

Head of School Evaluation

January 1, 2017 – June 30, 2017

A. Governance & Board Relations

Weight: 20%

		Ineffective (1 pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating
A1	Policy involvement Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 9	Makes decisions without regard to adopted policy.	Provides correspondence from policy provider with recommendation(s) for adoption. Follows as written.	Is actively involved in developing, recommending and administering school policies.	Is proactive in determining school needs and policy priorities.	
A2	Goal development Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 9, 10	Goals are not developed.	Goals are defined by implementing state curriculum and seeking to maximize student scores.	Participates in developing short-term goals for the school. Provides the necessary financial strategies to meet those goals.	Believes in and facilitates developing short and long-term goals for the school. Aligns the available resources within the budget to accomplish these goals.	
A3	Information Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9	Does not provide the information the board needs to perform its responsibilities.	Keeps only some members informed, making it difficult for the board to perform its responsibilities.	Keeps the board informed with appropriate information as needed so it may perform its responsibilities.	Keeps all board members informed with appropriate, regular communication so it may perform its responsibilities.	
A4	Board questions Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9	Board questions aren't fully answered and some information may be incorrect. Some questions may be avoided.	Most board questions are answered. All members aren't apprised of all relevant questions/answers.	Board questions are addressed with follow-up to members.	Board questions are answered thoroughly with communication to all members to ensure understanding.	
Category rating:						
Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain: <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting agendas/minutes <input type="checkbox"/> Board packets <input type="checkbox"/> Board development materials <input type="checkbox"/> Memos/communications <input type="checkbox"/> Board policies/policy book <input type="checkbox"/> Retreat agendas/minutes <input type="checkbox"/> Board development plan <input type="checkbox"/> Communication protocols <input type="checkbox"/> Policy review calendar						

A. Governance & Board Relations – continued

Weight: 20%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:		Goal:	
Evidence:			

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board:	Comments by HOS:

B. Community Relations

Weight: 15%

		Ineffective (1 pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating
B1	Parent feedback Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Doesn't accept input or engage with parents.	Accepts suggestions and input from parents but fails to seek it.	Readily accepts parent input.	Actively seeks parental input, creates methods for parents to be actively involved.	
B2	Communication with community Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Isn't readily available for parents, businesses, governmental and civic groups. Avoids engaging unless absolutely necessary.	Is available for parents, businesses, governmental and civic groups, providing them with information. Accepts suggestions and input but does not seek it.	Communicates with the community and actively seeks input as appropriate.	Actively communicates with the community and actively seeks input as appropriate. Provides alternative means of contact with the community.	
B3	Media relations Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Does not communicate with the media.	Communicates with the media only when requested.	Isn't proactive, but is cooperative with the media when contacted.	Promotes positive relations and provides the media with school event information.	
B4	School image Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Is indifferent or negative about the school. Does not speak well or represent the school well in front of groups.	Doesn't actively promote the school. Speaks adequately in public.	Projects a positive image of the school as expected. Well spoken.	Projects a positive image at all times; is a champion for the school. Articulate, knowledgeable and well-spoken.	
B5	Approachability Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8	Is neither visible nor approachable by members of the community.	Is visible but not necessarily approachable by members of the community.	Is visible and approachable by members of the community.	Is visible and approachable by members of the community. Attends a variety of events.	
B6						
Category rating:						
Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain: <input type="checkbox"/> Third-party survey data <input type="checkbox"/> School accreditation survey data <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting invitations, agendas <input type="checkbox"/> Press releases <input type="checkbox"/> Community meeting agendas <input type="checkbox"/> News clips/interviews <input type="checkbox"/> Community engagement calendar <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic planning agenda(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Communications <input type="checkbox"/> Service club membership(s)						

B. Community Relations – continued

Weight: 15%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:		Goal:	
Evidence:			

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board:	Comments by HOS:

C. Staff Relations

Weight: 15%

		Ineffective (1 pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating
C1	Staff feedback Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 7	Doesn't accept input or engage teachers and staff in decision-making or goal setting.	Accepts suggestions and input from staff but does not seek it. Does not engage staff in school-wide goal setting or decision-making.	Readily accepts staff input and engages staff in school-wide goal setting and/or decision-making.	Actively seeks staff input in decisions, creates methods for staff to be actively involved in setting and supporting school-wide goals.	
C2	Staff communications Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9	Doesn't inform staff of matters that may be of concern.	Is inconsistent in keeping staff informed of important matters.	Keeps staff informed of important matters as appropriate.	Establishes a system of keeping staff regularly informed of important matters as appropriate.	
C3	Personnel matters Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9	There is no system to handle personnel matters in a consistent manner. Some situations may be handled with bias.	A system has been established, but it is not applied consistently.	A system is used to address personnel matters with consistency, fairness, discretion and impartiality.	Establishes a system that is proactive with personnel matters. Personnel policies are routinely discussed and promoted.	
C4	Delegation of duties Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9, 10	Doesn't delegate duties. Maintains personal control over all school operations.	Delegates duties as staff members request additional responsibilities.	Delegates responsibility to staff within their abilities and then provides support to ensure their success.	Delegates responsibility to staff that will foster professional growth, leadership and decision-making skills.	
C5	Recruitment Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6	There is no formal recruitment process and/or hiring is considered in an arbitrary manner.	A formal recruitment process is in place, but is not used consistently.	Follows a formal recruitment process for each hiring opportunity.	Follows a formal recruitment process for each hiring opportunity. Actively recruits the best staff available and encourages their application to the school.	
C6	Visibility in school Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 4, 5, 6	Seldom visits buildings	Is present at building programs and special activities.	Visits buildings/classrooms occasionally	Regular, purposeful visits to buildings and classrooms are a priority.	
Category rating:						

C. Staff Relations – continued

Weight: 15%

Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain:

- Third-party survey data
- School accreditation survey data
- Hiring process documentation
- Personnel policies and procedures
- Recruitment calendar
- Staff leadership development plan
- Negotiations documentation
- School visit calendar
- Communications
- Staff meeting agendas/minutes

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:		Goal:	
Evidence:			

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board:	Comments by HOS:

D. Business & Finance

Weight: 20%

		Ineffective (1 pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating												
D1	Budget development and management Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 2, 9	Budget knowledge is limited. The budget is developed and managed without taking into consideration current needs of the school.	Works to develop and manage the budget to meet the immediate fiscal issues. Decisions are primarily reactive to current needs of the school.	Budget actions are proactive and consider the most current information and data. A balance is sought to meet the needs of students and remain fiscally responsible to the community.	Budget actions are proactive and consider both current and long-range information and data. A balance is sought to meet the current and future needs of students and remain fiscally responsible to the community.													
D2	Budget reports Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 2, 9	Doesn't report financial information to the board except with the annual audit.	Reports the status of financial accounts as requested by the board.	Reports to the board concerning the budget and financial status on a regular basis.	Constant flow of budgetary/ financial information provided with discussion of the ramifications of any changes.													
D3	Financial controls Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 9	Annual audit has revealed areas that are in need of improvement. Financial accounts aren't in order.	Annual audit is used to reveal any discrepancies. Internal controls are inconsistent.	Is up-to-date with GAAP and state accounting procedures. Maintains internal controls.	Promotes appropriate financial controls, including third-party audits and reconciliation of accounts. Is proactive.													
D4	Facility management Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 5, 9	A facilities management plan is not created. Maintenance is only performed when absolutely needed.	Facilities needs are discussed internally, but a plan is not created. Issues are addressed on an as-needed basis.	A facilities management plan is in place that includes the current status of the buildings and the need to improve any facilities in the future.	Facilities management plan in place includes current status of buildings and the need to improve facilities in the future, with a projected plan to secure funding.													
D5	Resource allocation Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 9	Resources are allocated without consideration of school needs.	Resources are allocated to meet immediate needs.	Resources are distributed based upon school goals and seek to meet immediate objectives.	Resources are distributed based upon school goals and seek to meet immediate and long-range objectives.													
Category rating:																		
<p>Artifacts that <u>may</u> serve as evidence of performance in this domain:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Strategic plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Auditor's report</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> School budget</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Budget-related communications</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Election results that impact funding or facilities</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of budgetary alignment to school-wide goals</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Grants received/applied for</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Policies/procedures related to fund management</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Long-term financial forecast data</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Facilities maintenance plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Facilities management plan</td> </tr> </table>							<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Auditor's report	<input type="checkbox"/> School budget	<input type="checkbox"/> Budget-related communications	<input type="checkbox"/> Election results that impact funding or facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of budgetary alignment to school-wide goals	<input type="checkbox"/> Grants received/applied for		<input type="checkbox"/> Policies/procedures related to fund management	<input type="checkbox"/> Long-term financial forecast data	<input type="checkbox"/> Facilities maintenance plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Facilities management plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Auditor's report	<input type="checkbox"/> School budget	<input type="checkbox"/> Budget-related communications															
<input type="checkbox"/> Election results that impact funding or facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of budgetary alignment to school-wide goals	<input type="checkbox"/> Grants received/applied for																
<input type="checkbox"/> Policies/procedures related to fund management	<input type="checkbox"/> Long-term financial forecast data	<input type="checkbox"/> Facilities maintenance plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Facilities management plan															

D. Business & Finance – continued

Weight: 20%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:		Goal:	
Evidence:			

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education:	Comments by HOS:

E. Instructional Leadership

Weight: 30%

		Ineffective (1 pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating
E1	Performance evaluation system Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 9, 10	No performance evaluation system is in place and/or not all evaluations have been completed as required.	Evaluations are completed but not entirely in compliance or are inconsistent with state law.	Evaluations are completed in a timely manner. Some less than “effective” staff lack individualized development plans.	Performance evaluation system in place that is in compliance with state law. Required evaluations completed. Necessary development plans in place. Evaluations are consistent across school.	
E2	Staff development Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 10	Staff development isn’t consistently provided. Staff members are responsible for their own improvement.	Staff development programs are offered based upon available opportunities.	Staff development programs are offered based upon available opportunities that are targeted toward staff growth and increasing student achievement.	Staff development programs are individualized, targeted toward school-specific goals and are sustained to increase student achievement.	
E3	School improvement Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 9, 10	School improvement efforts are limited. There is no comprehensive plan in place.	School improvement plans are in place at the building level but lack school-wide coordination.	School improvement plans are in place at all buildings and align to the school-wide goals.	School improvement plans are in place at all buildings and align to the school-wide goals. Systems are in place for implementation of improvement efforts and monitoring of progress.	
E4	Curriculum Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 4, 7	Curriculum isn’t a priority in the school and/or is inconsistent across grade levels.	Teachers are allowed to define their own curriculum. There is little coordination.	A curriculum is in place that seeks to meet the state standards.	Curriculum is in place, aligned across grade levels and in compliance with state standards.	
E5	Instruction Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 4, 6, 7	There is little to no focus on instruction. Technology is not utilized in classroom instruction.	Teachers are encouraged to enhance their instructional skills and embrace technology, but no comprehensive program(s) is in place.	Effort is made to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs and levels of readiness. Some effort is made to incorporate technology into learning.	Instructional practices in place that are differentiated and personalized to student needs. Technology is used to enhance teaching and learning.	
E6	Student feedback Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 5	Doesn’t accept input or seek student feedback.	Accepts suggestions and input from students but does not seek it.	Readily accepts student input and engages students in school discussions as appropriate.	Actively seeks student input, creates methods for students to be involved in school discussions as appropriate.	
E7	Student attendance Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 5	Attendance isn’t addressed as a policy issue. Attendance rates are decreasing.	Attendance isn’t an area of focus; and therefore, student attendance is a matter left to itself. Attendance rates fluctuate at will.	Attendance is an area of focus. There are plans and interventions in place to address chronic attendance problems. Attendance rates are improving.	Attendance is an area of focus. Individual student attendance problems are addressed early and supports are put into place. Attendance rates are being maintained at a high level.	

E. Instructional Leadership – continued

Weight: 30%

		Ineffective (1 pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating																				
E8	Support for students Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 5	Academic supports are in place, but are inconsistent.	Academic supports are in place but social supports to meet the needs of students are lacking.	Programs and activities are available for students. Maintains a safe, caring and healthy learning environment.	Coherent systems of academic and social supports are in place to meet the needs of all students. Maintains a safe, caring and healthy learning environment.																					
E9	Professional knowledge Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 4, 6	Is uninvolved in current instructional programs. Is unaware of current instructional issues.	Is somewhat knowledgeable of current instructional programs. Relies on others for information/data.	Demonstrates knowledge of current instructional programs, and is able to discuss them. Seeks to learn and improve upon personal and professional abilities.	Demonstrates knowledge and comfort with current instructional programs. Seeks to communicate with others how the school is implementing best practices. Participates actively in professional groups and organizations for the benefit of the school.																					
Category rating:																										
<p>Artifacts that <u>may</u> serve as evidence of performance in this domain:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Staff evaluation calendar</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> School performance evaluation system</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Head of School professional growth plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> RtI/MTSS</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Head of School professional development</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher analysis of student achievement data</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum audit</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Strategic plan/school-wide goals</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Staff development plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Professional development calendar</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Instructional model(s)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum team agendas</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Instructional audit</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Coaching documentation</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Observational data from staff</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of instructional rounds</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Positive behavior supports/character programs</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>							<input type="checkbox"/> Staff evaluation calendar	<input type="checkbox"/> School performance evaluation system	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of School professional growth plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum	<input type="checkbox"/> RtI/MTSS	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of School professional development	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher analysis of student achievement data	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic plan/school-wide goals		<input type="checkbox"/> Staff development plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional development calendar	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional model(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum team agendas	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Coaching documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Observational data from staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of instructional rounds	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive behavior supports/character programs	
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff evaluation calendar	<input type="checkbox"/> School performance evaluation system	<input type="checkbox"/> Head of School professional growth plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum	<input type="checkbox"/> RtI/MTSS																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Head of School professional development	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher analysis of student achievement data	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum audit	<input type="checkbox"/> Strategic plan/school-wide goals																							
<input type="checkbox"/> Staff development plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional development calendar	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional model(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum team agendas	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructional audit																						
<input type="checkbox"/> Coaching documentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Observational data from staff	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of instructional rounds	<input type="checkbox"/> Positive behavior supports/character programs																							

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator:		Goal:	
Evidence:			

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board:	Comments by HOS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very effective in working with other school leaders in West Michigan and beyond (SUPs meeting, panel discussions, school visits) Handles student situations in a fair, positive, and unbiased manner Maintains an open door policy that encourages staff and faculty interactions Fosters continuous improvement of staff and faculty (Peer to Peer reviews, Instructional Rounds, performance reviews) Insures curriculum meets or exceeds state standards and parent expectation (Program of Study, Curriculum Night) 	

F. Determining the Professional Practice Rating

Head of School name: Shannon Brunink

School year: 2016/2017

Item	Weight of Category	Category Score (%)	Category Weighted Score
A. Governance & Board Relations	20% (.2)	x	=
B. Community Relations	15% (.15)	x	=
C. Staff Relations	15% (.15)	x	=
D. Business & Finance	20% (.2)	x	=
E. Instructional Leadership	30% (.3)	x	=
Total Possible	100%	Score:	
		Adjusted (Score / 4) =	

G. Other Required Components of Evaluation

Head of School name:

School year:

Student Growth

Weight: 25%

Student growth and assessment data used for Head of School evaluation must be the combined student growth and assessment data used in annual evaluation for the entire school. Schools should establish a student growth model to be used for teacher and administrator evaluations. NOTE: Student growth and student achievement are *not* the same. Student achievement is a *single* measure of student performance while student growth measures the amount of students’ academic progress between *two points* in time¹.

	Ineffective (1pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating
	Fewer than 60% of students met growth targets	60-74% of students met growth targets	75-89% of students met growth targets	90% or more students met growth targets	
Growth:					
Evidence:	School Growth Model				
	Component score:				

* For Head of Schools who are *regularly involved in instruction*, 25% of the annual evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data for years 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018; 40% of the annual evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data beginning in 2018-2019.

¹ Measuring student growth: A guide to informed decision making, Center for Public Education.

Progress Toward School-Wide Goals

Weight: 10%

Progress made by the school school in meeting the goals set forth in the school school’s school improvement plans is a required component for Head of School evaluation.

	Ineffective (1pt)	Minimally Effective (2 pt)	Effective (3 pt)	Highly Effective (4 pt)	Rating
	Progress was made on fewer than 60% of goals	Progress was made on 60-74% of goals	Progress was made on 75-89% of goals	Progress was made on 90% or more of goals	
Progress:					
Evidence:	As indicated in School-Wide Improvement Plan				
	Component score:				

H. Compiling the Summative Evaluation Score

Component	Weight of Component	Component Score (%)	Component Weighted Score
Professional Practice (page 12)	65% (.65)	X	=
Student Growth (page 13)	25% (.25)	x	=
Progress Toward School-Wide Goals (page 13)	10% (.1)	x	=
Total Possible	100%	Total Score:	
		Total Score / 4 =	

Evaluation rating as follows: 90-100% = Highly Effective; 75-89% = Effective; 60-74% = Minimally Effective; Less than 60% = Ineffective

Comments by Board of Trustees:

Comments by the Head of School:

Board President Signature: _____ Date: _____

Head of School Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Head of School's signature indicates that he or she has seen and discussed the evaluation; it does not necessarily denote agreement with the evaluation.)

Appendix A – Research Base

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.

Mid-continent 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.

Appendix B – Process for Completing Year-End Evaluation for Superintendent

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.

Appendix C – Conducting the Formal Evaluation and Conference

Prior to meeting:

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

During meeting:

- 4) Superintendent presents self-evaluation and evidence. Superintendent remains present throughout the meeting.
- 5) Board president reviews with Board of Education superintendent's self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates conversation about performance.
- 6) Score is assigned for each performance indicator via consensus of the Board of Education.
- 7) Upon completion of all performance indicators within all domains, board president calculates overall professional practice score and identifies the correlating rating.
- 8) Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to progress toward district-wide goals.
- 9) Score is assigned for progress toward district-wide goals via consensus of Board of Education.
- 10) Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to district's student growth model.
- 11) Score is assigned for student growth via consensus of Board of Education.
- 12) Board president calculates overall evaluation score based on professional practice, progress toward district-wide improvement goals and student growth ratings.
- 13) Board president makes note of themes/trends identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation.
- 14) Board president calls for vote to adopt completed year-end evaluation for superintendent.
- 15) Superintendent notes his/her comments on evaluation.
- 16) Board president and superintendent sign completed evaluation form.

Appendix D – Considerations Related to the Closed Meeting Exception

Boards of Education may go into closed session for certain aspects of the superintendent’s evaluation but ONLY at the request of the superintendent. A superintendent who has requested a closed session may rescind the request at any time. The following table identifies which aspects of the process need to be in open and closed session:

OPEN PHASE

- Scheduling the evaluation
- Choosing and modifying the evaluation instrument
- Establishing performance goals or expectations
- Determining process for the evaluation
- Voting to go into closed session

CLOSED PHASE ***only if requested by employee***

- Discuss & deliberate about the evaluation

OPEN PHASE

- Adoption of the evaluation
- Related board actions and discussions

Consensus That Involves a Closed Session

1. Superintendent requests a Closed Session for the purpose of his/her evaluation.
2. Board of Education votes to go into closed session.
3. Board of Education moves into closed session: the superintendent remains present throughout the session unless he/she chooses to excuse him/herself.
4. Board president reviews with the Board of Education the superintendent’s self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates a conversation about performance. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for each domain score.
5. Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to progress towards district-wide goals. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for progress towards district-wide goals via consensus of Board of Education.
6. Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to district’s student growth model. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for student growth.
7. Upon completion of all areas, the board president calculates the overall score and identifies the correlating rating.
8. Board president makes a note of themes that were identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation.
9. **Board of Education comes out of Closed Session and returns to an Open Meeting.**
10. Board president reads aloud:
 - The consensus score/rating identified for each performance indicator and the calculated domain scores
 - The score/rating for progress towards district-wide goals
 - The score/rating for student growth
 - And then the overall rating earned by the superintendent. (This may occur at a subsequent meeting.)
11. Board president calls for a vote to adopt the completed year-end evaluation for the superintendent.
12. Superintendent notes his/her comments on the evaluation.
13. Board president and superintendent sign the completed evaluation form.
14. Board president works with the superintendent to coordinate public statement about the superintendent’s performance.

The completed evaluation form reflects the Board of Education’s assessment of the superintendent’s performance and is subject to FOIA.

The forms used by individual board members for notes are not subject to FOIA providing they are not calculated into an average score.

Appendix E – Possible Timelines for Evaluation of the Superintendent

Key dates and deliverables for superintendent evaluation should be mutually agreed upon by the Board of Education and the superintendent at the *beginning* of the evaluation cycle. Timeline scenarios and key benchmark descriptions are provided below.

Jan. – Dec.		July – June		April - March	
Activity	Month	Activity	Month	Activity	Month
Instrument, process, timeline and goals mutually established	January	Instrument, process, timeline and goals mutually established	July	Instrument, process, timeline and goals mutually established	May
Informal update	April	Informal update	October	Informal update	August
Formal discussion and check-in on progress towards goals	June	Formal discussion and check-in on progress towards goals	December	Formal discussion and check-in on progress towards goals	October
Informal update	August	Informal update	February	Informal update	December
Annual evaluation	November	Annual evaluation	May	Annual evaluation	March
Advantage: Aligns with election cycle. Board members who establish goals are likely the same board members evaluating performance.		Advantage: Aligns with the school year. Is compatible with natural flow of the school year as well as hiring cycle for most superintendents.		Advantage: Aligns with contract renewal cycle in many cases. Boards of Education must provide superintendents 90 days’ notice in the event of nonrenewal of contract.	

<p>Beginning of cycle: Board of Education and superintendent mutually agree upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System (instrument) to be used • Timeline and key dates • Goals, benchmarks and evidence • How evaluation will be compiled, i.e., consensus or average • How evaluation will be shared with superintendent • How evaluation will be shared with the community 	<p>Informal update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board president shares any specific questions/concerns from board members • Superintendent provides a written update to the board on goals, expectations and indicators of success • Board offers input on status/progress to-date 	<p>Mid-cycle formal update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board president provides questions from the board prior to meeting • Superintendent provides update on progress with available evidence • Board seeks clarification if needed • Discussion on progress and growth • Adjustments to course or goals are discussed 	<p>Annual evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superintendent performs self-evaluation; presents portfolio with evidence to Board of Education • Board members review portfolio prior to evaluation, seek clarification as needed • Board president or consultant facilitate evaluation • Formal evaluation is presented to and adopted by Board of Education • Board president and superintendent coordinate public statement regarding superintendent performance
---	---	---	---

Appendix F – Establishing Performance Goals for the Superintendent

The MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument provides a framework for evaluating the superintendent in critical areas of professional practice as well as the state-required components of student growth and progress towards district-wide goals. Additional performance goals should be established in exceptional circumstances to clarify the board’s expectations and give priority to the work being done. For this reason, performance goals should be limited in number, aligned to district goals and assist in clarifying accountability.

Superintendent performance goals may be developed from:

- A specific district goal
- A job performance indicator within an evaluation instrument
- Student performance data

When establishing performance goals, the following guidelines should be considered:

- Involve all board members and superintendent
- Decide on desired results
- Develop performance indicators
- Identify supporting documentation (evidence)
- Review and approve final performance goals, indicators and evidence
- Monitor progress at scheduled checkpoints

Performance Goal Fundamentals

Performance goals should be S-M-A-R-T:

Specific—Goals should be simplistically written and clearly define what is expected.

Measurable—Goals should be measurable and their attainment evidenced in some tangible way.

Achievable—Goals should be achievable given the circumstances and resources at hand.

Results-focused—Goals should measure outcomes not activities.

Time-related—Goals should be linked to a specific timeframe.



Process for Goal Development

1. Identify the district goal/priority/indicator/student performance data the superintendent’s goal is intended to support
2. Ask the superintendent:
 - a. What will we see next year toward the accomplishment of this that we don’t see now?
 - b. What measure will we use to know that the difference represents meaningful progress?
3. Allow superintendent time to craft a response
4. Once agreed upon, board and superintendent develop SMART goal statements

Appendix G – 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. See the appendixes of this document for additional artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance.

Appendix H – Possible Evidence of Performance

Evidence helps to demonstrate performance of the superintendent and remove guess work and subjectivity from evaluation. The following artifacts may be used as evidence of performance. The list is not comprehensive.

1 Administrative “calendar”—critical dates calendar (RE: due dates, etc.) and board presentation cycle/annual reports	20 Community survey	40 Equity district-wide program results
2 Administrative team book study (agendas and minutes)	21 Comprehensive School Improvement Plan	41 Evidence of annual review of district’s mission statement and alignment to practice
3 Administrative team meeting agendas	22 Customer satisfaction indices	42 Evidence of implementation of formal project management techniques
4 Affirmative action plan	23 Curriculum team meeting agendas	43 Evidence of relationship building (notes, cards, emails, etc.)
5 Agendas and/or minutes from community planning meetings, including key communicators meetings	24 Curriculum and instructional audit	44 Evidence of teachers examining student achievement data
6 Auditor’s report	25 Data on outreach programs	45 Feedback from a wide variety of stakeholders about performance as the superintendent
7 Background checks verification	26 Department of Education site visit summative report	46 Formal and informal community partnership agreements and plans
8 Board and administrative goals	27 Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Data	47 Formative assessments to inform instruction
9 Board meeting agendas	28 Development of wikis, blogs, etc., to collect feedback on specific issues in the district	48 Grants received/applied for—alignment to goals of the district; sustainability
10 Board policy and administrative policy enforcement that’s reflective of a “new” vision with supporting materials	29 District Budget	49 Growth goals for administrators
11 Bullying/harassment programs	30 District-wide School Improvement Plan	50 Hiring process (guidelines, procedures, schedules)
12 Character education program data	31 Distribution of research to administrative team and teachers	51 House calls—contact with parents and partners (documentation)
13 Civic group presentations	32 Diversity training/awareness plan	52 Induction plan of board members for understanding of school finance (confidence of board members’ understanding)
14 Collaboration/sharing incentives/opportunities for efficiency/effective learning (documentation)	33 Documentation of coaching for instruction, curriculum or assessment	53 Involvement with “school safety” organizations (documentation)
15 Collaborative partners (documentation)	34 Documentation of coaching and evaluation of principals	54 Instructional model
16 Collaborative sharing of programs, etc. (agendas and minutes)	35 Economic vision (participation with community development groups)	55 Instruction-related professional development/growth plans
17 Common teacher instructional planning time	36 Election results that impact tax levies	56 iPod audible book study
18 Communication “vehicles” that make the school vision visible to stakeholders including using technology	37 Emergency/Crisis Plans	57 Job-embedded PD on instruction
19 Communications with parents	38 Employee handbooks	
	39 Enrollment plans	

58 Leadership library (documentation)	75 Observational data from board, staff, etc.	91 Record of solicitation of feedback
59 Level of volunteerism (documentation)	76 Open houses (documentation)	92 Reports and celebrations of student achievement to board and other audiences
60 Linkage of Professional Development Model to student achievement goals (documentation)	77 Opening day PowerPoint-type presentation	93 School comparisons charts from CEPI
61 Log of school visits and conversations with staff (includes emails)	78 Parenting classes—numbers	94 Special Education delivery plan
62 Log of school visits and presentations	79 Parent-teacher conference numbers	95 Staff handbook
63 Meaningful interpretive reports of student achievement data delivered in lay language	80 Participation in social/fraternal organizations (documentation)	96 School Improvement Plans
64 Media—Newsletter/paper articles/website	81 Participation in youth-oriented organizations (documentation)	97 Staff recruitment plan
65 Meeting logs of times with administrative staff/support staff	82 Participation on state, regional, national initiatives (documentation)	98 Student achievement data
66 Membership and service to service clubs (documentation)	83 PBS—Positive Behavior Supports—control/theory/SAFE/Olweus/CHAMPS implementation plans	99 Surveys of staff/community
67 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress Data	84 Podcasts/video communicating district vision and accomplishments	100 Symbolic “pins,” other symbols—celebrations, etc.
68 Michigan Top-to-Bottom School Rankings	85 Policies/procedures for management of funds	101 Teacher mentor program
69 Minutes of the School Improvement Advisory Committee meetings	86 Preschool—community partnership plans	102 Trends in Career Development Plan growth goals for teachers
70 Monthly calendars	87 Presentations to groups, including teachers (shareholders/stakeholders)	103 Work with city council on city/school initiatives (documentation)
71 National Assessment of Educational Progress Data	88 Professional Development Plan	104 Work with School Improvement Advisory Committee (documentation)
72 Needs assessments/satisfaction surveys/focus groups	89 Program evaluation and process result	105 Written communications
73 Notes from state officials	90 Reflective journals	106 Written proposals for innovative practices
74 Number of visits to website		107 Written recommendations on difficult issues

Appendix I – Contingencies

If a superintendent receives a rating of **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. See the appendixes of this document for more information on developing an Individual Development Plan for the superintendent.

If a superintendent receives a rating of **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.

Appendix J – Student Growth

For all superintendents, the evaluation system has to take into account multiple measures of student growth and assessment data. For superintendents who are *regularly involved in instructional matters*—and this includes all but the most exceptional situations—the following specific expectations must be met with regards to student growth:

- 25% of the annual evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data for years 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018
- 40% of the annual evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data beginning in 2018-2019

Student growth and assessment data used for superintendent evaluation must be the combined student growth and assessment data used in teacher annual year-end evaluations for the entire district.

Student Growth Versus Student Achievement

Student growth and student achievement are not the same measurement. Student achievement is a single measurement of student performance while student growth measures the amount of students' academic progress between two points in time.¹

Student Achievement Example: A student could score 350 on a math assessment.

Student Growth Example: A student could show a 50-point growth by improving his/her math score from 300 last year in the fourth grade to 350 on this year's fifth grade exam.

It's important to note that, in order to measure student growth, the data considered must be from a single group of students, i.e., this year's fourth graders and next year's fifth graders.

What is a Student Growth Model?

School districts should establish a student growth model to be used in educator and administrator evaluations. A growth model is a collection of definitions, calculations or rules that summarizes student performance over two or more time points and supports interpretations about students, their classrooms, their educators or their schools.²

Michigan law requires that multiple research-based growth measures be used in student growth models that are used for evaluation purposes. This may include state assessments, alternative assessments, student learning objectives, nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards or based on individualized program goals. (Note: Beginning in 2018-2019, in grades and subjects in which state assessments are administered, 50% of student growth in core areas must be based on state assessments.)

Michigan law also requires that the most recent three consecutive years of student growth data be used for evaluation. If three years of data are not available, available data should be used.

¹ Measuring student growth: A guide to informed decision making, Center for Public Education.

² A Practitioner's Guide to Growth Models, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Appendix K – Developing an Individual Development Plan for the Superintendent

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.

Appendix L – Training

MASB provides training on its 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument to board members and superintendents via a cadre of certified trainers. Training is as follows:

Fundamentals of Evaluation: This training covers the fundamentals of evaluation including legal requirements, essential elements of a performance evaluation system and processes for establishing superintendent performance goals and expectations. This session may not be necessary for participants who have attended Board Member Certification Courses (CBA's) 300 and 301, or who have documented participation in in-district workshops focused on superintendent evaluation conducted by MASB trainers. It is offered at various locations on an individual registration basis or as requested in cooperation with intermediate school districts.

Instrument-Specific Training: This training covers the use of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument including the cycle and processes of evaluation, rating superintendent performance on the rubric, as well as the use of evidence to evaluate superintendent performance. This training fulfills the requirement of evaluator training for board members as well as evaluatee training for superintendents whose districts are evaluating their superintendent with the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. It is conducted on-location in districts with board members and superintendent present.

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 School District
- 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