maximum scores aligned to each of the HEDI rating categories for the Teacher Observation/Principal School Visit categories.
- Minimum growth targets for SLOs under the Required subcomponent of the Student Performance category representing at least one year of expected student growth and following State guidance.
- The weights for all subcomponents of the Student Performance and Teacher Observation/Principal School Visit categories to assign a final rating category of HEDI.

What is locally-established through negotiations:

- Whether to use the Optional subcomponent of the Student Performance category, and which option will be used.
- Whether to use the Optional subcomponent of the Teacher Observation/Principal School Visit category.
- How to implement the Teacher Observation/Principal School Visit categories, consistent with the corresponding Commissioner's Regulations, including, but not limited to, the scoring ranges aligned to each HEDI category within the parameters determined by the State.

Additional Notes

- The process by which weights and scoring ranges are assigned to subcomponents and categories must be transparent and available to those being rated before the beginning of each school year.
- Districts and collective bargaining units, where one exists, must certify that the process for assigning ratings will use the scoring bands and weighting processes specified in the regulations.
- Superintendents must certify that all individual growth targets used for SLOs represent, at a minimum, one year of expected growth consistent with State guidance.
- All teachers/principals who receive a State-provided growth score, must also have back-up SLOs set by the Superintendent or his/her designee in case there are not enough students, not enough scores, or other unforeseen data issues that will not allow the Department to generate a growth score.
- Annual Professional Performance Reviews conducted pursuant to a collective bargaining agreement entered into on or before April 1, 2015 and which remain in effect on or after April 1, 2015, shall be conducted pursuant to that agreement until a subsequent agreement is reached.
- Pursuant to Education Law §3012-d(6), the following elements may no longer be used in any evaluation subcomponent:
 - 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 or principal effectiveness;
 - Any district or regionally-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 Commissioner's regulations.
- The entire Annual Professional Performance Review shall be completed and provided to the teacher or the principal as soon as practicable but in no case later than September 1 of the school year next following the school year for which the teacher or principal's performance is measured. The teacher's and principal's score and rating on the observation/school visit category and in the optional subcomponent of the student performance category, if available, shall be computed and provided to the teacher or principal, in writing, by 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 next following the school year for which the teacher or principal's performance is measured.