

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

Administrator Name: _____

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.

This instrument recognizes that the role of an Administrator has become more complex in recent years encompassing an increase in observing teachers, formulating feedback, recordkeeping, attending community events, mentoring teachers, intervening with students and families, spending time on personal professional development and leading by example for staff in the building.

Instructions

1. The Administrator and the Superintendent, or his or her designee ("Superintendent"), should meet to discuss and 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. These factors may include an additional component to evaluate the wide range of duties an Administrator may have in a particular school district.

Finally, a determination should be made as to the rubric for scoring the evaluation. Districts have flexibility in designing a rubric to meet specific needs. The authors recommend that any rubric revision be reviewed with the primary author, Gary J. Collins, prior to implementation, to ensure the revision meets statutory requirements.

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, or designee, 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 the Administrator with respect to each Component. Circle the rating chosen (highly effective, effective, minimally effective or ineffective).
 - c. Provide comments in support of the rating. These comments will be helpful during the discussion with the Administrator when the Administrator's overall evaluation rating is determined. The comments may include specific examples of actions or behavior, or feedback from parents, students, or staff.
 - d. To the extent there is information necessary to do so, rate the Administrator on the Student Growth and Assessment portion of the evaluation. Provide comments in support of the ratings.
 - e. Complete the evaluation process as outlined in these documents.

COMPONENT 1: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND LEARNING

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Models ethical behavior and transparency, weaves reflective practice and self-awareness into culture and codes of the school, and models and provides a supportive environment for engaging most educators in the school in ongoing reflective dialogue. ▪ Leads staff to model ethical and respectful behavior leading to shared professional accountability. ▪ Continuously engages in professional learning and monitoring, including seeking mentor feedback and expertise. ▪ Leads activities that contribute to the profession. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Models ethical behavior and transparency, practices reflective practice and self-awareness, and engages some educators in the school in ongoing reflective dialogue. ▪ Expects staff to display professional, ethical, and respectful behavior and takes swift action when inappropriate conduct or practice is reported or observed. ▪ Continually engages in activities to improve professional learning and monitors the extent to which these activities enhance leadership skills. ▪ Participates in activities that contribute to the profession. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fails to model professionalism at all times but understands professional expectations as evidenced by not acting counter to these expectations. ▪ Occasionally holds students and colleagues to professional, ethical, and respectful behavior expectations. ▪ Occasionally reflects on personal practice, sets meaningful goals, and/or researches ways to improve efficiency and practice. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fails to model professionalism at all times, and occasionally models behaviors counter to expectations. ▪ Rarely or never holds students and colleagues to professional, ethical, and respectful behavior expectations. ▪ Does not engage in activities to improve professional practices.

COMPONENT 2: ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develops a budget that loosely aligns with district’s vision, mission, and goals or inconsistently manages expenditures and available resources. ▪ Sees the schools resources as given and is not knowledgeable of possibilities for accessing alternate human and fiscal resources; develops skills in planning and developing a budget that manages school goals. ▪ Some emerging trends and potential problems are sometimes identified and confronted. ▪ Communication skills are inconsistent in some segments of the school population. ▪ Does not always protect student, family, and/or staff confidentiality appropriately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Builds a budget that does not align with the district goals or mismanages available resources. ▪ Unable to accurately assess and/or leverage school and district resources; does not effectively manage budget. ▪ Some emerging trends and potential problems are rarely identified and confronted. ▪ Communication skills are ineffective in some segments of the school population. ▪ Does not adequately protect student, family, and/or staff confidentiality.

COMPONENT 3: SCHOOL PLANNING AND PROGRESS

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leads 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 capacity of individual teachers and teacher teams to engage in continuous improvement processes using multiple sources of relevant data to improve instruction, leadership practices, and student learning. ▪ Develops and implements systems to track and analyze disaggregated formative and summative data and other learning indicators to monitor progress towards student learning goals; implements revised strategies as supported by the data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uses limited data to identify priority areas for improvement and sets some measurable school wide goals; names a few milestones and benchmarks of student progress and develops a school improvement plan that identifies a limited strategy to reach school wide goals. ▪ Inconsistently addresses areas of underperformance and/or may only address concerns to a subset of the staff; inconsistently holds conversations on improving and enhancing student learning results. ▪ Uses limited data to revise curricula and district-wide assessments but does not seek input from educators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does not use data to identify priority areas or goals for improvement; has no way to track progress; does not complete a school improvement plan and/or creates a plan that is not aligned to school priorities for improvement. ▪ Does not address areas of underperformance with staff members; does not hold conversations on improving and enhancing student learning results. ▪ Draws incorrect conclusions from data or educator input when making revisions to curricula or district-wide assessments.

COMPONENT 4: SCHOOL CULTURE

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has expectations for all staff to take an active role in decision making and serve in leadership roles according to their areas of expertise. Effectively coaches others in the process of shared governance. • Develops, advocates, and sustains an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders <i>and</i> 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. • Communicates and collaborates effectively with stakeholders <i>and</i> seeks and effectively engages stakeholders in order to promote the success of all students through productive and frequent communication. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has 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. Coaches others in the process of shared governance. • Develops, advocates, and sustains an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders. • Communicates and collaborates effectively with stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has limited expectations for staff to take a role in decision making and serve in leadership roles according to their areas of expertise. Provides only initial opportunities for staff to have input into decision making and rarely coaches others in the process of shared governance. • Inconsistently promotes the success of all students by developing, advocating, or sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, or safe school climate for all stakeholders. • Inconsistently communicates and/or infrequently collaborates with stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has no expectations for staff to take a role in decision making and serve in leadership roles. • Rarely or never promotes the success of all students by developing, advocating, or sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, or safe school climate for all stakeholders. • Demonstrates inadequate and/or detrimental communication or collaboration with stakeholders.

COMPONENT 5: PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engages stakeholders in developing a vision for high student achievement and college readiness and implements the vision through effective stewardship. ▪ Builds and develops the capacity of the leadership team to conduct frequent, formal and informal observations to collect evidence of teacher practice; tailors teacher observations to the needs of each teacher and to school-wide initiatives; develops interrater reliability with the leadership team by co-observing. ▪ Facilitates continuous, individualized, growth-focused conversations with teachers that provide actionable and timely feedback based on evidence collected from observations and student learning data; facilitates the development plans for staff based on evaluation results; develops and implements a transparent system for allocating coaching and other resources to meet most significant needs. ▪ Implements, monitors and refines a rigorous, consistent evaluation system aligned to district requirements; ensures final evaluation ratings are evidence-driven and incorporate multiple examples of student outcomes and teacher practice; works with the leadership team to incorporate evaluation results into school planning and decisions about staffing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Engages stakeholders in developing a vision for high student achievement and college readiness. ▪ Conducts frequent formal and informal observations to collect evidence of teacher practice; tailors teacher observations based on teacher need. ▪ Provides frequent individualized, actionable and timely feedback based on evidence collected from observations and student learning data; monitors the implementation of individual growth and developmental plans for staff based on evaluation results; ensures that all teachers have some access to coaching and other resources to meet their needs. ▪ Implements a consistent evaluation system aligned to district requirements; incorporates evidence of student outcomes and teacher practice in final evaluation ratings; uses evaluation results to inform staffing decisions. ▪ Performs with integrity and the best interest of all students; monitors staff perceptions, while ensuring communication and action are evidence of such performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develops minimal opportunities for staff and students to learn about a vision of high expectations, including college and career readiness, for all students; gives staff limited input into the development and maintenance of the vision. ▪ Occasionally visits teachers to observe instruction. ▪ Occasionally analyses student performance data to drive instruction and evaluation instructional quality. ▪ Provides inconsistent or ineffective feedback to teachers and/or is not aimed at improving student outcomes. ▪ Generally demonstrates sound judgment reflecting integrity and fairness with occasional lapses in judgment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adopts a vision that lacks focus on student achievement or college readiness. ▪ Rarely or never visits teachers to observe instruction; rarely or never analyses student performance data or lacks ability to derive meaning from analysis of data; rarely or never provides feedback to teachers or consistently provides feedback to teachers that is completely unrelated to student outcomes. ▪ Demonstrates lack of sound judgment reflecting integrity and fairness.

Administrator Name: _____

COMPONENT 5: PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES AND INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

This Component 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.

Component 5 Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective Effective Minimally Effective Ineffective

Comments:

COMPONENT 6: STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT AND ENGAGEMENT

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrates proactive strategies to promote tolerance and address incidents of intolerance to create an environment that supports high achievement levels for all students. ▪ Recruits and utilizes parent and community volunteers as appropriate for the school’s instructional program. ▪ Utilizes technology and other resources as appropriate to maximize the communication with parents and community members about student learning. ▪ Promotes and leads school-community partnerships to support student achievement and school and community priorities. ▪ Collaborates with school and community groups to identify resources and solutions to increase achievement among all students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Regularly practices two-way communications with parents about expectations for student learning needs and progress. ▪ Provides parents and students with relevant information about available school services (instructional, behavioral, and psychological) to address student learning needs. ▪ Regularly/frequently represents the school at community functions and advisory groups. ▪ Uses print and electronic media to inform the community about the school. ▪ Identifies and uses school and community based resources to participate in decision-making and increase achievement among all students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possesses rudimentary understanding of diversity and tolerance. ▪ Asks for feedback to a developed plan, but does not seek input when developing the plan from multiple voices. ▪ Some communication concerning decisions with the school community. ▪ Limited engagement with a few components of the school community. ▪ Utilizes limited communication approaches. ▪ Occasionally responds to contact from parents and community members in a timely and meaningful way. ▪ Has a basic knowledge of community resources and makes minimal efforts to utilize these resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insensitive to diversity or fails to promote tolerance in the school environment. ▪ Rarely or never communicates with families; families and community do not feel welcome; and families are not sure what their children are learning. ▪ Is disrespectful and/or excludes voices from community forums to discuss school performance. ▪ Does not utilize different approaches to communicate or ineffectively utilizes several communication approaches. ▪ Responses to parents and community members are not timely or meaningful. ▪ Has no understanding of the role of community resources that can affect success for students.

Administrator Name: _____

COMPONENT 6: STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT AND ENGAGEMENT

This Component 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.

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 an Administrator's job duties, including the listed statutory components found below. 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.

¹ MCL 380.1249b(1)(d).

Administrator Name: _____

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:

Administrator Name: _____

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:

Administrator Name: _____

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 60% of the performance evaluation tool rating and 40% of the student growth and assessment rating. Follow the steps 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 6.0 = _____
Student Growth and Assessment			x 4.0 = _____
	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

Administrator Name: _____

FINAL OVERALL EVALUATION RATING

Overall Evaluation Rating (Circle One):

Highly Effective Effective Minimally Effective Ineffective

Superintendent's Comments:

Evaluator Printed Name

Date: _____

Evaluators Signature

Administrator Printed Name

Date: _____

Administrator Signature

Updated: May 1, 2019
4851-4458-3827, v. 3

PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

***Only required if Administrator received final rating of Minimally Effective or Ineffective.**

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 | 5) Professional Qualities and Instructional Leadership |
| 2) Organizational Management | 6) Stakeholder Support and Engagement |
| 3) School Planning and Progress | 7) Statutory Factors (Optional) |
| 4) School Culture | 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) _____