

East Windsor Public Schools
70 South Main Street — East Windsor, CT 06088

-

**Administrator Evaluation and
Professional Development Plan**

Revised August 2014

Table of Contents

Purpose and Rationale.....	3
Overview of the Evaluation Process.....	4
The Evaluation Cycle.....	5
Leadership Practice Related Indicators.....	11
Student Outcomes Related Indicators.....	17
Summative Evaluation Rating	21
Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring	30
Dispute Resolution	25

East Windsor Public Schools

Administrator Evaluation and Development Plan

Purpose and Rationale

This section of the East Windsor Administrator Evaluation and Development Plan outlines the model for the evaluation of school and school district administrators in East Windsor. A robust administrator evaluation system is a powerful means to develop a shared understanding of leader effectiveness. The administrator evaluation and support model defines administrator effectiveness in terms of (1) administrator practice (the actions taken by administrators that have been shown to impact key aspects of school life); (2) the results that come from this leadership (teacher effectiveness and student achievement); and (3) the perceptions of the administrator's leadership among key stakeholders in his/her community.

The model describes four levels of performance for administrators and focuses on the practices and outcomes of *Proficient* administrators.

These administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 Student Learning Objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers are proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

The model includes an exemplary performance level for those who exceed these characteristics, but exemplary ratings are reserved for those who could serve as a model for leaders across their district or even statewide. A proficient rating represents fully satisfactory performance, and it is the rigorous standard expected of most experienced administrators.

As noted, the model applies to all administrators holding an 092 endorsement. Because of the fundamental role that principals play in building strong schools for communities and students, and because their leadership has a significant impact on outcomes for students, the descriptions and examples focus on principals. However, where there are design differences for assistant principals and central office administrators, the differences are noted.

Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning

Student success depends on effective teaching, learning and leadership. The CSDE vision for professional learning is that each and every Connecticut educator engages in continuous learning every day to increase professional effectiveness, resulting in positive outcomes for all students. For Connecticut's students to graduate college and career ready, educators must engage in strategically planned, well supported, standards-based, continuous professional learning focused on improving student outcomes.

Throughout the process of implementing administrator evaluation, in mutual agreement with their evaluators all administrators will identify professional learning needs that support their goal and objectives. The identified needs will serve as the foundation for ongoing conversations about their practice and impact on student outcomes. The professional learning opportunities identified for each administrator should be based on the individual strengths and needs that are identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common need among administrators, which can then be targeted with school-wide or district-wide professional learning opportunities.

Career Development and Growth

Rewarding exemplary performance identified through the evaluation process with opportunities for career development and professional growth is a critical step in both building confidence in the evaluation and support system itself and in building the capacity and skills of all educators.

Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to: mentoring early-career administrators; leading Professional Learning Communities; differentiated career pathways; and focused professional learning based on goals for continuous growth and development.

Overview of the Evaluation Process

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures of administrator performance.

All administrators will be evaluated in four components, grouped into two major categories: Leadership Practice and Student Outcomes.

1. **Leadership Practice Related Indicators:** An evaluation of the core leadership practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This category is comprised of two components:

a) **Observation of Leadership Performance and Practice (40%)** as defined in the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

b) **Stakeholder Feedback (10%)** on leadership practice through surveys.

2. **Student Outcomes Related Indicators:** An evaluation of an administrator's contribution to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This category is comprised of two components:

a) **Student Learning (45%)** assessed in equal weight by: (a) progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures.

b) **Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)** as determined by an aggregation of teachers' success with respect to Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

Scores from each of the four components will be combined to produce a summative performance rating as defined below:

- **Exemplary** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- **Proficient** – Meeting indicators of performance
- **Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- **Below Standard** – Not meeting indicators of performance

The Evaluation Cycle and Timeline

All administrators will confer with their supervisors a minimum of three times per year to:

1. Identify goals
2. Monitor growth and revise goals as appropriate
3. Assess the level of goal achievement

These conferences will occur within the following timelines:

- By the end of November: goal setting
- By the end of February: review of data, revision of goals
- By the end of school: summative review and ratings

1. **By the end of November**

Administrators will review this document with their evaluator to ensure all parties are oriented to the evaluation and development process.

To begin the process of developing SLOs and survey targets, the administrator needs four things to be in place:

1. Student learning data are available for review by the administrator
2. Stakeholder survey data are available for review by the administrator.
3. The superintendent has communicated his/her student learning priorities for the year.
4. The administrator has developed a school improvement plan that includes student learning goals.

The following must be documented on the Administrator Evaluation and Support Plan (Form 1).

1. Administrators identify three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and one survey target.



2. They also determine two areas of focus for their practice that will help them accomplish their SLOs and survey targets, choosing from among the elements of the Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

While administrators are rated on all portions of the six Performance Expectations agreed upon, administrators are not expected to focus on improving their practice in all areas in a given year. Rather, they should identify two specific focus areas of growth to facilitate professional conversation about their leadership practice with their evaluator. It is likely that at least one and perhaps both, of the practice focus areas will be in instructional leadership, given its central role in driving student achievement.

3. In the fall, the administrator completes a self-assessment, rating their performance on all 18 elements of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

For each element, the administrator determines whether he/she:

- Needs to grow and improve practice on this element;
- Has some strengths on this element but needs to continue to grow and improve;

- Is consistently effective on this element; or
- Can empower others to be effective on this element.

The administrator should also review his/her focus areas and determine if he/she considers him/herself on track or not.

If the administrator completed a self-assessment in the spring of the previous year, that self –assessment will be used in lieu of a fall self-assessment. All administrators will complete a new self-assessment if they change positions within the administrative unit with a focus on their strengths and needs given new expectations.

4. The administrator and the evaluator meet to discuss and agree on the selected, mutually agreed upon out- come goals and practice focus areas. The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional learning needs to support the administrator in accomplishing his/her goals.
5. The focus areas, goals, activities, outcomes and time line will be reviewed by the administrator’s evaluator prior to beginning work on the goals. The evaluator may suggest additional goals as appropriate.

Observations

The evaluator must conduct a minimum of three observations, which may include school site visits or reviews of practice.

Administrators new to the district, the profession, who change administrative positions or have previously received a rating of *developing* or *below standard* will receive a minimum of four observations, which may include school site visits ore reviews of practice.

A pre-observation conference should occur prior to each on-site observation. Evaluators must provide timely, written feedback after each visit. (Form 2)

The school site visits must span the school year to provide a better picture of the administrator’s growth and performance over time. Periodic, purposeful school visits offer critical opportunities for evaluators to observe, collect evidence and analyze the work of school leaders. It is recommended that evaluators plan visits carefully to maximize the opportunity to gather evidence relevant to an administrator’s practice focus areas.

This model relies on the professional judgment of the administrator and evaluator to determine appropriate sources of evidence and ways to collect mutually agreed upon

evidence.

The following are examples of types of evidence which may be helpful in the evaluation and development process but is not an exhaustive list:

- Data systems and reports for student information
- Artifacts of data analysis and plans for response
- Observations of teacher team meetings
- Observations of administrative/leadership team meetings
- Observations of classrooms where the administrator is present
- Communications to parents and community
- Conversations with staff
- Conversations with students
- Conversations with families
- Presentations at Board of Education meetings, community resource centers, parent groups etc.

2. By the end of February – midyear review

Midway through the school year (especially at a point when interim student assessment data are available for review) is an ideal time for a formal check-in to review progress. In preparation for meeting:

- The administrator analyzes available student achievement data and considers progress toward outcome goals.
- The evaluator reviews observation and feedback forms to identify key themes for discussion.

The administrator and evaluator hold a Mid-Year Formative Conference, with explicit discussion of progress toward student learning targets, as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice. The meeting is also an opportunity to surface any changes in the context (e.g., a large influx of new students) that could influence accomplishment of outcome goals; goals may be changed at this point. **Mid-Year Conference Discussion Prompts** are available on the SEED website.

3. By the end of the school year - Summative Review and Rating

The administrator and evaluator meet in the late spring to discuss the administrator's self-assessment and all evidence collected over the course of the year. While a formal rating follows this meeting, it is recommended that evaluators use the meeting as an opportunity to convey strengths, growth areas and their probable rating. After the meeting, the evaluator assigns a rating based on all available evidence.

The written summative review and final rating should be completed within two weeks of the final summative meeting, whenever possible.

Should standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly impacted by standardized test data or teacher effectiveness ratings, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator's summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than September 15. This adjustment should take place as much before the start of the new school year as possible so that prior year results can inform goal setting in the new school year.

Initial ratings are based on all available data and are made in the spring so that they can be used for any employment decisions as needed. Since some components may not be completed at this point, here are rules of thumb to use in arriving at a rating:

- If stakeholder survey results are not yet available, then the observation of practice rating should count for 50% of the preliminary rating.
- If the teacher effectiveness outcomes ratings are not yet available, then the student learning measures should count for 50% of the preliminary rating.
- If the state accountability measures are not yet available, then the Student Learning Objectives should count for the full assessment of student learning. For the 2014-2015 academic year, an administrator's SLOs will be utilized in lieu of state assessment data per flexibilities.
- If none of the summative student learning indicators can yet be assessed, then the evaluator should examine the most recent interim assessment data to assess progress and arrive at an assessment of the administrator's performance on this component.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators are required to complete training on the evaluation and support model.

Evaluators will participate in training with a consultant including observation of video and in-person instruction and calibrate observations with other evaluators and the consultant.

Improvement and Remediation Plans

If an administrator's performance is rated as *developing* or *below standard*, it signals the need for focused support and development. The district will develop a system to support administrators not meeting the proficiency standard. Plans will be developed in consultation with the administrator and his/her exclusive bargaining representative, when applicable, and be differentiated by the level of identified need and/or stage of development.

Leadership Practice Related Indicators

The Leadership Practice Related Indicators evaluate the administrator's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in leadership practice. It is comprised of two components:

- Observation of Leadership Practice, which counts for 40 %; and
- Stakeholder Feedback, which counts for 10 %.

Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice (40 %)

An assessment of an administrator's leadership practice – by direct observation of practice and the collection of other evidence – is 40 % of an administrator's summative rating.

Leadership practice is described in the Common Core of Leading (CCL) Connecticut School Leadership Standards and defines effective administrative practice through six performance expectations. These expectations will be weighted in the following manner for all administrators covered under this evaluation:

- 1. Vision, Mission and Goals:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission and high expectations for student performance
- 2. Teaching and Learning:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning
- 3. Organizational Systems and Safety:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment
- 4. Families and Stakeholders:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders to respond to diverse community interests and needs and to mobilize community resources
- 5. Ethics and Integrity:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by being ethical and acting with integrity
- 6. The Education System:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students and advocate for their students, faculty and staff needs by influencing systems of political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts affecting education

All six of these performance expectations contribute to successful schools, but

research shows that some have a bigger impact than others. In particular, improving teaching and learning is at the core of what effective educational leaders do. As such, **Performance Expectation 2 (Teaching and Learning)** comprises half (20%) of the leadership practice rating and the other five performance expectations are weighted in accordance with the responsibilities and expectations as defined by the East Windsor Public Schools.

In order to arrive at these ratings, administrators are measured against the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric which describes leadership actions across four performance levels for each of the six performance expectations and associated elements. The four performance levels are:

- **Exemplary:** The Exemplary Level focuses on the concepts of developing capacity for action and leadership beyond the individual leader. Collaboration and involvement from a wide range of staff, students and stakeholders is prioritized as appropriate in distinguishing Exemplary performance from Proficient performance.
- **Proficient:** The rubric is anchored at the Proficient Level using the indicator language from the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The specific indicator language is highlighted in bold at the Proficient level.
- **Developing:** The Developing Level focuses on leaders with a general knowledge of leadership practices but most of those practices do not necessarily lead to positive results.
- **Below Standard:** The Below Standard Level focuses on a limited understanding of leadership practices and general inaction on the part of the leader.

Two key concepts, indicated by bullets, are often included as indicators. Each concept demonstrates a continuum of performance across the row, from *below standard* to *exemplary*.

Examples of Evidence are provided for each element of the rubric. While these Examples of Evidence can be a guide for evaluator training and discussion, they are only examples and should not be used as a checklist. As evaluators learn and use the rubric, they should review these Examples of Evidence and generate additional examples from their own experience that could also serve as evidence of Proficient practice.

Strategies for Using the Evaluation Rubric

Helping administrators get better: The rubric is designed to be developmental in use. It contains a detailed continuum of performance for every indicator within the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards in order to serve as a guide and

resource for school leaders and evaluators to talk about practice, identify specific areas for growth and development, and have language to use in describing what improved practice would be.

Making judgments about administrator practice: In some cases, evaluators may find that a leader demonstrates one level of performance for one concept and a different level of performance for a second concept within a row. In those cases, the evaluator will use judgment to decide on the level of performance for that particular indicator.

Assigning ratings for each performance expectation: Administrators and evaluators will not be required to complete this rubric at the Indicator level for any self-assessment or evaluation process. Evaluators and administrators will review performance and complete evaluation detail at the Performance Expectation level and may discuss performance at the Element level, using the detailed Indicator rows as supporting information as needed. As part of the evaluation process, evaluators and school leaders should identify a few specific areas for ongoing support and growth.

Assessing the practice of administrators other than principals: All indicators of the evaluation rubric may not apply to assistant principals or central office administrators. Districts may generate ratings using evidence collected from applicable indicators in the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

The Director of Special Education will not be required to utilize the new evaluation and support model for the 2014 – 2015 school year. The Director and Superintendent will utilize a mutually agreed upon format for evaluation. The Director will utilize the new evaluation and support model, pending further guidance, in the 2015-2016 academic year.

Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating

Summative ratings are based on the evidence for each performance expectation in the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric. Evaluators collect written evidence about and observe the administrator’s leadership practice across the six performance expectations described in the rubric. Specific attention is paid to leadership performance areas identified as needing development.

This is accomplished through completion of required observations defined within this evaluation document; discussion and feedback and the MidYear Formative Conference; completion of the Self-Assessment by the administrator; and review of all evidence collected across the course of the academic year.

Following the conference, the evaluator uses the preponderance of evidence to assign a summative rating of *exemplary*, *proficient*, *developing* or *below standard* for each performance expectation. Then the evaluator assigns a total practice rating based on the criteria in the chart below and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

Principals, Assistant Principals, and Central Office Administrators:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
<i>Exemplary</i> on Teaching and Learning +	At least <i>Proficient</i> on Teaching and Learning +	At least <i>Developing</i> on Teaching and Learning +	<i>Below Standard</i> on Teaching and Learning or

Exemplary on at least 2 other performance expectations
+

No rating below *Proficient* on any performance expectation

At least *Proficient* on the majority of the performance expectations
+
No rating below *Developing* on any performance expectation

At least *Developing* on the majority of performance expectations

Below Standard on the majority of performance expectations

Component #2: Stakeholder Feedback (10[%])

Feedback from stakeholders – assessed by administration of a survey with measures that align to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards – is 10[%] of an administrator's summative rating.

The East Windsor Public Schools will utilize a Parent Survey regarding school climate, administered annually to all grade levels except incoming kindergarten and preschool parents, who will receive the survey in both the fall and spring of their children's incoming year to provide comparative data. This same survey will be utilized for Educator Evaluation and for the purposes of informing the Safe School Climate work district-wide. Administrators and their evaluators will review the survey at the start of the year to determine which portions of the survey best align to the CCT Leadership Standards and will be used for the evaluation.

Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating

Ratings should reflect the degree to which an administrator makes growth on feedback measures, using data from the prior year and/or beginning of the year (for preschool and kindergarten) as a baseline for setting a growth target.

Exceptions to this include:

- Administrators with high ratings already, in which case, the rating should reflect the degree to which measures remain high.
- Administrators new to the role, in which case, the rating should be based on a reasonable target, using district averages or averages of schools in similar situations.

This is accomplished in the following steps, undertaken by the administrator being evaluated and reviewed by the evaluator:

1. Select appropriate survey measures aligned to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
2. Review baseline data on selected measures
3. Set 1 target for growth or performance on selected measures
4. After administration of the survey, review data and determine if the administrator met the established goal

5. Assign a rating, using this scale:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Substantially exceeded target	Met target	Made substantial progress but did not meet target	Made little or no progress against target

Establishing what results in having “substantially exceeded” the target or what constitutes “substantial progress” is left to the discretion of the evaluator and the administrator being evaluated in the context of the target being set. However, more than half of the rating of an administrator on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement over time.

The Student Outcomes Related Indicators capture the administrator’s impact on student learning and comprise half of the final rating.

Student Outcomes Related Indicators

Student Outcomes Related Indicators includes two components:

- Student Learning, which counts for 45[%]; and
- Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes, which counts for 5[%].

Component #3: Student Learning (45[%])

Student learning is assessed in equal weight by: (a) performance and progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures. Each of these measures will have a weight of 22.5[%] and together they will account for 45[%] of the administrator's evaluation.

***PLEASE NOTE:** SPI calculations will not be available for the 2014-15 school year due to the transition from state legacy tests to the Smarter Balanced Assessment. Therefore, 45[%] of an administrator's rating for Student Learning will be based on student growth and performance on locally determined measures.*

Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives)

Administrators establish three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) on measures they select. In selecting measures, certain parameters apply:

- All measures must align to Common Core State Standards and Connecticut Content Standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.
- At least one of the measures must focus on student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments.
- For administrators in high school, one measure must include the cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate, as defined in the State's approved application for flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All

protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings for cohort graduation rate and extended graduation rate shall apply to the use of graduation data for principal evaluation.

- For administrators assigned to a school in “review” or “turnaround” status, indicators will align with the performance targets set in the school’s mandated improvement plan

	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3
Elementary or Middle School	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion	
High School Principal	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects)	Broad discretion	
Elementary or Middle School AP	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
High School AP	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
Central Office Administrator	(meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement) Indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students or subject area most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.		

Beyond these parameters, administrators have broad discretion in selecting indicators, including, but not limited to:

- Student performance or growth on state-administered assessments and/or district-ad- opted assessments not included in the state accountability measures (e.g., commercial content area assessments, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations).
- Students’ progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/

or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation.

- Students’ performance or growth on school-or classroom-developed assessments in subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments.

The process for selecting measures and creating SLOs should strike a balance between alignment to district student learning priorities and a focus on the most significant school-level student learning needs.

- First, the district establishes student learning priorities for a given school year based on available data..
- The administrator uses available data to craft an improvement plan for the school/ area..
- The administrator chooses student learning priorities for her/his own evaluation that are (a) aligned to district priorities (unless the school is already doing well against those priorities) and (b) aligned with the school improvement plan.
- The administrator chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable SLOs for the chosen assessments/indicators
- The administrator shares the SLOs with her/his evaluator, informing a conversation designed to ensure that:
 - The objectives are adequately ambitious.
 - There is adequate data that can be collected to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established objectives.
 - The objectives are based on a review of student characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics) relevant to the assessment of the administrator against the objective.
 - The professional resources are appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.
- The administrator and evaluator collect interim data on the SLOs to inform a mid-year conversation and summative data to inform summative ratings.

Based on this process, administrators receive a rating for this portion, as follows

Exemplary	Proficient	Developin	Below Standard
-----------	------------	-----------	----------------

Met all 3 objectives and substantially exceeded at least 2 targets	Met 2 objectives and made at least substantial progress on the 3rd	Met 1 objective and made substantial progress on at least 1 other	Met 0 objectives OR Met 1 objective and did not make substantial progress on either of the other 2
--	--	---	--

This rating shall serve as the Student Learning Summative Rating during 2014-2015. In following years, state assessment data and locally determined measures will be combined for a summative rating.



Component #4: Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)

Teacher effectiveness outcomes – as measured by an aggregation of teachers’ student learning objectives (SLOs) – make up 5% of an administrator’s evaluation.

Improving teacher effectiveness outcomes is central to an administrator’s role in driving improved student learning. That is why, in addition to measuring the actions that administrators take to increase teacher effectiveness the administrator evaluation and support model also assesses the outcomes of all of that work.

Teachers’ accomplishment of their SLOs is the basis for assessing administrators’ contribution to teacher effectiveness outcomes.

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
> 80% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives	> 60% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives	> 40% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives	< 40% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives

- Central Office Administrators will be responsible for the teachers under their assigned role.
- All other administrators will be responsible for the teachers they directly evaluate.

Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating

Summative Scoring

Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings:

3. **Exemplary:** Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
4. **Proficient:** Meeting indicators of performance
5. **Developing:** Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
6. **Below standard:** Not meeting indicators of performance

Proficient represents fully satisfactory performance. It is the rigorous standard expected for most experienced administrators. Specifically, proficient administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting and making progress on 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 student learning objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

Exemplary ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds proficiency and could serve as a model for leaders district-wide or even statewide. Few administrators are expected to demonstrate exemplary performance on more than a small number of practice elements.

A rating of *developing* means that performance is meeting proficiency in some components but not others. Improvement is necessary and expected and two

consecutive years at the developing level is, for an experienced administrator, a cause for concern. On the other hand, for administrators in their first year, performance rating of *developing* is expected. If, by the end of three years, performance is still rated *developing*, there is cause for concern.

A rating of *below standard* indicates performance that is below proficient on all components or unacceptably low on one or more components.

Determining Summative Ratings

The rating will be determined using the following steps:

1. Determining a Leader Practice Rating;
2. Determining an Student Outcomes Rating; and
3. Combining the two into an overall rating using the Summative Matrix.

Each step is illustrated below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{A. PRACTICE: Leadership Practice (40\%)} \\
 & \text{B. + Stakeholder Feedback (10\%)} = 50\%
 \end{aligned}$$

The practice rating derives from an administrator’s performance on the six performance expectations of the Common Core of Leading Evaluation Rubric (CCL) and the one stakeholder feedback target. The observation of administrator performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and stakeholder feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Summary Score
Observation of Leadership	2	40	80
Stakeholder Feedback	3	10	30

TOTAL LEADER PRACTICE-RELATED 110

Leader Practice-Related Points	Leader Practice-Related Rating
50-80	Below Standard

50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developin
127-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplar

C. **OUTCOMES: Student Learning (45%)**
+ Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) = 50%

The outcomes rating is derived from student learning – student performance and progress on student learning objectives – and teacher effectiveness outcomes. As shown in the **Summative Rating Form**, state reports provide an assessment rating and evaluators record a rating for the student learning objectives agreed to in the beginning of the year. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table page 82.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Student Learning (SLOs)	3	45	135
Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	2	5	10
TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES-RELATED			14

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developin

127-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplar

D. OVERALL: Leader Practice + Student Outcomes

The overall rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below. Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes-Related Indicators and Leader Practice-Related Indicators, follow the respective column and row to the center of the matrix. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the Leader Practice-Related rating is developing and the Student Outcomes-Related rating is proficient. The summative rating is therefore proficient.

If the two major categories are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of *exemplary* for Leader Practice and a rating of *below standard* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

		Overall Leader Practice Rating			
		4	3	2	1
Overall Student Outcomes Rating	4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	<i>Gather further information</i>
	3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing
	2	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
	1	<i>Gather further information</i>	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

Adjustment of Summative Rating:

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by June 30 of a given school year. Should standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a summative rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly affected by standardized test data, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator’s final summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating not later than September 15. These adjustments should inform goal setting in the new school year.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system. A pattern may consist of a pattern of one rating. The state model recommends the following patterns:

Novice administrators shall generally be deemed effective if said administrator receives at least two sequential proficient ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice administrator’s career. A *below standard* rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice administrator’s career, assuming a pattern of growth of developing in year two and two sequential proficient ratings in years three and four.

An experienced administrator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said administrator receives at least two sequential *developing* ratings or one *below*

standard rating at any time.

Dispute-Resolution Process

In the event of any disagreement, the evaluator has the authority and responsibility to finalize the goals, supports and sources of evidence to be used.

In cases where the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan, the issue in dispute may be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the administrative professional development and evaluation committee (APDEC) at the request of the administrator. The superintendent and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district will each select one representative from the APDEC to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party, as mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and the collective bargaining unit. In the event that the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the superintendent whose decision shall be binding.