Research Base McREL Principal Evaluation System

Administrator Evaluation: Postings and Assurances

Non-State Approved Evaluation Tool; District-Approved Evaluation Tool

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 specific information about the evaluation tool(s) used for its performance evaluation system for school administrators. Complete language (including requirements) for MCL 380.1249b can be found here.

This evaluation tool has been approved by the district, as the result of a review process implemented with fidelity. The contents of this document are compliant with the law laid forth, specifically pertaining to McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation System.

Mrs. Nawal Hamadeh

Printed Name of Superintendent

Signature of Superintendent

9/20/2016

Date of Adoption in District

Research Base for the Evaluation Framework, Instrument, and Process [Section 1249b(2)(a)]

The McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation System is based on the leadership research of Waters, Marzano and McNulty. That work is presented in the 2005 ASCD publication School leadership that works: From research to results[1]. The findings from McREL's research (meta-analysis and factor analysis) lay the foundation for The McREL Principal Evaluation System. The meta-analysis examined 69 studies that met rigorous criteria to examine the relationship between school-level leadership and student achievement. This analysis resulted in three major findings, including the identification of 21 leadership responsibilities with statistically significant correlations to student achievement. McREL conducted a factor analysis to determine if there were inter-correlations among the 21 leadership responsibilities identified in the meta-analysis. This analysis did not produce sufficient inter-correlations among the 21 leadership responsibilities. However, the analysis did result in an empirical relationship between the 21 leadership responsibilities and impact of implementing change initiatives. This comprehensive study yielded the Balanced Leadership Framework®.

The McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation System is designed to complement the Balanced Leadership Framework®. The evaluation rubrics include three framework components. Each framework component is supported by a set of associated leadership responsibilities. Each leadership responsibility is supported by a formative rubric with sets of descriptors or leadership practices that distinguish leadership at various levels of performance.

Rather than use a model that describes what principal's do not do, the McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation system is designed to express what principals should know and be able to do. Therefore, the levels of performance extend along a five categorical rating continuum that include: "Developing", "Proficient", "Accomplished", "Distinguished", and "Not Demonstrated". Information and data regarding principal performance will be collected through a variety of methods, for example; site-visits, evaluation meetings, artifacts, staff and community surveys or school improvement plans. The data collected throughout the evaluation process is benchmarked against the principals' performance and demonstration or fulfillment of the descriptors/practices captured in formative rubrics. At the end of the evaluation process a summary rating form is constructed using the data collected throughout the evaluation process. The summary rating form provides a summative assessment of the school leaders' performance and subsequently the results are used to establish a set of professional development goals focused on improved performance.

The McREL Principal Evaluation System is designed to provide school-level leaders with a holistic perspective and feedback based on their performance utilizing the three Balanced Leadership Framework components. Each component consists of a set research-based leadership responsibilities with explicit definitions for each responsibility. While, one can perceive these responsibilities as discrete leadership practices they are, in most cases, interdependent. In other words, proficient school-

---

[1] Marzano, R. J., Waters, J. T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

level leaders know how and when to emphasize these responsibilities strategically and effectively based on specific educational contexts. Figure 1 provides an example of the rubrics for evaluating principals.

Identification and Qualifications of the Author(s) [Section 1249b(2)(b)]

Tony Davis, Ph.D., is a Senior Director from McREL International's Center for Educator Effectiveness and primary author for our evaluation systems. He supervises, coordinates and provides research, design and implementation of Educator Evaluation Systems and provides technical assistance and consultation to state and regional education agencies across the nation. In addition, he provides professional development sessions in school-level leadership designed from McREL's Balanced Leadership: School Leadership that Works series.

Previously, he was as a high school teacher for eight years before serving as an assistant principal and principal at the high school and middle school levels in the Denver Metro area for 20 years. He served as a faculty member at Regis University at the graduate level in Educational Leadership and Teacher Licensure programs. He holds a doctoral degree in Educational Administration and Policy Studies from the University of Denver.

Evidence of Reliability, Validity, and Efficacy [Section 1249b(2)(c)]

Introduction

A crucial form of validity is found in the constructs and practices implied through the descriptors that constitute the content of the rubic (what we want leaders to know and be able to do). Descriptor develop arise from their connection to the theoretical and empirical literature on effective school leadership such as school environment, organizational management, school improvement, teacher practices, and student outcomes. Conceptually, this is a form of content validity where descriptors used will have been linked to key outcomes associated with effective leadership. This is done by drawing from extant literature on effective leadership practices. For example, there is strong agreement among researchers that effective leadership is important to successful school improvement and student performance (Bryk et al., 2010; Fullan, 2007; Desimone, 2002; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Fullan, 2007; Goddard et al., 2011). Both meta-analytic research (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2003; Robinson et al., 2008) and a recent research synthesis (Louis & Anderson, 2012) indicate a statistically significant relationship between the strength of school leadership and student achievement. The extensive review and synthesis of research is the foundation of McREL's Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation rubric.

Descriptive analysis of summative performance data.

During the spring of 2009 McREL's Balanced Leadership-based Principal Evaluation System was field tested in a large urban school district. As part of this project, McREL provided feedback to the district about the distribution of ratings on evaluation forms. Analysis was limited to describing scoring patterns due to the small sample size (n=25) and the small percentage of participants who provided data to McREL. 1 provides the distribution of schools on the three forms used in the evaluation. In this urban district, the Self-Evaluation form was completed by the principal, the School Improvement Officers (SIO) form was completed by the SIO, and the joint form was completed at a meeting by both the principal and evaluator. An analysis of the distribution of scores showed that three of the rubric levels were used in the field test and that the Distinguished score was not used an any of the forms. These results indicate that further studies might examine the reasons that no principals were rated as Distinguished and examine whether or not this category is adequately defined in the rubric.

Table 1: Percent of Principals Rated at Each Performance Level Overall

Form	n	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Self	4	--	--	**75**	25	--
SIO	6	--	**50**	**50**	--	--
Joint	10	10	20	**60**	10	--

*Note. Self=Self evaluation summary form, SIO=School Improvement Officer summary form, Joint=joint evaluation form. Numbers in **bold** indicate that ≥50% of the principals were ranked in that category.*

Addressing Educational Leadership Policy Standards

McREL has examined content validity by looking at the extent to which the components in the evaluation align to ISLLC standards. McREL's research on school-level leadership has shown close connections to other frameworks and standards for principal leadership. McREL has conducted a bi-directional analysis (Kendall, Alpert, & Jones, 2012) comparing the contents of the McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation rubrics to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) leadership standards. The purpose of this study was to determine and report whether and to what degree the standards described as important for principals in the ISLLC standards are present in the McREL's leadership framework and evaluation instruments and vice versa. The degree of alignment is likely an important factor when considering an evaluation system, as large discrepancies in content has implications to development and adoption.

The findings demonstrate that all content described in the ISLLC Educational Leadership Policy standards is present in the McREL's Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation rubrics to some degree. Of the 31 ISLLC functions, 13 (42%) were identified as a strong match, 13 (42%) judged a satisfactory match, and 5 (16%) were considered a weak match. Conversely, all the content of the McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation components is addressed to some extent in the ISLLC standards. Of

the 21 leadership responsibilities in the McREL Leadership Framework, 4 (19%) were found to have a strong match while 13 (62%) were a satisfactory match, and 4 (19%) were a weak match.

Measurable Practices

The McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation System is based on the leadership research McREL (Waters, Marzano and McNulty, 2005). The findings from McREL's research (meta-analysis and factor analysis) lay the foundation for The McREL Principal Evaluation System. The meta-analysis examined 69 studies that met rigorous criteria to examine the relationship between school-level leadership and student achievement. This analysis resulted in three major findings, including the identification of 21 leadership responsibilities with statistically significant correlations to student achievement. In fact, the data demonstrated a substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement. The average effect size (expressed as a correlation) between leadership and student achievement is .25. Stated differently, our findings indicate that an increase (one standard deviation) in leadership practices translate into an average of a ten percentile point gain in student achievement.

Following the meta-analysis, McREL conducted a factor analysis to determine if there were inter-correlations among the 21 leadership responsibilities identified in the meta-analysis. This analysis did not produce sufficient inter-correlations among the 21 leadership responsibilities. However, the analysis did result in an empirical relationship between the 21 leadership responsibilities and impact of implementing change initiatives. This comprehensive study yielded the Balanced Leadership Framework®.

The McREL Principal Evaluation System is designed to provide school-level leaders with a holistic perspective and feedback based on their performance utilizing the three Balanced Leadership Framework components. Each component consists of a set of research-based leadership responsibilities with explicit definitions for each responsibility.

While, one can perceive these responsibilities as discrete leadership practices they are, in most cases, interdependent. In other words, proficient school-level leaders know how and when to emphasize these responsibilities strategically and effectively based on specific educational contexts.

McREL Rubric defines and measures performance

Framework-based evaluations systems incorporate the quantitative and qualitative evidence on independent factors associated with dependent factors. McREL's Balanced Leadership Evaluation System leverages the quantitative findings on the effects of leadership on student achievement combined with current best-practice literature and professional wisdom to articulate leadership performance.

The rubric are developed using a constructive approach that scaffolds leadership knowledge, skills and dispositions across a continuum of rating that differentiate performance from a novice to distinguished practitioner. McREL's Principal Evaluation rubrics address the multiple ways that leaders contribute to improving student performance and organizational productivity.

Multiple indicators are distributed across four categories and distinctive to the degree that performance can be discretely identified and accurately measured. Scaffolding leadership practices/behaviors across a continuum of ratings that differentiate novice to distinguished leadership practices provide specific guidance toward performance improvement. Rather than use a model that describes what principal's do not do, the McREL Balanced Leadership Principal Evaluation system is designed to express what principals should know and be able to do. Therefore, the levels of performance extend along a five categorical rating continuum that include: "Developing", "Proficient", "Accomplished", "Distinguished", and "Not Demonstrated".

References

Bryk, A.S., Sebring, P.B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Desimone, L. (2002). How can comprehensive school reform models be successfully implemented? Review of Educational Research, 72(3), 433–479.

Fullan, M. (2007). The new meaning of educational change. New York, NY: Routledge.

Goddard, R. D., Goddard, Y. L., Kim, E. S., & Miller, R. J. (2011). A social cognitive perspective on collective efficacy and goal attainment in schools: The roles of principals' instructional leadership and teacher collaboration. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. The Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217–247.

Kendall, Alpert, & Jones, (2012). A comparison of McREL's principal evaluation components and the ISLLC standards. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. McREL

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Robinson, V. M., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. Educational administration quarterly, 44(5), 635-674.

Evaluation Framework and Rubric [Section 1249b(2)(d)]

Rubrics define and measure performance

Framework-based evaluations systems incorporate the quantitative and qualitative evidence on independent factors associated with dependent factors. McREL's Balanced Leadership Evaluation System leverages the quantitative findings on the effects of leadership on student achievement combined with current best-practice literature and professional wisdom to articulate leadership performance.

The rubrics are developed using a constructive approach that scaffolds leadership knowledge, skills and dispositions across a continuum of rating that differentiate performance from a novice to distinguished practitioner. McREL's Principal Evaluation rubrics address the multiple ways that leaders contribute to improving student performance and organizational productivity. Multiple indicators are distributed across four categories and distinctive to the degree that performance can be appropriately identified and accurately measured.

Evaluation Components

Principal Leadership Responsibilities Associated with Managing Change

Managing change involves understanding the implications of change efforts for stakeholders and adjusting leadership behaviors accordingly.
   a. *Change agent: Is willing to and actively challenges the status quo.*
   b. *Flexibility: Adapts his or her leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent.*
   c. *Ideals and Beliefs: Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about school and schooling.*
   d. *Intellectual Stimulation: Ensures that the faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school culture.*
   e. *Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is knowledgeable about the current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices.*
   f. *Monitor and Evaluate: Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning.*
   g. *Optimize: Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations.*

Principal Responsibilities Associated With Focus Of Leadership
Focus of leadership involves accurately and pro-actively targeting appropriate areas for school improvement efforts.
   a. *Contingent rewards: Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments.*
   b. *Discipline: Protects teachers from issues and influences that would detract from their time or focus.*
   c. *Focus: Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention*
   d. *Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment: Is directly involved in helping teachers design curricular activities and address assessment and instructional issues.*
   e. *Order: Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines.*
   f. *Outreach: Is an advocate and spokesperson of the school to all stakeholders.*
   g. *Resources: Provides teachers with material and professional development necessary for the execution of their jobs.*

Principal Responsibilities Associated With Purposeful Community

   A purposeful community is one with the collective efficacy and capability to develop and use assets to accomplish goals that matter to all community members through agreed upon processes.
   a. *Affirmation: Recognizes and celebrates school accomplishment and acknowledges failures.*
   b. *Communication: Establishes strong lines of communication with teachers and among students.*
   c. *Culture: Fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation.*
   d. *Input: Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions.*
   e. *Relationships: Demonstrates awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff.*
   f. *Situational awareness: Is aware of the details and the undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems.*
   g. *Visibility: Has quality contacts and interactions with teachers and students.*

Performance ratings

Each framework component is subdivided into responsibilities. For each responsibility, associated behaviors (identified as "practices" in the evaluation system) are defined. These practices are aligned to five ordinal performance levels. From lowest to highest performance level, these categories are: Not Demonstrated, Developing, Proficient, Accomplished and Distinguished. The performance level for an individual on a leadership responsibility depends on the combination of practices the evaluatee demonstrates. The ordinal rating scale used to differentiate performance measures is supported by clear definitions for each rating. McREL has developed a series of rubrics that align and measure behaviors found in each of the standards/components. The following ordinal performance ratings are used to evaluate principals;

> **Developing:** *Principal demonstrated adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) during the period of performance, but did not demonstrate competence on standard(s) of performance.*

Proficient: Principal demonstrated basic competence on standard(s) of performance.
Accomplished: Principal exceeded basic competence on standard(s) of performance most of the time.
Distinguished: Principal consistently and significantly exceeded basic competence on standard(s) of performance.
Not Demonstrated: Principal did not demonstrate competence on or make adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) of performance. (Note: If the Not Demonstrated rating is used, the evaluator must comment about why it was used.)

Description of Process for Conducting Classroom Observations, Collecting Evidence, Conducting Evaluation Conferences, Developing Performance Ratings, and Developing Performance Improvement Plans [Section 1249b(2)(e)]

STEPS OF THE PROCESS

COMPONENT 1: TRAINING

Each school year, evaluators will conduct a group orientation with all principals. At this orientation, each principal will receive a complete set of materials outlining the evaluation process and an explanation of the timeline and how performance will be measured. Each principal should become thoroughly familiar with McREL's Principal Evaluation System and all of the materials associated with it, including definitions and forms.

COMPONENT 2: PRINCIPAL AND EVALUATOR EACH COMPLETE PRINCIPAL EVALUATION RUBRIC

a. Principals will assess their own performance using the Principal Evaluation Rubric. This self-assessment will serve as the basis for the preliminary goals form, which should be completed prior to Step 3.

b. Concurrently (with step a), the evaluator will assess the performance of the principal using the Principal Evaluation Rubric. Along with the principal's self-assessment, this will serve as the foundation for the performance discussion to be held as Step 3.

COMPONENT 3: MEETING BETWEEN THE PRINCIPAL AND EVALUATOR

Principals will meet individually with their evaluator to discuss the results of self-assessment, The evaluator's ratings of the principal, preliminary performance goals, and any artifacts or other evidence the principal and evaluator believe are critical to understanding the principal's performance. The principal and evaluator will agree on the data, evidence, and documentation necessary to complete the evaluation process and confirm the principal's level of performance.

COMPONENT 4: MID-YEAR EVALUATION DISCUSSION

Principals will meet individually with their evaluator to discuss their progress toward achieving annual goals. This mid-year discussion will focus on the status of goal attainment and necessary mid-year adjustments to action plans that must be made in order to achieve goals by the end of the school year.

COMPONENT 5: CONSOLIDATED PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

The principal will synthesize the information from Steps 3 and 4 in order to prepare a consolidated assessment or comprehensive view of performance throughout the year. This brief summary of the data and artifacts used to judge performance should be provided to the evaluator well in advance of the end-of-year performance discussion.

COMPONENT 6: END-OF-YEAR PERFORMANCE DISCUSSION

The principal and evaluator will meet at the school to discuss progress toward completing the evaluation process. They will discuss the self-assessment, consolidated assessment, and superintendent's summary evaluation of the principal, which have been prepared in advance of the meeting. Should additional data or artifacts be needed for the discussion, the principal will have them available at that time.

COMPONENT 7: FINAL EVALUATION CONFERENCE AND GOAL SETTING

At this meeting, the principal and evaluator will agree upon performance goals and recommendations for the Professional Development Plan. All forms needed to complete this process are included in this at the end of this manual. While all of the forms are highly recommended, use of the following is required:

- Principal Evaluation Rubric. The Rubric will be used for the following steps:

- Self-Assessment

- Evaluator Assessment

- Meeting Between Principal and Evaluator

- Final Evaluation and Goal-Setting Meeting

Description of Plan for Providing Evaluators and Observers with Training [Section 1249b (2)(f)]

Tony Davis, Ph.D., a Senior Director from McREL International's Center for Educator Effectiveness and primary author for our evaluation systems, is scheduled for providing the initial training for all the instructional administrators. HES Academies Staff that has been trained as "Trainer of Trainers" will deliver the PD services to new and existing instructional administrative staff each academic year at the beginning of the year, and throughout the year as new instructional leaders join in. Moreover, HES academies periodically contracts with McREL International Staff to conduct virtual trainings that cover any updates to the content and system.