

 [**Administrator Evaluation Instrument**](http://www.goschooladvance.org/node/290)

**Administrator Evaluation: Postings and Assurances**

**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 on [The Revised School Code, P.A. 451 of 1976](http://www.legislature.mi.gov/%28S%284hxdr3jr4idmpaaomzjjfwvn%29%29/mileg.aspx?page=getObject&objectName=mcl-380-1249b) website.

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 [MASA’s School Advance Administrator Evaluation Instrument](http://www.goschooladvance.org/node/290).

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

For [MASA’s School Advance Administrator Evaluation Instrument](http://www.goschooladvance.org/node/290), see description at link:

<http://www.goschooladvance.org/sites/default/files/PrinSumRubExam.SA%20Version%202.0_7.30.18.pdf>

Note: Domain Five: Technology Integration and Competence will be included in IES administrator evaluations beginning in the 2018-19 school year. IES will develop the infrastructure to support this domain in the 2017-18 school year.

IES has added a mission-specific component to the MASA School Advance Administrator Evaluation Tool. This section of the IES administrator evaluation tool is based on the Choosing to Teach research study, “a detailed multiyear investigation of three selective, mission-driven teacher preparation programs the Urban Teacher Education Program at the University of Chicago, the Alliance for Catholic Education at the University of Notre Dame, and the Day School Leadership through Teaching program at Brandeis University that traces each program s impact on graduates during their first few years of teaching.
Feiman-Nemser and her colleagues show how teacher education programs like these can help teachers develop the understanding, commitment, tools, and strategies they need to teach in specific settings. By tracking the professional growth of teachers in these programs and documenting the challenges they encounter in their respective school sectors, the book explores and illustrates the ways in which these mission-driven programs select and prepare teachers for particular school environments."

Feiman-Nemser, S., Tamir, E., & Hammerness, K. (2014). *Inspiring teaching: Preparing teachers to succeed in mission-driven schools*. Harvard Education Press: Cambridge, MA.

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

See description at link: http://www.goschooladvance.org/sites/default/files/AssurancesDoc\_Michigan\_Users\_2016\_6.pdf?sid=1042

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

See description at link: http://www.goschooladvance.org/sites/default/files/AssurancesDoc\_Michigan\_Users\_2016\_6.pdf?sid=1042

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

Note: Domain Five: Technology Integration and Competence will be included in IES administrator evaluations beginning in the 2018-19 school year. IES will develop the infrastructure to support this domain in the 2017-18 school year.

***(Note: Will combine with Attachment once turned into a PDF)***

IES has added a mission-specific component to the MASA School Advance Administrator Evaluation Tool. This section of the IES administrator evaluation tool is based on the Choosing to Teach research study, “a detailed multiyear investigation of three selective, mission-driven teacher preparation programs the Urban Teacher Education Program at the University of Chicago, the Alliance for Catholic Education at the University of Notre Dame, and the Day School Leadership through Teaching program at Brandeis University that traces each program s impact on graduates during their first few years of teaching.
Feiman-Nemser and her colleagues show how teacher education programs like these can help teachers develop the understanding, commitment, tools, and strategies they need to teach in specific settings. By tracking the professional growth of teachers in these programs and documenting the challenges they encounter in their respective school sectors, the book explores and illustrates the ways in which these mission-driven programs select and prepare teachers for particular school environments."

Feiman-Nemser, S., Tamir, E., & Hammerness, K. (2014). *Inspiring teaching: Preparing teachers to succeed in mission-driven schools*. Harvard Education Press: Cambridge, MA.

|  |
| --- |
|   |
| **Flexibility:** |  |  |  |
| Accepts change positively and professionally. Helps implement change even when the reason for change is not immediately evident.  |
|   |
| **Life-Long Learner:** |  |  |  |
| Achieves and maintains technical and professional proficiency related to current administrative position.  |
|   |
| **Integrity and Trust:** |  |  |
| Acts ethically and gains the trust and respect of others.  |
|  |
|   |
| **Relationship Building:** |  |  |
| Builds and sustains productive relationships with students, families of students, staff, community partners, and other school stakeholders.  |
|  |
|   |
| **Effective Communication:** |  |  |
| Follows the district communication protocol personally and ensures staff follow it as well. Engages in collaborative discussions by inviting and considering contrary viewpoints and opinions. Is able to inspire mission-directed and mission-supportive school processes and staff behaviors. |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 |
|   |
| **Initiative:** |  |  |  |
| Recognizes opportunities and acts on it. Is continually looking to improve and reach the next steps for school Improvement. Exhibits a positive, “can-do” attitude which inspires staff. |
|  |
|   |
| **Planning and Organizing:** |  |  |
| Sets Priorities and creates detailed plans. Is able to follow through with these plans to implementation and sustainability. |
|  |
|   |  |  |  |  |

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

The school administrator (principal or assistant principal), meets with the superintendent a minimum of twice monthly and up to once weekly throughout the school year for at least an hour. The focus of the agenda of these meetings is at least 50% of the time on instructional leadership and student achievement and, at most, 50% of the time about administrative tasks and/or building management. Data (perceptions, process, students achievement and/or demographic) is a continual focus of these meetings.

In addition, the superintendent and school leader co-observe instruction in the class room and discuss evidence of curriculum, instruction, and assessment alignment observed as well as areas needing improvement.

By November each year, each school administrator completes a self-evaluation using the School Advance Tool and the mission-specific component. The superintendent reviews this self-assessment and selected SMART goals with the school leader to reach a mutual agreement on the assessment and goals for the school year. Last, at the end of the school year, in May/June each year, the superintendent completes a summative School Advance evaluation tool and the mission-specific component. A summary score of 1,2,3,4 is given to each element and domain. The School Advance element, “student results” is worth 50% of the overall evaluation rating and the rest of the elements are weighted evenly to compose 25% of the overall evaluation rating. Lastly, the remaining 25% of the overall rating is composed of evenly weighted elements in the mission-specific component.

The overall evaluation ratings equate to the following effectiveness ratings:

1-Ineffective (not meeting standards)

2-Minimially effective (progressing)

3-Effective (proficient)

4- Highly effective (exemplary)

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

The school leadership discussed evaluation tools approved by the state and those that might be developed by the team itself at a leadership retreat help in July 2017. This team unanimously agreed to select [MASA’s School Advance Administrator Evaluation Instrument](http://www.goschooladvance.org/node/290) as its evaluation tool. The team is scheduled to attend a training on the tool on  October 11 and 12, 2017.