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.

Christine M. Johns
Printed Name of Superintendent

Signature of Superintendent

2/12/18
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

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM

Introduction

The Michigan Revised School Code requires the Boards of School Districts and Intermediate School Districts to ensure that its Administrators are evaluated annually. This Administrator Performance Evaluation System evaluates an Administrator's performance across six Components: (1) Professional Growth and Learning; (2) Organizational Management; (3) School Planning and Progress; (4) School Culture; (5) Professional Qualities and Instructional Leadership; and (6) Stakeholder Support and Engagement. There is an optional seventh component discussed further below.

These Components reflect the expectations that an effective Administrator is one who positively affects student achievement, retains and develops effective teachers, and maintains a positive school culture and climate.

Instructions

1. The Administrator and the Superintendent, or his or her designee ("Superintendent"), should meet to discuss to determine which, if any, additional factors, including goals, will be considered by the Superintendent in evaluating the Administrator on his or her year-end evaluation.

2. When the Superintendent is prepared to evaluate the Administrator, a copy of the Administrator Evaluation packet should be provided to the Administrator. The Superintendent should follow these instructions:

    a. For each Component in the Performance Evaluation Tool, read the introduction and performance indicators. These indicators are intended to provide objective examples of the characteristics and/or actions an effective Administrator would exhibit with respect to this Component.

    b. Determine a rating for your Administrator with respect to each Component. Circle the rating you have chosen (highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective).

    c. Provide comments in support of your rating. These comments will be helpful during your discussion with the Administrator when the Administrator's overall evaluation rating is determined. The comments may include specific examples of actions or behavior, general thoughts or impressions, or feedback from parents, students, or staff.

    d. To the extent you have the information necessary to do so, rate the Administrator on the Student Growth and Assessment portion of the evaluation. Provide comments in support of your ratings.

    e. Complete the evaluation process as outlined in these documents.

COMPONENT 1: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND LEARNING

This domain focuses on measuring an Administrator's growth and the degree to which he or she has followed through on a professional growth and learning plan to improve his or her own practice. The Administrator is recognized as the leader of the school who continually improves his or her practice.

Performance Indicators:
Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.

This Component evaluates whether the Administrator:

1.1 Values and is committed to continuous professional growth and development.
1.2 Values and is committed to lifelong learning.
1.3 Engages in activities to improve his or her professional practice and monitors the extent to which these activities enhance personal leadership skills and the staff's confidence about his or her ability to lead.
1.4 Demonstrates self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior.

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
▪ Consistently models positive professional and ethical behavior. ▪ Empowers staff to model ethical and respectful behavior leading to shared professional accountability. ▪ Regularly and accurately reflects on personal professional practice and pursues ongoing professional growth activities. ▪ Consistently applies current educational research to practice and monitors impact. ▪ Leads activities that contribute to the profession.	▪ Consistently models positive professional and ethical behavior. ▪ Expects staff to display professional, ethical, and respectful behavior and takes swift action when inappropriate conduct or practice is reported or observed. ▪ Regularly and accurately reflects on personal professional practice and pursues professional growth activities. ▪ Consistently applies current educational research to practice and monitors impact. ▪ Participates in activities that contribute to the profession.	▪ Occasionally models positive professional and ethical behavior. ▪ Expects staff to display professional, ethical, and respectful behavior, but inconsistently holds them accountable for doing so. ▪ Occasionally reflects on personal professional practice. ▪ Inconsistently applies current educational research to inform practice.	▪ Does not model professionalism or ethical behavior. ▪ Rarely holds staff to professional, ethical, and respectful behavioral expectations. ▪ Does not reflect on personal professional practice. ▪ Rarely applies current educational research to inform practice.

Component 1 Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

COMPONENT 2: ORGANZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

This domain measures the Administrator's ability to ensure that management of the organization, operations and resources results in a safe, efficient, effective and positive learning environment.

Performance Indicators:
Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.

This Component evaluates whether the Administrator:

2.1 Operates within budget and fiscal guidelines directed effectively towards teaching and learning.
2.2 Leverages resources to achieve mission, vision and goals.
2.3 Ensures proper maintenance of facility.
2.4 Maintains accurate records and maintains confidentiality.

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
▪ Enables stakeholder groups to understand the importance of abiding by monetary guidelines and increases their knowledge of ways to effectively direct resources toward teaching and learning. ▪ Teaches stakeholder groups ways to use funding to simultaneously meet student needs and district, state and federal fiscal mandates. ▪ Seeks additional resources to further vision, mission and goals and models new ways to manage existing resources. ▪ Recognizes both present and future facility needs and communicates with appropriate district personnel in a timely manner to resolve concerns. ▪ Develops a system for maintaining records, anticipates problems, adheres to all timelines when submitting reports, uses technology to maintain accurate records; maintains confidentiality.	▪ Adheres to monetary guidelines and effectively directs resources toward teaching and learning. ▪ Allocates funds based on student needs within the framework of district, state and federal fiscal mandates. ▪ Aligns and uses resources to achieve vision, mission and goals. ▪ Recognizes and communicates facility needs and communicates with appropriate district personnel to resolve concerns. ▪ Submits reports in an efficient, timely and succinct manner; maintains confidentiality.	▪ Understands monetary guidelines and develops capability of directing resources toward teaching and learning. ▪ Lacks understanding of ways to meet district, state and federal fiscal mandates while allocating funds to meet student needs. ▪ Explores ways to use resources to achieve vision, mission and goals. ▪ Recognizes needs and communication at building level. ▪ Returns reports with minimal information and maintains confidentiality.	▪ Has little understanding of monetary guidelines and/or fails to direct resources toward teaching and learning. ▪ Does not allocate funds appropriately. ▪ Does not relate use of resources with mission, vision and goals. ▪ Fails to recognize and communicate facility needs. ▪ Has no system for maintain accurate records or submits records late, or does not maintain confidentiality.

Component 2 Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

COMPONENT 3: SCHOOL PLANNING AND PROGRESS

This domain focuses on the Administrator's ability to manage school planning processes for achieving school goals and ensuring quality implementation of the programs and services identified with increasing student success. It includes developing, implementing, and monitoring school goals.

Performance Indicators:
Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.

This Component evaluates whether the Administrator:

3.1 Collects and uses data to identify school improvement goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promotes organizational learning.
3.2 Monitors and evaluates progress and revised school goals.
3.3 Ensures and monitors the implementation of a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program.
3.4 Develops the instructional and leadership capacity of staff.

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
▪ Inspires adults and students in the school and community to adopt and enact the vision; builds the capacity of staff to implement effective instructional strategies to achieve the vision; ensures all decisions are aligned to and support the vision. ▪ Builds the capacity of staff to collaboratively and continuously analyze summative and interim learning outcomes for identified student groups, predictive indicators, and school practices; builds the capacity of staff to diagnose the current state of the school, set school priorities and goals, and establish grade level targets using disaggregated data. ▪ Supports staff ownership of and accountability for monitoring progress toward student learning goals; builds the capacity of staff to use disaggregated formative data and other leading indicators to monitor, track, and review progress, systematically adjusting strategies where needed.	▪ Supports adults and students in the school and community in taking ownership of the vision; works with the leadership team to implement effective instructional strategies to achieve the vision; makes decisions aligned to and in support of the vision. ▪ Develops and implements a strategic plan that identifies weekly and monthly milestones and describes strategies for implementing rigorous classroom content and effective instructional practices to support students in achieving the learning targets; examines school practices on the basis of practical evidence and research and identifies misalignments between school and district priorities. ▪ Develops and implements systems to track and analyze disaggregated formative and summative data and other leasing indicators to monitor progress towards student learning goals; implements revised strategies as supported by the data.	▪ Broadly communicates the vision to adults and students in the school community; identifies instructional strategies that may align to the vision; may consider the vision when making decisions. ▪ Drafts a strategic plan that identifies monthly milestones and some strategies for effective instruction to support students in working toward learning targets; references evidence from research and practice in judgments about the effectiveness of school practices, may miss some misalignments between school and district priorities. ▪ Periodically reviews data but shows limited ability to adjust strategies and practices in order to reach goals.	▪ Makes limited attempts to implement the vision; makes decisions without considering alignment with the vision. ▪ Rarely shares school priorities or baseline student learning goals with staff; rarely formalizes strategies or plans to reach school priorities or goals; does not use evidence from research or practice to inform judgments about the effective ness of school practices; misses opportunities to align strategies. ▪ Monitors annual student data but does not relate it to progress toward student learning or use it to inform adjustment to classroom strategies.

Component 3 Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

COMPONENT 4: SCHOOL CULTURE

This domain focuses on the Administrator's ability to develop and maintain a positive school culture that includes not only the tone of a school but also school safety, enthusiasm of students and faculty, and level of connectedness with the community. Leaders strongly influence student learning by creating and sustaining a school culture that sets high expectations and enables teachers and students to learn and work collaboratively.

Performance Indicators:
Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.

This Component evaluates whether the Administrator:

4.1 Expects staff to take an active role in decision making and serving in leadership roles according to their areas of expertise.

4.2 Incorporates knowledge of the social, cultural, leadership, and political dynamics of the school community to cultivate a positive academic learning environment.

4.3 Uses shared decision-making and collaboration to build relationships with all stakeholders and maintain positive school morale.

4.4 Promotes a culture of collaboration, trust and shared leadership.

4.5 Plans for and solicits staff, parent, and stakeholder input to promote effective decision-making and communication when appropriate.

4.6 Maintains visibility and accessibility to students, parents, staff, and other stakeholders.

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
• The evidence indicates that the Administrator had expectations for all staff to take an active role in decision making and serve in leadership roles according to their areas of expertise. Leaders effectively coached others in the process of shared governance. • The Administrator fosters the success of all students by developing, advocating, and sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders *and* the Administrator seeks out new opportunities or substantially improves existing programs to create an environment where students and stakeholders thrive and the rigor of academic expectations has significantly increased as evident through results. • The Administrator fosters the success of all students by communicating and collaborating effectively	• The evidence indicates that the Administrator had expectations for staff to take a role in decision making and serve in leadership roles according to their areas of expertise, but may have had uneven results. Administrators coached others in the process of shared governance. • The Administrator fosters the success of all students by developing, advocating, and sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders. • The Administrator fosters the success of all students by communicating and collaborating effectively with stakeholders.	• The evidence indicates that the Administrator had limited expectations for staff to take a role in decision making and serve in leadership roles according to their areas of expertise. Administrators provided only initial opportunities for staff to have input into decision making and rarely coach others in the process of shared governance. • The Administrator inconsistently promotes the success of all students by developing, advocating, or sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, or safe school climate for all stakeholders. • The Administrator inconsistently communicates and/or infrequently collaborates with stakeholders.	• The evidence indicates that the Administrator had minimal expectations for staff to take a role in decision making and serve in leadership roles. • The Administrator rarely promotes the success of all students by developing, advocating, or sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, or safe school climate for all stakeholders. • The Administrator demonstrates inadequate and/or detrimental communication or collaboration with stakeholders.

with stakeholders *and* the Administrator seeks and effectively engages stakeholders in order to promote the success of all students through productive and frequent communication.			

Component 4 Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

COMPONENT 5: PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

This domain measures an Administrator's leadership knowledge, skills, and behavior competencies as seen in their daily practice. Administrator's professional qualities and practices include the ability to lead instruction, build support for organization mission and vision, and behave in a professional manner.

Performance Indicators:
Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.

This Component evaluates whether the Administrator:

5.1 Promotes the success of every student by facilitating the articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning.

5.2 Increases teacher and staff effectiveness through quality observations, actionable feedback, coaching and evaluation.

5.3 Supports teachers in implementing quality, effective classroom instructional strategies to meet diverse student learning needs, increase intellectual challenge and drive increases in student achievement.

5.4 Promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
▪ Engages stakeholders in developing a vision for high student achievement and college readiness and implements the vision through effective stewardship. ▪ Conducts a formal, annual evaluation of all faculty and staff and provides written, actionable feedback; ensures teacher evaluation processes are updated regularly to ensure the results are consistent with student achievement data; develops highly effective action plans based on all available data to improve teacher performance. ▪ Builds capacity of the staff to effectively implement instructional strategies and pedagogical methods that improve student outcomes and support content mastery. ▪ Performs with integrity and best interest of all students; actively seeks performance feedback to inform decisions, or improve how he or she performs is perceived.	▪ Engages stakeholders in developing a vision for high student achievement and college readiness. ▪ Evaluates a majority of faculty and staff annually, ensures teacher evaluation data regarding pedagogical strengths and weaknesses are collected from multiple sources, and provides clear feedback on performance; monitors the extent to which teacher evaluations are consistent with student achievement data. ▪ Supports staff in implementing instructional strategies and pedagogical methods that improve student outcomes and support content mastery; monitors and evaluates the impact of the instructional program. ▪ Performs with integrity and the best interest of all students; monitors staff perceptions, while ensuring communication and action are evidence of such performance.	▪ Develops a vision for high student achievement and college readiness with limited opportunity for staff and student input. ▪ Evaluates less than half of all faculty and staff annually; attempts to ensure teacher evaluation data regarding pedagogical strengths and weaknesses are collect from multiple sources but does not complete the task and does not provide clear feedback on performance. ▪ Provides staff with limited support in the use of instructional strategies that support student learning; limited implementation. ▪ Performs with integrity and the best interests of the students but does so sporadically and inconsistently.	▪ Adopts a vision that lacks focus on student achievement or college readiness. ▪ Does not conduct annual evaluations of faculty and staff; does not ensure teacher evaluation data regarding pedagogical strengths and weaknesses are collected from multiple sources and does not provide clear feedback on performance.

Component 5 Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

COMPONENT 6: STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT AND ENGAGEMENT

This domain focuses on the Administrator's ability to build strong community relationships with stakeholders within and outside the school. This includes the ability to collaborate and partner with stakeholders and to identify and mobilize community resources for the good of the school program. Community stakeholders become valued participants in the school.

Performance Indicators:
Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.

This Component evaluates whether the Administrator:

6.1 Promotes understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources.
6.2 Builds and sustains positive relationships with family and caregivers.
6.3 Builds and sustains productive relationships with community partners.
6.4 Uses community resources to improve student learning.

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
▪ Administrator uses proactive strategies to promote tolerance and address incidents of intolerance to create an environment that supports high achievement levels for all students. ▪ Administrator actively recruits and utilizes parent and community volunteers as appropriate for the school's instructional program. ▪ Administrator uses technology and other resources as appropriate to maximize the communication with parents and community members about student learning. ▪ Administrator arranges school-community partnerships to support student achievement and school and community priorities. ▪ Administrator collaborates with school and community groups to identify resources and solutions to increase achievement among all students.	▪ Administrator models appreciation and respect for the cultures of the school and community to create an environment that supports high achievement for all students and uses strategies to remedy instances of intolerance of individuals and groups. ▪ Administrator regularly practices two-way communications with parents about expectations for student learning needs and progress. ▪ Administrator provides parents and students with relevant information about available school services (instructional, behavioral, and psychological) to address student learning needs. ▪ Administrator regularly represents the school at community functions and advisory groups. ▪ Administrator uses print and electronic media to inform the community about the school. ▪ Administrator identifies and uses school and community based resources to participate in decision-making and	▪ Administrator has implemented policies to ensure tolerance and to support diversity. ▪ Administrator communicates with parents about expectations for student learning. ▪ Administrator seeks opportunities for school and community to provide input regarding decision-making. ▪ Administrator attends community functions. ▪ Administrator uses print and electronic media to inform the community about the school.	▪ Administrator reacts to instances of intolerance, but does not proactively institute policies to ensure tolerance and support diversity. ▪ Administrator rarely or never communicates with families; families and community do not feel welcome; and families are not sure what their children are learning. ▪ Administrator does not show evidence that family and community input are used in decision-making. ▪ Administrator demonstrates a pattern of missed opportunities for productive engagement with parents and community members.

	increase achievement among all students.		

Component 6 Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

COMPONENT 7: STATUTORY FACTORS (OPTIONAL)

It is the intent of the evaluation tool to cover all major components of a Administrator's job duties, including the below-listed statutory components. However, each School District varies and it is impossible to anticipate the unique characteristics in each district. This Component gives the Administrator and Superintendent the opportunity to jointly agree upon other factors to be considered in the Administrator's evaluation. These factors could include:

(i) If the school administrator conducts teacher performance evaluations, the school administrator's proficiency in using the evaluation tool for teachers used by the school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy under section 1249. If the school administrator designates another person to conduct teacher performance evaluations, the evaluation of the school administrator on this factor shall be based on the designee's proficiency in using the evaluation tool for teachers used by the school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy under section 1249, with the designee's performance to be counted as if it were the school administrator personally conducting the teacher performance evaluations.

(ii) The progress made by the school or school district in meeting the goals set forth in the school's school improvement plan or the school district's school improvement plans.

(iii) Pupil attendance in the school or school district.

(iv) Student, parent, and teacher feedback, as available, and other information considered pertinent by the Superintendent or other school administrator conducting the performance evaluation.[1]

(v) Goal Achievement: Goals should be specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and timely.

Goal 1 -					
	Highly Effective	**Effective**	**Minimally Effective**	**Ineffective**	**Rating**

Goal 2 -					
	Highly Effective	**Effective**	**Minimally Effective**	**Ineffective**	**Rating**

Goal 3 -					
	Highly Effective	**Effective**	**Minimally Effective**	**Ineffective**	**Rating**

Goal 4 -					
	Highly Effective	**Effective**	**Minimally Effective**	**Ineffective**	**Rating**

Overall Rating for Component 7 (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

[1] MCL 380.1249b(1)(d).

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION TOOL
OVERALL RATING

1. Transfer your ratings from the Components to this page.

Component 1: Professional Growth and Learning

Highly Effective | Effective | Minimally Effective | Ineffective

Component 2: Organizational Management

Highly Effective | Effective | Minimally Effective | Ineffective

Component 3: School Planning and Progress

Highly Effective | Effective | Minimally Effective | Ineffective

Component 4: School Culture

Highly Effective | Effective | Minimally Effective | Ineffective

Component 5: Professional Qualities and Instructional Leadership

Highly Effective | Effective | Minimally Effective | Ineffective

Component 6: Stakeholder Support and Engagement

Highly Effective | Effective | Minimally Effective | Ineffective

Component 7: Statutory Factors (Optional)

Highly Effective | Effective | Minimally Effective | Ineffective

2. Determine an overall rating on the evaluation tool component.

Overall Rating on the Performance Evaluation Tool (Circle One):

Highly Effective | **Effective** | **Minimally Effective** | **Ineffective**

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

STUDENT GROWTH AND ASSESSMENT DATA

Pursuant to Michigan's Revised School Code, during the 2017-2018 school years, 25% of an Administrator's annual evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data. Beginning with the 2018-2019 school year 40% of an Administrator's annual evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data. The Revised School Code provides that the "student growth and assessment data to be used for the school administrator annual evaluation are the aggregate student growth and assessment data that are used in teacher annual year-end evaluations in each school in which the school administrator works as an administrator or for central-office-level school administrator, for the entire school district or intermediate school district."[2]

During the 2016-2017 school year, a teacher's student growth and assessment data must be based on multiple measures, which may include student learning objectives, achievement of individualized education program ("IEP") goals, national or local-assessments, research-based growth measures, or alternative assessments. Often, teachers and administrators agree at the beginning of the school year to the student growth and/or achievement goals by which the teacher will be rated.

Student Growth and Assessment Rating for Teachers:

The aggregate student growth and assessment data that are used in teacher annual year-end evaluations for the Administrator's school(s) found the school(s)' teachers achieved the following average student growth and assessment rating (circle one):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Student Growth and Assessment Rating for Administrator:

The Administrator's student growth and assessment rating is consistent with the teachers rating and is therefore: (circle one):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Comments:

[2] MCL 380.1249b(1)(b).

DEVELOPING A FINAL RATING

1. The Administrator's overall evaluation rating is based on two categories:

   a. The Administrator's rating by the Superintendent on the performance evaluation tool; and

   b. The Administrator's rating on student growth and assessment.

2. Circle the rating determined by the Superintendent for each of these categories:

Performance Evaluation Tool:

Highly Effective Effective Minimally Effective Ineffective

Student Growth and Assessment:

Highly Effective Effective Minimally Effective Ineffective

3. The Administrator's overall evaluation rating is calculated by first converting the performance evaluation tool and student growth and assessment ratings into numerical values. Each rating has the following numerical values:

Rating	Numerical Score
Highly Effective	4
Effective	3
Minimally Effective	2
Ineffective	1

4. The Administrator's overall evaluation rating is comprised of 75% of the performance evaluation tool rating and 25% of the student growth and assessment rating. Follow the steps to below to determine your Administrator's final rating:

	Rating (highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective)	**Numerical Score** (4, 3, 2, or 1 - see table above)	
Performance Evaluation Tool			x 7.5 = _____
Student Growth and Assessment			x 2.5 = _____
			Sum of above two numbers: _____

Find your sum in the range below to determine the Administrator's overall evaluation rating.

40-35	34-25	24-15	14-10
Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective

FINAL OVERALL EVALUATION RATING

Overall Evaluation Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective **Effective** **Minimally Effective** **Ineffective**

Superintendent's Comments:

4824-0890-4513, v. 6

PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

***Only required if Administrator received final rating of <u>Minimally Effective</u> or <u>Ineffective</u>.**

If the Administrator receives a final rating of minimally effective or ineffective, the Superintendent, or his or her designee, must develop and require the Administrator to implement a Performance Improvement Plan to correct the deficiencies. The improvement plan must "recommend professional development opportunities and other actions designed to improve the rating of the [Administrator] on his or her next annual evaluation." MCL 380.1249b(1)(h).

1. To develop a Performance Improvement Plan, we suggest the Superintendent, or his or her designee, first look at the specific components in which the Administrator received ineffective or minimally effective ratings.

Below, circle the components in which the Administrator was rated ineffective or minimally effective:

1) Professional Growth and Learning
2) Organizational Management
3) School Planning and Progress
4) School Culture
5) Professional Qualities and Instructional Leadership
6) Stakeholder Support and Engagement
7) Statutory Factors (Optional)
8) Student Growth and Assessment

2. Develop goals for the Administrator, focusing on those components in which the Administrator received ratings of ineffective or minimally effective. It may be helpful to refer to the characteristics of a highly effective Administrator when developing goals.

Performance Improvement Goals:

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____
4) _____
5) _____
6) _____

3. The law requires the Performance Improvement Plan to recommend professional development opportunities and other actions to improve the rating of the Administrator on his or her next annual evaluation. We recommend the Superintendent, or his or her designee, work in collaboration with the Administrator to determine appropriate professional development opportunities or other actions that should be taken.

Recommended Professional Development Opportunities and Other Actions:

1) _____
2) _____
3) _____
4) _____
5) _____
6) _____