

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

POSTING AND ASSURANCES

Per MCL 380.1249b: Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, a school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy shall post on its public website the following information about the evaluation tool(s) in use for evaluation of teachers and administrators:

- *Research base for the evaluation framework, instrument, and process;*
- *Identity and qualifications of the author;*
- *Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy;*
- *Evaluation framework and rubric;*
- *Description of processes for conducting observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings and developing performance improvement plans;*
- *Description of the plan for providing evaluators and observers with training.*

This evaluation tool has been approved by the District. The contents of this document are compliant with the law laid forth, specifically pertaining to the Administrator Evaluation.

Printed Name of Superintendent

Signature of Superintendent

Date of Adoption in District

RESEARCH BASE FOR THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, INSTRUMENT, AND PROCESS

[Section 1249b(2)(a)]

The Administrator Evaluation is derived from the following research bases:

- NAESP/NASSP, *Rethinking Principal Evaluation: A New Paradigm Informed by Research and Practice* (2012);
- Elliot, S.N., Clifford, M., (2014) *Principal Assessment: Leadership Behaviors Known to Influence Schools and the Learning of All Students* (Document No. LS-5);
- Wahlstrom, Kyla; Seashore, Karen; Leithwood, Kenneth, Anderson, Stephen (2010). *Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning: Final Report of Research Findings*. The Wallace Foundation;
- Ball, Deborah Loewenberg (2013). *Final Recommendations*. Michigan Counsel for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE);
- *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. (2015) National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

- Clifford, Matthew Ph.D., Hansen, Ulcca Joshni Ph.D., J.D., Wraight, Sara J.D. (2012). *A Practical Guide to Designing Comprehensive Principal Evaluation System*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Tobin, James. (2014). *Management and Leadership Issues for School Building Leaders*. National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.
- Collins, Gary J. & Blaha, William J. (2016). *Michigan Teacher and Administrator Evaluations*. Collins and Blaha, P.C.

The foundation of the Administrator Evaluation is the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, formally known as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. The Professional Standards “communicate expectations . . . about the work, qualities and values of effective educational leaders.” The National Policy Board for Educational Administration, which publishes the Professional Standards, stated in 2015:

The 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape. It involved a thorough review of empirical research . . . and sought the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups to identify gaps among the 2008 Standards, the day-to-day work of education leaders, and leadership demands of the future. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and American Association of School Administrators (AASA) were instrumental to this work.

The Administrator Evaluation is also the result of reviewing administrator evaluation systems in all 50 states, with particular focus on the following evaluation tools:

- Principal Evaluation Process, An Arizona Model for Measuring Educator Effectiveness, Arizona Department of Education in collaboration with the Arizona School Administrators Association (2014-2015);
- Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol KEEP, Kansas State Department of Education (June 14, 2011);
- Kentucky Principal Performance Standards, Kentucky Department of Education;
- RISE Evaluation and Development System, Indiana Department of Education (August 1, 2012);
- Summative Rating Matrix, Illinois Association of School Administrators (July 14, 2012);
- Leader Evaluation and Professional Growth, Maine Schools for Excellence (May, 2016);
- Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation, Massachusetts Department of Elementary & Secondary Education (January, 2012);
- Minnesota Principal Development and Evaluation Rubric, Minnesota Department of Education (August 20, 2016);
- New Hampshire Principal Evaluation Frameworks, New Hampshire Department of Education (April, 2012);
- Ohio Principal Evaluation System, Ohio Department of Education (November 17, 2015);
- Oregon Educational Leader/Administrator Rubric, Oregon Department of Education (January, 2013);

- Utah Educational Leadership Standards, Utah State Office of Education (August, 2013);
- Wisconsin Framework for Principal Leadership, State of Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (2012).

IDENTIFICATION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE AUTHOR(S)

[Section 1249b(2)(b)]

The Administrator Evaluation is the result of Collins & Blaha, P.C.'s range of experience in the field of education law, input from various districts in Michigan and the careful selection of elements from multiple state-approved evaluation tools. Educators and experts in several southeastern Michigan school districts provided input for the tool as well.

Authors

- Gary J. Collins, Esq., Collins & Blaha, P.C. (Primary Author) in collaboration with the attorneys of Collins & Blaha, P.C.

Construct Validity Consultants

- Karl D. Paulson, Superintendent, Lakeview Public Schools; and
- Barbara VanSweden, Superintendent, Fitzgerald Public Schools.

EVIDENCE OF RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND EFFICACY

[Section 1249b(2)(c)]

Reliability: The Administrator Evaluation has the following plan for developing evidence of reliability, as permitted by MCL 380.1249b(2)(c). The Administrator Evaluation will use test-retest reliability to measure the degree to which the tool produces stable and consistent results. A sample of school districts will administer the evaluation at two different points in time. The ratings given by a Superintendent, or his or her designee, will be compared to evaluate the assessment for reliability.

Validity: A test is valid if it measures what it is supposed to measure. Thus a performance evaluation tool is valid if it is actually measuring performance. Construct validity is a continuous process of evaluation, reevaluation, refinement, and development.

Construct Validity Consultants

- Karl D. Paulson, Superintendent, Lakeview Public Schools; and
- Barbara VanSweden, Superintendent, Fitzgerald Public Schools.

Efficacy: The Administrator Evaluation reflects a growth and development model. Administrators are measured, among other improvement activities, on how well they engage in activities to improve professional practice, develop the capacity of individual teachers to engage in continuous improvement processes, develop a culture of collaboration, and engage stakeholders in the promotion of the school's mission, vision and improvement goals.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND RUBRIC

[Section 1249b(2)(d)]

The Administrator Evaluation Form is attached as Appendix A to this document.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS FOR CONDUCTING CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS, COLLECTING EVIDENCE, CONDUCTING EVALUATION CONFERENCES, DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE RATINGS, AND DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS

[Section 1249b(2)(e)]

The Superintendent, or his or her designee, should meet to discuss and agree upon student growth and assessment goals, and to determine which, if any, additional factors will be considered in evaluating the Administrator on his or her year-end evaluation.

The Administrator should collect throughout the year, and present to the Superintendent, or his or her designee, through periodic updates, evidence and artifacts of his or her demonstrated achievement in each of the performance areas. Additional information on evidence gathering is provided during training.

Under the Administrator Evaluation tool the following ratings must be assigned:

- Highly Effective;
- Effective;
- Minimally Effective; and
- Ineffective.

When the Superintendent, or his or her designee, is prepared to evaluate the Administrator, a copy of the Administrator Evaluation packet should be provided to the Administrator. The Superintendent, or designee, should read the introduction and performance indicators which are intended to provide objective examples of the characteristics and/or actions an effective Administrator would exhibit with respect to each Component. The Superintendent or designee shall determine a rating for the Administrator with respect to each Component, including the Student Growth and Achievement Component of the evaluation. In determining the proper performance evaluation ratings, the Superintendent or designee should provide specific examples of actions or behavior, general thoughts or impressions, or feedback from parents, students, or staff, if available. The Superintendent or designee should follow the evaluation's instructions in determining an overall performance rating for the administrator. The instructions are included in Appendix A.

For those areas in which improvement may be needed, the Superintendent, or his or her designee, should develop a Performance Improvement Plan using the format and guidance provided in Appendix B.

DESCRIPTION OF PLAN FOR PROVIDING EVALUATORS AND OBSERVERS WITH TRAINING

[Section 1249b(2)(f)]

The Administrator Evaluation authors are available to conduct live training. This training will include the purpose of the tool and how it should be used to conduct an evaluation of the Administrator. Formal training will include:

- The evaluation process;
- Evidence gathering;
- Review of the six components of the tool;
- Determination of the Administrator's Student Growth and Assessment Rating; and
- Calculation of the Final Score.

The Administrator Evaluation also provides step-by-step instructions for the Superintendent, or his or her designee, using the tool to evaluate its Administrator. The Administrator Evaluation tool then provides a process to reach a final evaluation rating.

4828-0362-1459, v. 2