Do the educator evaluation parameters need to be changed as they no longer provide actional information to better support your educators and students?

If so, depending on the changes you wish to make, a material change or a variance plan may be the right next steps for your LEA. See <u>Question IB</u>, below, for further information.

### Q&A

Yes. For the 2022-23 school year, LEAs are required to fully implement their <u>currently approved educator</u> evaluation plans.

If you have an educator evaluation plan that was approved before April 12, 2019, Education Law §3012-d, as amended, requires your LEA to submit a new plan to the Department once you enter into a successor collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Therefore, if your LEA has entered into a successor CBA any time after April 12, 2019, or if your LEA agreed to keep your plan the same, you are required to submit your new agreement to the Department for review and approval by the Commissioner. Please email <u>EducatorEval@nysed.gov</u> to request access to the new streamlined educator evaluation form.

A material change for an educator evaluation plan is required when making any changes to an approved plan that fall within the requirements of Education Law §3012-d and the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(e.g., a change in assessment for an SLO in the Student Performance category, a different approved rubric for the Teacher Observation/Principal School Visit category, etc.).

A variance may be used for the provisions of Education Law §3012-d that delegate responsibility to the Commissioner to establish the standards and procedures (e.g., a measure of student growth for teachers in the Student Performance category that does not rely on the results of a summative assessment, etc.) but where an LEA wishes to employ processes, procedures or methods beyond the parameters defined in the regulations while still complying with the requirements of Education Law §3012-d.

Both a material change and a variance are subject to collective bargaining to the extent required by Article 14 of the Qvil Service Law.

If an LEA is unsure if the proposed revision for their educator evaluation plan requires a material change or a variance, they should reach out to their educator evaluation team contact at the Office of Educator Quality and Professional Development, or send an email to EducatorEval@nysed.gov.

Variance applications must be approved by the Department by December 1 of a school year to be implemented in that school year. Absent a finding by the Commissioner of extraordinary circumstances, a variance application approved after December 1 of a school year will not be implemented until the following school year. The Department advises LEAs to submit variance applications as soon as possible to ensure that all stakeholders know, as early in the school year as possible, how they will be evaluated.

The deadline to submit material changes for a school year is March 1 of that year. Any changes submitted

- Are the assessments that are selected for the summative measure in the SLO the most accurate available in capturing student growth for the school year?
  - Do these sources provide actionable information relative to the knowledge and skills students will need to be successful in the current course?
  - Does the analysis of baseline data provide insight into the type of instructional
  - strategies and areas of support needed to ensure the success of each student?
- What SLO target setting model<sup>1</sup> will be used?
  - considering their varied starting levels?
  - Are the targets rigorous yet attainable?
  - Do your local processes allow for target adjustments during the school year when new student data becomes available?

If using an Input Model for Principals<sup>2</sup>:

- In determining the specific actions a principal will take to impact student growth for this coming school year, has the LEA taken into consideration pandemic-related challenges?
- How will principals work collaboratively with teachers to help ensure student growth goals are met?
- Define what success should look like, including benchmarks along the continuum. How will you know if principals are successful at impacting student growth?

## STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES (SLOS)

# Baseline data is not limited to prior year test scores. The Department has always recommended that multiple sources of evidence be used to establish the most informative baseline. Those sources of evidence should include the best information ss at the start of a course/grade level to help inform accurate target setting. Often, this information will be a n end of year summative

assessment) and/or information collected during the first marking period of the course.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See <u>SLO Guidance</u> for more information on different target setting models.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Input Models for teachers are possible through an educator evaluation variance.

The Department encourages educators who are included in a collectively attributed measure to think about how their instruction and work in the classroom is related to the growth targets included in the SLO and to include this information in the rationale section of their own SLO.

## INPUT MODEL FOR PRINCIPALS

In an input model, effectiveness is measured by the actions educators take to improve student performance and to achieve set goals. In the case of the principal input model for the Required Student Performance category, principals are evaluated based on evidence of principal practice related to the Leadership Standards that impacts student growth whereas the principal school visit category of an evaluation involves all observable elements of principal practice related to the Leadership Standards, including and beyond those elements related to student growth.

The input model provides LEAs the opportunity to reimagine the Student Performance category for principals in such a way that centers the evaluative process around professional goal setting and attainment, recognizes and supports the varying roles, responsibilities, authority or autonomy principals have in their buildings, and can better existing strategic goals of an LEA.

However, an LEA may locally determine that they will use those areas specific of their principal practice rubric that are related specifically to student growth as evidence for their input model, through

- Are there changes to protocols, processes, rubric priority areas, or feedback loops that need to be addressed? If so, after local consultation, this might be achieved without necessitating a change to the currently approved educator evaluation plan.
- Do the number/ frequency/type of observation/school visit, scoring of the practice rubric, or the practice rubric itself need to be amended to better align with LEA vision? If so, please see <u>Question IIIB</u>.

TEACHER OBSERVATIONS/ PRINCIPAL SCHOOL VISITS

If an LEA has health and safety concerns related to COVID-19 and independent evaluators, they may apply for a Rural or Single Building or an Undue Burden Independent Evaluator Hardship Waiver (IEHW)00912 0 612 792 reW\*hBT,

How will these systems of evaluation provide differentiated feedback and support for