



Evaluation Instruments: Research Base, Authors and Training Plans Thornapple Kellogg School District

Introduction

Thornapple Kellogg School District believes in the responsibility and importance of growing the skill sets and abilities of its certified staff to their fullest potential for our students benefit. This document is designed to demonstrate to our parents, students, and community one way we seek to achieve that goal through our evaluation process. The three evaluation instruments will be used in our evaluation process:

Michigan Association of School Boards: Superintendent Evaluation

School Advance: Administrator Evaluation

5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning: Teacher Evaluation

For each of these three instruments, we will describe and/or provide access to the following:

- a. The research base that supports the framework, instrument, and process
- b. Identity the authors and provide the qualifications of the authors
- c. Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy
- d. The evaluation frameworks and rubrics
- e. A description of our process for conducting observations, collecting evidence, conducting evaluation conferences, developing performance ratings, and developing performance improvement plans
- f. The training plan for evaluators and observers

Michigan Association of School Boards Superintendent Evaluation

(Information below can be found at MASB.org)

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. Reston, VA: Author.

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 (see the Bibliography for a selection of supporting sources) 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, National Association of Secondary School Principals and American Association of School Administrators were instrumental to this work. The public was also invited to comment on two drafts of the Standards, which contributed to the final product. The National Policy Board for Education Administration, a consortium of professional organizations committed to advancing school leadership (including those named above), has assumed leadership of the 2015 Standards in recognition of their significance to the profession and will be their steward going forward.

Midcontinent Research for Education and Learning (2006). *School District Leadership That Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement*. Denver, CO: Author.

To determine the influence of district superintendents on student achievement and the characteristics of effective superintendents, McREL, a Denver-based education research organization, conducted a meta-analysis of research—a sophisticated research technique that combines data from separate studies into a single sample of research—on the influence of school district leaders on student performance. This study is the latest in a series of meta-analyses that McREL has conducted over the past several years to determine the characteristics of effective schools, leaders and teachers. This most recent meta-analysis examines findings from 27 studies conducted since 1970 that used rigorous, quantitative methods to study the influence of school district leaders on student achievement. Altogether, these studies involved 2,817 districts and the achievement scores of 3.4 million students, resulting in what McREL researchers believe to be the largest-ever quantitative examination of research on superintendents.

Authors

The Michigan Association of School Boards has served boards of education since its inception in 1949. In the decades since, MASB has worked hands-on with tens of thousands of school board members and superintendents throughout the state. Evaluation of the superintendent has been a key aspect of that work – MASB developed superintendent evaluation instruments and trained board members in their use nearly half a century before the requirements.

MASB staff and faculty involved in creating the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument include:

- Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), East China
- Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
- Donna Oser, CAE, Director of Executive Search and Leadership Development, MASB
- Debbie Stair, MNML, former school board member, Board Development Manager, MASB

New York Council of School Superintendents staff and leadership involved in creating the Council's Superintendent Model Evaluation (which significantly influenced MASB's instrument):

- Jacinda H. Conboy, Esq., New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Sharon L. Contreras, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools, Syracuse City SD
- Chad C. Groff, Superintendent of Schools
- Robert J. Reidy, Executive Director, New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Maria C. Rice, Superintendent of Schools, New Paltz CSD
- Dawn A. Santiago-Marullo, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools, Victor CSD
- Randall W. Squier, CAS, Superintendent of Schools, Coxsackie-Athens CSD
- Kathryn Wegman, Superintendent of Schools (retired), Marion CSD

Validity

Validity refers to how well an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Construct validity was established for the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Construct validity ensures the assessment is actually measuring superintendent performance. Validity was established using a panel of experts familiar with the research base and work of the effective school superintendent. The experts examined the research, identified performance indicators for measure and refined the scale for measurement.

Panel members included:

- Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), Consultant, MASB
- Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
- Mary Kerwin, former school board member, Senior Consultant, MASB
- Debbie Stair, MNML, former school board member, Board Development Manager, MASB

Efficacy

Efficacy refers to the capacity of the evaluation instrument to produce the desired or intended results.

The MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument has three intended outcomes:

- To accurately assess the level of a superintendent's job performance
- To improve the superintendent's professional practice and impact on student learning
- To advance the goals of the school district

MASB will seek to establish efficacy of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument by surveying school board members and superintendents from a representative sample of school districts (see details below). An electronic survey instrument will be used to ascertain the extent to which:

- The district followed the prescribed process for conducting the evaluation, and
- The evaluation instrument and prescribed process supported the stated outcomes

Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which an evaluation instrument produces stable and consistent results. While there are several types of reliability, MASB will seek to establish the test-retest reliability of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Test-retest reliability is a measure of reliability obtained by administering the same instrument twice over a period of time to a group of individuals. To accomplish this, a representative sample of school districts using the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument will participate in a reliability study. A minimum of 15 school districts (with low board member turnover and no transition in the superintendency) will conduct an evaluation at the midpoint of their evaluation cycle (T1) and again at the end of their evaluation (T2). Scores from the two assessments will then be correlated in order to evaluate the test for reliability. A coefficient of 7.0 or higher will indicate acceptable stability.

Evaluation Rubric

The complete MASB 2018 Superintendent Evaluation instrument

https://www.masb.org/portals/0/Education_Community/Superintendents/SuptEvalInstrument_LSD.pdf

Planning: At the beginning of the year in which the evaluation is to occur, the Board of Education and superintendent convene a meeting in public and agree upon the following items:

- Evaluation instrument
- Evaluation timeline and key dates
- Performance goals (if necessary beyond performance indicators outlined in rubric, district-wide improvement goals and student growth model)
- Appropriate benchmarks and checkpoints (formal and informal) throughout year
- Artifacts to be used to evidence superintendent performance
- Process for compiling the year-end evaluation
- Process and individual(s) responsible for conducting the evaluation conference with the superintendent

- Process and individual(s) responsible for establishing a performance improvement plan for the superintendent, if needed
 - Process and individual(s) responsible for sharing the evaluation results with the community
- Checkpoints: The Board of Education and superintendent meet at key points in the evaluation year as follows:

- Three months in – Informal update – Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
- Six months in – Formal update – Superintendent provides update on progress along with available evidence prior to convening a meeting in public. Board president collects questions from the board and provides to superintendent prior to meeting. Board and superintendent discuss progress and make adjustments to course or goals, if needed.
- Nine months in – Informal update – Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
- 11-12 months in – Formal evaluation – Superintendent conducts self-evaluation; presents portfolio with evidence to Board of Education (made available prior to meeting). Board members review portfolio prior to evaluation meeting; seek clarification as needed. Board president (or consultant) facilitates evaluation. Formal evaluation is adopted by Board of Education.

Evidence

Validity, reliability and efficacy of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument relies upon board members using evidence to score superintendent performance.

- Artifacts to serve as evidence of superintendent performance should be identified at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and mutually agreed upon by the Board of Education and the superintendent.
- Artifacts should be limited to only what is needed to inform scoring superintendent performance. Excessive artifacts cloud the evaluation process and waste precious time and resources.
- Boards of education and superintendents should establish when artifacts are to be provided, i.e., as they originate, at designated checkpoints, during self-evaluation, etc.

A list of possible artifacts that may be used as evidence is provided at the end of each professional practice domain rubric. Appendix D of the evaluation instrument offers additional artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance.

Conducting the Formal Evaluation and Conference

Prior to meeting:

- Superintendent prepares self-evaluation, compiles evidence and provides to Board of Education.
- Board members seek clarity as needed regarding self-evaluation or evidence provided.
- Board of Education members receive blank evaluation instrument and make individual notes about their observations.

During meeting:

- Superintendent presents self-evaluation and evidence. Superintendent remains present throughout the meeting.
- Board president reviews with Board of Education superintendent's self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates conversation about performance.
- Score is assigned for each performance indicator via consensus of the Board of Education.
- Upon completion of all performance indicators within all domains, board president calculates overall professional practice score and identifies the correlating rating.
- Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to progress toward district-wide goals.
- Score is assigned for progress toward district-wide goals via consensus of Board of Education.

- Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to district's student growth model.
- Score is assigned for student growth via consensus of Board of Education.
- Board president calculates overall evaluation score based on professional practice, progress toward district-wide improvement goals and student growth ratings.
- Board president makes note of themes/trends identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation.
- Board president calls for vote to adopt completed year-end evaluation for superintendent.
- Superintendent notes his/her comments on evaluation.
- Board president and superintendent sign completed evaluation form.

After the meeting:

- Completed evaluation form reflects Board of Education's assessment of superintendent's performance.
- Board president works with superintendent to coordinate public statement about superintendent's performance.

Contingencies

If a superintendent is rated as minimally effective or ineffective, the Board of Education must develop and require the superintendent to implement an improvement plan to correct the deficiencies. The improvement plan must recommend professional development opportunities and other actions designed to improve the rating of the superintendent on his/her next annual evaluation.

If a superintendent is rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the Board of Education may choose to conduct an evaluation biennially instead of annually. However, if a superintendent is not rated as highly effective on one of these biennial evaluations, the superintendent must again be evaluated annually.

Developing an Individual Development Plan

Individual Development Plans are an excellent way of helping employees develop their skills. Boards of education should encourage superintendents to develop an IDP in order to foster professional development.

In the event that a superintendent receives a rating that is less than effective, the law requires the creation of an IDP. The following process is a framework for creating and implementing an IDP for the superintendent:

- During the evaluation conference, the Board of Education provides clear feedback to the superintendent in the domain(s) in which he/she received a less than effective rating.
- A committee of the Board of Education is established to support and monitor the superintendent's development.
- The superintendent drafts an IDP and presents it to the committee for feedback and approval. The IDP outlines clear growth objectives, as well as the training and development activities in which the superintendent will engage to accomplish objectives. The committee reviews, provides feedback and approves the IDP.
- The committee meets quarterly with the superintendent to monitor and discuss progress.
- The superintendent reports progress on his/her IDP with his/her self-evaluation prior to the formal annual evaluation.

MASB Superintendent Evaluation Instrument Assurances

<http://www.masb.org/postingrequirements>

The School Advance Model (Administrators)

(Information below can be found at gomasa.org)

The Research Base

“The six guiding principles for designing performance evaluation and feedback systems that support learning, growth, and adaptation were developed by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Dr. George Aramath, based on a two year meta-analysis of the literature on performance assessment and feedback.

The administrator evaluation rubrics were developed by Dr. Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill based on a one-year meta review of extant administrator evaluation instruments and research bases.

The work for both were significantly informed by the work of the Wallace Foundation, including two Michigan based Wallace Foundation grant projects focused on school level leadership development. Dr. Reeves served on the grant faculty teams for both of these projects with the late Dr. Van Cooley and Dr. Jianping Shen of Western Michigan University.

Dr. Reeves and Mrs. McNeill are also experienced school administrators who each served for over two decades as school administrators in Michigan.”

Source: <http://www.goschooladvance.org/Research-and-Development>

Authors

School Advance was created by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill., for full biographies,

<http://www.goschooladvance.org/Who-Created-School-ADvance>

Dr. Patricia Reeves

Dr. Patricia Reeves is an Associate Professor of educational leadership, research, and evaluation in the College of Education and Human Development at Western Michigan University – Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology. She also serves a contracted MASA Associate Executive Director for Administrator Certification and Development. Dr. Reeves joined the MASA team and the WMU faculty in 2005 with 19 years’ experience as a K-12 assistant superintendent and superintendent. Prior to that, she was a Director of Instruction, a Gifted and Talented Program Specialist, a Reading Specialist, and a classroom teacher.

Mrs. Patricia McNeill

* Executive Director, Michigan ASCD January 2010- July 2016

* Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum, Instruction + Professional Development – Holt Public Schools March 1997-December 2009

* Curriculum Director – Waverly Public Schools September 1992-March1997

* Staff Developer – Waverly Public Schools August 1984- September 1992

* Waverly High School Special Education (Learning Disabilities) Consultant * Sanilac Career Center Learning Specialist * Sandusky Schools Adult Education Teacher * Cooperative Pre-School Teacher * Harrison Elementary Special Education Teacher * Harrison Elementary 3rd Grade Teacher

Evidence of Reliability, Validity and Efficacy:

Source: <http://www.goschooladvance.org/node/97>

The School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is based on Four Assumptions, which are grounded in the work of researchers in the field of educator performance evaluation:

- The ultimate goal of educator evaluation is to achieve better results for students by fostering improved effectiveness of teachers and leaders.
- New accountability requirements have enormous implications for administrators' expertise—and for the way they do business and spend their time.
- High-stakes accountability must be balanced with ongoing feedback and support for continuous improvement.
- Evaluation should not be something we do to people; rather, it should empower employees to take responsibility for their own learning, growth, and performance.

The School ADvance System holds to **Ten Core Values**, which we believe hold up through many perspectives—community, board, administrator, teacher, student. Those **Ten Core Values** are the following:

1. Growing capacity for better student results
2. Two-way dialogue and interaction
3. A grounding in research supported practice
4. Self-Assessment and reflective practice
5. Authentic feedback
6. Growth targets that really matter
7. Personal ownership
8. Context, conditions, and student characteristics
9. Multiple sources of data/evidence
10. Student results

Moreover, the developers have identified **six research-aligned principles** and critical elements that must be part of any comprehensive educator evaluation system for teachers and administrators.

As a result, the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is:

1. **Authentic**, using evidence-based practices to achieve better student outcomes
2. **Professional**, building personal commitment and efficacy for growth and improvement
3. **Purpose Driven**, focused on measurable improvement targets for student success
4. **Adaptive**, fostering self-assessment, reflective practice, action research, and innovative methods of improving student results
5. **Evidence Based**, data informed, using multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data tied to student achievement and evidence-based practice including achievement and observation data
6. **Inclusive**, serving all, with alignment between student, teacher, administrator, and district improvement goals

By incorporating these elements, School ADvance can assist teachers, administrators, and boards of education in answering the three important questions regarding their own work:

- *Where am I right now in my learning and performance?*

- *Where should I focus next to learn, grow, and improve?*
 - *How should I proceed to reach that next level of performance?*
- The Actual Evaluation Frameworks and Rubrics: School Advance*
 A request to review the actual rubrics can be made at this web site:
http://www.goschooladvance.org/request_to_review_rubrics_and_guides
 Or by clicking [here](#).

Evaluation Process: Administrators

- I. Self-Assessment: Using the School Advance Rubrics, the administrator self-assesses his/her performance
- II. Goal Setting Conference: The building administrator and the evaluator meet in the beginning of the year to set performance goals for the upcoming school year.
 - A. Connection to Self-Assessment: performance goals are individualized to the growth needs of the administrator.
 - B. Connection to District Priorities: performance goals relate to and support district priorities.
- III. Personal Growth Plan: a set of activities is designed to support the administrator's achievement of his/her goals.
- IV. Establish Formative Performance Profile: the building administrator compiles evidence in an electronic portfolio.
 - A. Evidence has connection to personal growth goals.
 - B. Evidence has connection to district goals.
- V. Mid-Year Conference: evaluator meets with the building administrator for a reflective conversation.
 - A. Progress made on Personal Growth Plan and artifacts is collected and discussed.
 - B. Barriers to progress being made on the Personal Growth Plan, if any, are explored.
 - C. Any necessary alterations to the plan that are needed to support personal and/or district goals, if needed, are made.
- VI. Update Formative Performance Profile: the building administrator adds to evidence in an electronic portfolio
 - A. Evidence has connection to personal growth.
 - B. Evidence has connection to district goals.
- VII. End of year summative meeting
 - A. Update Performance Profile (portfolio) and evaluate the connection to personal and district goals.
 - B. Evaluator shares ratings from the summative rubric as well as overall rating.
 - C. Dialogue on potential goals for the following year is initiated.

- VIII. On-going dialogue: conversation and dialogue is an ongoing process between the evaluator and the building administrator, in addition to beginning, mid-year, and end of year conferences.

Training Plan

Administrators received training in the School Advance in the summer of 2016, 2016-2017 school year, and there are scheduled trainings for the 2017-2018 school year. Our goal is to increase the administrator's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric.

School Advance Assurances

http://www.goschooladvance.org/sites/default/files/AssurancesDoc_Michigan_Users_2016_6.pdf?sid=402

5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (Teachers)

Center for Educational Leadership University of Washington, College of Education [link](#)

Thornapple Kellogg School District Evaluation Process: Summary

The foundation of the evaluation process will include observations based on the 5D+ Teacher Evaluation rubric, focusing on Purpose, Student Engagement, Assessment, Classroom Environment/Culture, and Professional Collaboration and Communication.

Observations may consist of unannounced and announced visits from any TK School's administrator. Teachers may meet with administration to request additional observations. The classroom observation shall include a review of the teacher's lesson plan and state curriculum standards through pacing guides and a review of pupil engagement in the lesson. After classroom observations an administrator will share an informal written summary in PIVOT. The teacher must respond to questions posed by the observer within 2 school days. The administrator or teacher may schedule a follow up meeting to discuss any observation and/or written statement.

A mid-year progress report will be provided to first year teachers, and any teacher on a plan or having less than an effective rating.

Focus Areas

Every teacher must choose 2-3 focus areas and one measurable data goal (at each of two inquiry cycles). The data goal should be a measurable student achievement/growth goal tied to School Improvement Plan. The other two are professional development goals based on the indicators in the 5D+ rubric.

The focus areas will be submitted in PIVOT by September 1, 2017/January 26, 2018.

Observations

Minimum of two observations per semester.

August 22 - December 22, January 8 - June 1

Overall Rating

By June 15, 2018, each teacher will receive an overall rating, to be reported to the State of Michigan based upon the requirements from the State.
The rating will be one of the following: Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, Highly Effective.

Annual achievement data and growth data
Will be attached in an addendum to the summative evaluation by June 15, 2018.

Lesson Plan

Teachers must have a plan readily available for administrators to view in an observation that includes:

- Learning target connected to standard
- Planned activities
- Success criteria

Training Plan

Teachers and Administrators received training in the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning Framework in the 2016-2017 and the 2017-2018 school year. Our goal is to increase the teacher's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric. 5D Teacher Evaluation Assurances http://mymassp.com/5D_teacher_evaluation_postings_and_assurances