

## Van Dyke Public Schools 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 the 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 Administrator 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.*

Piper Bogner, Superintendent

Date of Adoption in District: November 2017

---

### RESEARCH BASE FOR THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, INSTRUMENT, AND PROCESS

The Administrator Evaluation is derived from the following research bases:

- DiPaola, M.F. (2010). *Evaluating the Superintendent (White Paper)*. American Association of School Administrators.
- Leo, S.F. & Lachlan-Haché, L. (2012). *Creating Summative Educator Effectiveness Scores: Approaches to Combining Measures*. American Institutes for Research.
- *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. (2015) National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- Sanders, N.M. & Kearney, K.M. (Eds.) (2008). *Performance Expectations and Indicators for Education Leaders, an ISLLC-Based Guide to Implementing Leader Standards and a Companion Guide to the Educational Leadership Policy Standards*. (2008). Council of Chief State School Officers; State Consortium on Education Leadership.
- 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:

- Model Superintendents Evaluation, New York State Council of School Superintendents (November 2014);

- An Arizona Model for Measuring Educator Effectiveness, Arizona Department of Education in collaboration with the Arizona School Administrators Association (2014-2015);
  - Superintendent Evaluation, Connecticut Association of Boards of Education and Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (June 2016);
  - Superintendent Evaluation, Massachusetts Association of School Committees (September 2012); and Superintendent Evaluation, Oregon School Boards Association (June 2014).
- 

### **IDENTIFICATION AND QUALIFICATION OF THE AUTHOR(S)**

The Administrators 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:

- Dr. Christine Johns, Superintendent, Utica Community Schools;
  - Karl D. Paulson, Superintendent, Lakeview Public Schools; and
  - Barbara VanSweden, Superintendent, Fitzgerald Public Schools.
- 

### **EVIDENT OF RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND EFFICACY**

**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/designee to an administrator 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:

- Dr. Christine Johns, Superintendent, Utica Community Schools;
- Karl D. Paulson, Superintendent, Lakeview Public Schools; and
- Barbara VanSweden, Superintendent, Fitzgerald Public Schools.

**Efficacy:** The Administrator Evaluation was developed to address the needs of local school districts and intermediate school districts while complying with the requirements of Michigan law. The Administrator Evaluation reflects a true governance model, encouraging evaluators to provide input, discuss the administrator's performance, and reach a consensus. While a numerical approach reduces the administrator's evaluation to a tallying or averaging of the scores, a consensus-based approach, like this Administrator Evaluation, results in a rating that reflects a unified decision (when applicable).

---

### **EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND RUBRIC**

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**

The evaluator and administrator 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 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 scored:

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

When the evaluator is prepared to evaluate the administrator, a copy of the Administrator Evaluation packet should be given to the administrator. The administrator 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 evaluator should facilitate a discussion to reach a consensus with respect to a performance rating for each Component, including the Student Growth and Assessment Component of the evaluation. In determining the proper performance evaluation ratings, the evaluators should provide specific examples of actions or behavior, as well as general thoughts or impressions and feedback from parents, students, and/or staff, if available. The evaluator 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 evaluator and administrator 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**

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 Superintendent's Student Growth and Assessment Rating; and
- Calculation of the Final Score.

The Administrator Evaluation also provides step-by-step instructions for a evaluators using the tool to evaluate administrators. The tool instructs the evaluators to reach a consensus with respect to each Component. The Administrator Evaluation tool then provides a process to reach a final evaluation rating.