Assurances Posting

This document provides the information required under Michigan Statute, Sections 1249 and 1249a (MCL 380.1249 and 380.1249a and 380.1249b) of 1976 PA 45, as amended by PA 173 of 2015, Section 1249.b.2. This document may be utilized by all qualified entities that meet and agree to the School ADvance (SA) Licensing Agreement to comply with the Michigan requirement that local school districts (LEAs), Intermediate school districts/educational service agencies (ISDs/ESAs), and Public School Academies (PSAs) must begin posting the assurances required under sub-section 1249.b.2 by the beginning of the 2016-17 school year.

The following content summarizes the manner in which School ADvance complies with each subsection of Michigan PA 173 of 2015, Section 1249.b.2.a-f.

Section 1249.b.2.a: The Research Base

The co-principal investigators for School ADvance™ are Dr. Patricia Reeves and Patricia McNeill. Dr. Reeves is an Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Research at Western Michigan University (since 2004) and served as a Michigan local school district central office administrator and superintendent from 1984-2004. She also served as a contracted associate executive for education policy, leadership development and credentialing and educator evaluation from 2004-2016. Patricia McNeill served as executive director for Michigan ASCD from 2010-2013 and as a Michigan district administrator and assistant superintendent from the mid-1980s through 2010.

Additionally, the two above referenced Co-Principal Investigators and Researchers collaborated with a number of WMU faculty, doctoral assistants, school leaders, other experts in the field, and co-researchers through several major grant projects to develop the research base for the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation system. For a list of some of the major published works that informed the development of School ADvance see ”Research Base References.”

Development and Design of the School ADvance Administrator Frameworks and Rubrics

School ADvance™ is a research-supported framework with tools and training to assist schools and districts in developing an educator evaluation system to support learning, growth, and adaptation for teachers and administrators at the school and district level. School ADvance is also an aligned system of administrator evaluation tools, processes, and training for principals and district leaders (including the superintendent).

The Research and Standards Base

School ADvance was developed in several stages:

1. Dr. Patricia Reeves worked with principal investigators, Dr. Jianping Shen and Dr. Van Cooley of Western Michigan University, under a grant funded by the Wallace Foundation, to study principal practices with an emphasis on evidence-based decision-making. As part of the grant activity, Dr. Shen obtained permission from Dr. Robert Marzano for the development of a multi-rater instrument to assess the extent to which principals monitor the eleven *"What Works in Schools"* (2003) factors that Dr. Marzano and his team of researchers at McREL isolated from a meta-analysis on school level factors with positive associations with student achievement.

   Dr. Reeves constructed the principal rating instrument and, through two consecutive Wallace Foundation grants, Dr. Shen and the grant team systematically used the instrument to collect large data samples. Subsequently, Dr. Shen and two other research associates conducted reliability and validity studies. This tool was disseminated nationally through the Wallace Foundation and selected by the Michigan Department of Education as part of the MI-LIFE Leadership Development Program and the Michigan School Improvement Framework. The tool was also disseminated to the field through specialty endorsement programs sponsored by the school administrator professional associations (Michigan Association of School Administrators [MASA], Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association [MEMSPA], Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals [MASSP], Michigan ASCD, and the Michigan Association of School Boards [MASB].

   Dr. Reeves, subsequently, used the tool as one of the primary sources to inform the constructs and descriptors for development of the School ADvance principal rubrics for which she is co-author. Dr. Marzano also cites this instrument as one of the sources for his "*School Leadership Evaluation Model"* for principals.

2. For the second phase of the work leading up to the creation of the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System, Dr. Reeves and graduate assistant George Aramath, spent two years examining, analyzing and synthesizing, the research literature on performance assessment and feedback systems. They focused particularly on studies that identify characteristics of performance assessment and feedback that can be positively associated with learning, growth, and adaptation. Through an extensive coding and distillation process, Dr. Reeves and Dr. Aramath found strong support for six characteristics of performance assessment and feedback systems that show positive correlations to learning, growth, and/or adaptation.

   The two researchers then organized the six characteristics into a framework for guiding schools and school districts in the design of their educator performance evaluation systems. A synopsis of the six characteristics (principles) is located in Appendix A of this Assurances Document. These six research supported characteristics also became the foundation for development of the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System as detailed in the School ADvance Evaluation User's Guide.

3. Phase three of the work was collaboration between Dr. Reeves and Patricia McNeill, Executive Director of Michigan ASCD, and volunteer internal and external reviewers. In 2010, the two co-authors of the School ADvance Rubrics initiated a search for administrator evaluation instruments that met the requirements of Michigan's educator evaluation statutes. After an extensive review of available instruments for building and district level leaders, the School ADvance authors found the following:
   a. Developmental rubrics for use in administrator evaluations were just emerging and several major researchers had instruments in various stages of development. None of the instruments in rubric format, however, had been in use long enough for the conduct of full validation studies. The review

included both rubrics and rating scales in order to include instruments such as the *Val-ED* rating scale, McREL's *Balanced Leadership* rating scale and the *Data-Informed Decision-Making on High Impact Strategies* Principal rating scale, which have all undergone extensive reliability and validity studies.

b. The research base for the emerging administrator evaluation rubrics was broad and each of the instruments reviewed offered areas of overlap and areas of difference. In other words, they did not map onto each other as a complete match in terms of the research supported elements addressed.
c. The standards base for the instruments was also varied, but the common denominator was the 2008 ISLLC Standards (though the authors found varying degrees of alignment with the Standards). Moreover, the instruments reviewed did not directly address standards related to technology; the inclusion of parent, student, staff and community feedback; and principals' and district leaders' management of the teacher evaluation process (all requirements of the Michigan statute).
d. The instruments reviewed also offered varying degrees of developmental language (i.e., behavioral and/or operational descriptors that represent a clearly identifiable developmental frame where one level of performance builds upon another) and varying degrees of objective versus subjective, value laden, or judgmental language (i.e., observable and/or documentable descriptors versus descriptors that call for judgment or inference).

4. Phase 4 of the process for development of the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System and Rubrics began with the conclusions derived from the phase three review:
    a. There was a need for more comprehensive administrator evaluation rubrics for both principals and central office/superintendent administrators.
    b. There was a need for rubrics that align the work of teachers, principals, and district leaders.
    c. There was a need for rubrics with consistently observable and/or documentable descriptors.
    d. There was a need for rubrics that provide administrators with a clear developmental path for growth, development, and refinement of professional practice.
    e. There was a need for Administrator Evaluation tools and systems that are grounded in research supported principles/characteristics of performance assessment and feedback that supports learning, growth, and adaptation.

    These conclusions became the criteria for creating the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System. The co-authors (Reeves/McNeill) used the following steps in developing and vetting the framework for the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation Rubrics:

    a. The authors created a crosswalk map of the ISLLC (2008) Standards, the State of Michigan preparation standards for school leaders, the National Technology Standards for Administrators (2009), the Learning Forward Standards for Professional Learning (2010 draft/2011 final). The authors next identified state statutory and federal statutory Race to the Top (RTTT) criteria for educator/administrator performance and educator effectiveness and added those requirements or criteria to the framework created by our standards crosswalk map.
    b. Finally, we did a crosswalk of the administrator practice domains, factors, and characteristics published by major authors and research centers: Marzano, et al; McREL, Reeves, D; Hattie & Hallinger; Shen & et al; Leithwood; Stronge; Hoyle; Darling-Hammond; Wallace Foundation, etc. The authors collapsed this cross-walk into four practice and one results domain with aligned factors and characteristics that map onto the standards crosswalk described above (See Appendix B: School ADvance Standards (See Appendix C: Central Office/Superintendent Specialty Endorsement Standards).

c. Next, the authors mapped the research and standards crosswalk tables onto one another to create a broad spectrum of factors and characteristics associated with (a) statutory requirements; (b) state and national standards; and/or research findings connecting administrator practice to positive student outcomes. The authors then collapsed the broad map into five domains (one results domain and four practice domains) to frame both the Principal and the Superintendent/Central Office evaluation rubrics.

5. The final step in the process of building the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation Rubrics was developing the actual developmental descriptors for each characteristic assessed in the rubrics. The descriptors are written in such a way as to establish a clear path of growth from the lowest to the highest ratings of performance for each characteristic. There is no descriptor for ineffective. The authors avoided describing the negative. The absence of observable behaviors described in the first level (minimally effective) places the administrator in the ineffective category for that performance characteristic—a performance status from which an administrator can grow and develop. Each level of development for each characteristic builds deeper levels of practice for that characteristic as the descriptors are read from left to right. All criteria for previous performance levels accrue to the next performance level. Thus, to claim a performance level, the administrator should be able to demonstrate work in that performance level plus the previous performance levels.

School ADvance Administrator Performance Levels

The School ADvance Rubrics are organized around four levels of performance: **Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective, and Ineffective.** The authors give permission to use other comparable performance category terms according to the requirements of Michigan or other state statutes and/or user district preferences (e.g., **Extended, Developed, Basic, Not Yet Addressed**). An administrator may stay in a given developmental level for one or more evaluation cycles depending on the areas of development that are deemed highest priority for addressing the needs of the school in any given evaluation cycle or series of cycles.

Each research validated School ADvance characteristic is described in behavioral terms deriving from detailed descriptions of the work associated with positive school and district results distilled from multiple studies. To create differentiated performance levels for each characteristic, Reeves/McNeill created a developmental key that applies to each characteristic as follows:

1. **Ineffective or Not Yet Addressed:** The administrator is not able to demonstrate, at least, a minimal level of performance in the characteristic at the Basic or Minimally Effective level.
2. **Minimally Effective or Basic:** The administrator can demonstrate work to develop personal knowledge, compliance, and/or ownership sufficient to administer the work associated with the characteristic at a maintenance level.
3. **Effective or Developed:** The administrator can demonstrate work to engage, direct, motivate, and develop the capacity of key staff and stakeholders (i.e. developing their knowledge, ownership, practice, compliance, etc.) to conduct the critical work associated with the characteristic.
4. **Highly Effective or Extended:** The administrator can demonstrate the development, motivation, and empowerment of leaders among key staff and stakeholders to conduct/lead the critical work associated with the characteristic at an extended level; and/or the administrator can demonstrate extended personal leadership for the work associated with the characteristic at a level beyond the scope of responsibility for the position the administrator holds.

Each descriptor for the next performance level builds upon the descriptor for the previous performance level. Additionally, the descriptors in the rubrics articulate increasing levels of performance for each characteristic as per the above developmental key. Users and reviewers are encouraged to spend some time examining the language of the rubrics and the way that language provides a frame for continuous practice and results improvement. Users are also advised that rater and inter-rater reliability are greatly enhanced by the identification of specific evidence that fits the context in which the administrator works.

Ongoing Reliability, Validity, and Efficacy Studies

The first drafts of the completed rubrics were submitted for review by internal and external reviewers with an emphasis on clarity of descriptors, consistency of interpretation, and the ability to either observe and/or document the descriptor. External review included a rigorous review process by the Michigan Council for Educator Effectiveness (MCEE) in 2009 and the New Jersey Department of Education in 2011 with updated review in 2017. User reviews included feedback from trainees and adopters and various focus groups including a focus group for adaptation for ISD/ESA use.

Feedback from reviewers was incorporated into the final 1.0 version of the rubrics and School ADvance began issuing licenses for use of the rubrics in the fall of 2011. Part of the limited license agreement is a provision for the authors to access user data (anonymously) from those districts using the School ADvance rubrics in specified on-line management systems (under a separate limited licensing agreement for management system providers) for further research and development including reliability and validity studies. Since Michigan schools began use of the School ADvance rubrics for the first time in spring 2013, with the bulk of users implementing between 2013 and 2016, the researchers began downloading user data in the summer of 2014 for conducting the validation studies. Also, the co-authors began working through the School ADvance training sessions and facilitated evaluation processes in 2016 to collect data on inter-rater reliability.

The Authors used data from the above referenced processes to make revisions and issue School ADvance 2.0 in the spring of 2018. Validation work is ongoing.

System Components

Domains, Factors, and Characteristics

The School ADvance Administrator Evaluation framework starts with five domains of leadership practice for the principal and five for the central office administrator or superintendent. For all administrators, the first domain (Domain 1) is Results (in Michigan, referenced in Section 1249.b as “student growth”). School ADvance provides a framework for linking results to an administrator’s evaluation that will adapt to a state growth or value added model. The Results domain allows districts to set growth or other improvement targets in a variety of ways, to provide a more robust picture of performance impact. The Results domain is also tied directly to school and district level improvement goals.

The other Four Domains for building and district administrators, including the superintendent,are broadly aligned, but also adapted to fit the differences in both level and scope of responsibility between building level and district administration. Each domain is broken down to performance Factors that correspond to major areas of responsibility found in research for building and district leaders. Within each Factor, there is also a set of 3-5 characteristics derived from deeper analysis of research findings.

Rubric Design

Each of the characteristics of the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation Framework is supported by a set of descriptors that correspond to that characteristic in ways that are observable and/or documentable. The descriptors avoid value-laden words and qualifiers that are not observable or documentable.

The Formative Rubrics

The descriptors in the Formative Rubrics are sufficiently detailed to provide administrators with explicit reference points for their work and for the ways to raise performance levels. Thus, they are useful for self-assessment, establishing a performance profile baseline, providing guidance for the collection of evidence, and developing activities for a performance growth plan.

The Summative Rubrics

The descriptors in the Summative Rubrics collapse the detailed elements from the Formative Rubrics into a summary descriptor that is useful for developing the summative evaluation. The Summative Rubric descriptors are also useful for determining priority performance areas and guiding the performance improvement planning process.

As described in the Research and Standards Basis section of this document (pages 5-9), the authors systematically cross-referenced several sources of research findings and state/national standards (including the 2008 and 2016 ISLLC Standards), and made a map of the cross-referenced standards and the research base for those standards. The authors used the resulting map to determine the specific factors and characteristics for each performance domain in the School ADvance Rubrics for both Principal/School level and Superintendent/Central Office Administrator Evaluations. Since the research on administrator effectiveness does not address performance levels within a characteristic associated with positive impact, the authors used experience and other sources of current literature on the work of school leadership to guide the discrimination between levels of performance for each characteristic. This resulted in the application of the developmental rating key referenced on page 4 of this document.

Other Important Features of the School ADvance Rubrics Based on Multiple Sources of Evidence (collected over time)

The School ADvance Evaluation Rubrics are designed to assist administrators and their evaluators in developing a comprehensive profile of practice and performance. Our collaboration with various web based evaluation management systems has produced an efficient way for administrators and others who contribute observation and feedback data for an administrator's performance review and assessment to upload and link evidence, observations, feedback, and artifacts to the various domains, factors, and characteristics of the evaluation rubrics. The School ADvance training for Educator Evaluation emphasizes use of the developmental rubrics as a high utility "playbook" within which administrators and their supervisors identify priority performance areas linked to district and school improvement goals. The training also emphasizes the importance of building evidence-based portfolios to aid ongoing self-assessment, reflective practice, and alignment of practice to priority school improvement targets, and reliability and validity of supervisor ratings.

Balance Between Demonstration and Inspection

School ADvance recommends a thoughtful balance between demonstration and inspection with a strong locus of control for the person being evaluated. The user training provides assistance to both evaluators and evaluatees for establishing rater and inter-rater reliability through examples of evidence that could support each of the factors and characteristics of the administrator evaluation rubrics. The training also provides practice on having authentic and crucial conversations on: (a) performance and practice priorities; (b) performance and practice growth edges; and (c) performance and practice results. School ADvance recommends that the administrator evaluation tools be supported by a robust educator evaluation management system and be used as the basis for an ongoing conversation between administrators and their staffs and administrators and their supervisors (including the Board of Education).

Quality Feedback from Supervisors

The School ADvance training emphasizes the importance of ongoing dialogue and interaction between administrators and their supervisors around performance and practice priorities and performance results. To assist in making this ongoing dialogue authentic and relevant to the achievement of district, school, program, and performance improvement targets, we recommend that supervisors regularly upload artifacts of their interactions with the school administrators they supervise. These artifacts can include notes from conversations, copies of communications with the administrator, observation notes, and summaries of performance and results conferences. School ADvance maintains a listing of authorized providers of on-line management systems to support efficient use of the School ADvance system and tools. Each of these management systems includes a platform for building the evidence base for an administrator's performance review and development process. These systems keep track of what both the administrator and the supervisor upload into the system.

Assessment of Progress on School or District Level Improvement Goals

School ADvance meets this criterion in two ways: First the administrator evaluation rubrics include a domain for incorporating results into the performance evaluation. There are four components to the Domain 1: Results framework. These four components all require that the administrator work with district leaders (and in the case of the superintendent, the board of education) to establish improvement targets for student results at the district, school, program, and classroom levels. The four-part framework works off of those targets and accounts for four levels of attainment that link back to the administrator's evaluation (see School ADvance Rubrics).

Second, the School ADvance rating system can be used to develop three ways to understand the current status of an administrator's development and performance: (a) an overall performance profile covering all elements in the rubrics;
(b) a priority practice rating for domains, factors and characteristics identified by the employing district as being essential or priority performance areas; and (c) a growth rating that recognizes performance growth.

Finally, to assist the process of producing performance profiles and ratings, School ADvance provides a Summative Rubric, which collapses all the descriptors for a given characteristic into a single summative framework for rating an entire set of descriptors that map on to a summative characteristic (see both the Formative and Summative Rubrics).

Incorporation of Stakeholder (Staff, Student, Parent (and in the case of superintendents, community)

Feedback

School ADvance calls for the incorporation of feedback from teachers and other stakeholders as appropriate to the administrator's position in two ways: First, the system calls for the administrator to upload stakeholder feedback into their evidence documentation. Second, the rubrics for both principal and central office/superintendent evaluations include several areas where feedback is required as part of effective and/or highly effective evidence based or data informed process for school and/or district renewal and improvement and strategic plans.

Focus on Teaching and Learning

Domain 2 includes the responsibility for holding and developing a shared understanding of the school or district's mission for educating students and vision for how the school or district will achieve its mission. Domain 2 also includes the leadership characteristics that build a strong culture for teaching and learning and establish the credibility of the administrator as a leader. Domain 3 of the School ADvance Rubrics addresses two school program factors. The first factor is "High Fidelity and Reliability Instructional Programs. This factor in both the principal and central office/superintendent rubrics provides the details of how building and district leaders are held to performance criteria related to Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment. The expectations for exercising curriculum, instruction, and assessment leadership, along with evidence-based (data informed) decision-making, are a dominant feature in the School ADvance Rubrics. Additional factors throughout domains 3-5 are all focused on developing processes and developing capacity to support a high quality and high reliability teaching and learning program.

Capacity Building

While domain 3 focuses strongly on administrators' oversight of the instructional program (see above), Domain 5, the Human Capacity Factors, provide strong direction for principals and central office administrators to systematically develop the professional capacities of staff with an emphasis on effective instructional practice. Domain 3 of the Principal Rubrics includes the Human Capacity Factors referenced above with an entire section of the rubrics that focuses on the characteristics of Performance Evaluation, Professional Development, and Leadership Development. These sections of the rubrics place emphasis on the development of effective professional practice and the cultivation of leadership capacity among staff and administrators, parents and students, and the board of education.

Collaborative Inquiry

Learning organizations rely on strong collaborative inquiry and learning processes and systems. Domain 4 addresses the ideas of communication, collaboration, inclusion to support the ongoing inquiry and learning process that allow schools as complex systems to continuously renew themselves and refine processes, practices, and systems to support continuous improvement in student outcomes.

Collecting and Using Evidence

Both an Administrator and his/her Evaluator (usually a superintendent, assistant superintendent, or director) will be responsible for collecting evidence (artifacts of practice) to support performance ratings in the five domains of the School ADvance rubrics. Administrators will demonstrate proficiency by collecting, organizing, and reflecting on evidence throughout the year. The evidence should be in direct support of the characteristics in the rubric. When posting evidence to the formative version of the rubrics, administrators and their supervisors should focus on those areas designated by the district as priority performance areas for that position (based on district and school goals) and any designated growth areas for that administrator for that performance review cycle.

Administrators may start the process of building the evidence base for each domain by identifying exemplars of work in the priority areas identified for his/her position from the previous 1-2 years in the position. This can be done in combination with completing an initial self-assessment to create a performance baseline (see Section 1: School ADvance Principal or Central Office Performance Growth Assessment). After the initial self-assessment and first cycle of summative evaluation, administrators should focus on adding evidence that relates to progress toward and/or achievement of the administrator's professional growth plan (which should be aligned to district, school, and performance growth goals). All evidence offered should be linked to one or more performance characteristics in the administrator evaluation rubrics (Formative and/or Summative Rubrics) with annotations indicating how that piece of evidence reflects the characteristics.

The administrator's evaluator is also responsible for submitting evidence to the administrator's performance documentation throughout the year. This evidence can come from observation and/or collection of artifacts. The administrator and evaluator will review all information collected and attempt to reach agreement as to which characteristics in the evaluation rubric the evidence supports. The supervisor must give final approval for determining what sources of evidence to accept to support the performance criteria in the summative evaluation.

Administrators and Evaluators should be cautious about the quality, alignment, and the purpose of all evidence collected. Enough evidence should be collected to support judgments on the summative evaluation. Additionally, evidence offered in support should be of high quality, current, and well aligned with the areas designated for inclusion in the summative evaluation. Administrators should be strategic in selecting evidence that represents best work and avoid over packing the evidence portfolio with redundant, trivial, obscure, outdated, or poorly aligned materials. Being strategic and aiming for quality and clarity rather than volume will keep the documentation process from becoming cumbersome for both the administrator and the evaluator.

Examples of Evidence

1. **Observations –** There are two basic sources of observations:
    1. Observing the administrator directly in a large range of circumstances (e.g., leading staff or administrative team meetings; professional learning communities; data team meetings; meeting with parents; presenting to the Board of Education or Parent Organization; meeting with individual teachers; etc.)
    2. Observing systems and processes that the administrator has established (e.g., professional learning communities; data teams; professional development programs; communications, data collection and analysis; performance evaluations; parent/student/community engagement; etc.)

2. **Artifacts of Practice** – As referenced above, artifacts should be selected that provide direct evidence of the key work the administrator is doing (has done) for a given performance characteristic. This can include products resulting from an administrator's work that serve as exemplars of that administrator's key work for that evaluation cycle.

3. **Feedback Data** – Feedback data is useful for understanding how others experience the work of the school leader. Where possible, feedback data should align directly with specific performance characteristics and related to specific areas of school conditions, culture, processes, practices, and/or procedures the person(s) providing the feedback has actually experienced.
    1. Teacher Feedback Data (e.g., validated multi-rater assessments of the administrator's work; school culture and climate assessments; school leadership capacity assessments, assessments of how teachers are experiencing specific initiatives, etc.)
    2. Student Feedback Data (e.g., exit surveys, culture and climate assessments; school program and process assessments; etc.)

3. Parent and Community Feedback (e.g., parent engagement surveys; school satisfaction surveys, etc.)

4. **Student Results Data**
    1. Student Achievement Evidence (e.g., national, state, and/or local student assessment results; sub-group and sub-test data; pre-post gains/losses; actual vs. projected growth; etc.)
    2. Student Engagement Evidence (e.g., attendance, behavior, and participation data, etc.).
    3. Student Accomplishments (e.g., completion of advanced or specialized courses; dual enrollment; awards and recognitions; matriculation and graduation; etc.)
    4. Validated Measures of student efficacy, motivation, persistence, etc.

A single artifact and/or data set may provide evidence of an administrator's practice across a range of factors and characteristics in the rubric. Collection, management, and sharing of performance evidence are best facilitated through an on-line management system that:

1. Provides each administrator with a password protected personal evaluation workspace that contains the Formative Rubrics, Summative Rubrics, and space to upload and link artifacts/data sets to one or more items in the rubrics.
2. Provides each supervisor with access to the evaluation files of persons assigned to him or her for evaluation input and feedback.
3. Provides each supervisor the means to upload observation notes and performance evidence to the evaluation files of the persons they evaluate.
4. Provides both the person being evaluated and the evaluator access to the same body of evidence to support performance dialogue.

Tips for Gathering Feedback Data for Administrator Evaluation

Best practices for including perception data and other parent/staff/student feedback for the purposes of administrator evaluation suggest the following:

- Feedback from staff/students/community should relate closely to goals that have been set for the school/district and administrator leads.
- Feedback pertaining to the work of a superintendent should relate to performance goals previously set with the board and the superintendent should be credited for any growth on district improvement and strategic plan goals.
- Internal feedback from students and teachers should be (a) based on what the respondent actually experiences; and (b) have links to research supported factors pertaining to either conditions in the school and/or the student and teacher experiences in the school (or district).
- External feedback on school and district improvement goals should be gathered on a systematic basis related to the goals and priorities of the school and the district. This feedback, then, becomes relevant data for an administrator's performance portfolio and evaluation if that administrator has been actively involved in work to achieve those goals and priorities.
- Feedback on an administrator's work should not be based on "opinions about the administrator"; rather feedback should be based on targets for improving school or district performance in specific areas designated as priority areas for the school/district the administrator to lead or contribute to positive change.
- Feedback for evaluation should come from multiple sets of data gathered over time and examined for trends.
- A good rule of thumb when seeking stakeholder feedback: Avoid asking questions on issues the administrator has no power to influence; that the respondent has no direct experience upon which to base a response, or are not relevant to established goals and priorities for the administrator.
- If referring to a bank of model surveys, use only questions that offer information about work going on in YOUR district.

Examples:

Look for goals that directly target areas where teachers, students, parents, and community members can provide valuable feedback. For instance:

- If the goal is to raise awareness about a certain initiative or program or measure how much the community understands and supports it, feedback questions should relate to the questions of awareness and understanding. This would indicate if the key administrators responsible for the initiative are doing an effective job communicating with stakeholders about the initiative (this includes the board).
- If the goal is to improve the learning culture of the school or district, student/staff perception data about the learning environment would indicate how effective principals and central office administrators have been in making targeted changes in the school or district culture.
- If the goal is to increase parent involvement, perception data regarding parents' level of comfort in approaching district administrators will indicate how effective administrators and teachers have been with being accessible, responsive, etc.
- If the goal is to expand the status of shared leadership, perception data on how stakeholders perceive the current conditions of shared leadership could help understand how effective an administrator has been in cultivating an inclusive environment and sharing leadership responsibilities.

- If the goal is for students to feel more ownership in their own learning and to feel more empowered as learners, student feedback on a validated efficacy and empowerment instrument could provide evidence of the effectiveness of certain strategies the leader had been working to implement.

There are an infinite number of examples, but the common thread should be that stakeholders are asked to provide feedback on what they actually experience and observe. If surveys and rating scales ask stakeholders for feedback on things they (a) do not understand; (b) have not experienced; or (c) have not directly observed over time, those surveys and rating scales can misinform and mislead evaluations of programs, services, schools, districts, and administrators. If the items on the survey instruments and rating scales are misaligned to the school/district goals and priorities, the feedback on those items can divert attention from those goals and priorities.

A summary of possible existing data sources:

- Feedback from parents collected by schools or district
- Student surveys (including exit surveys)
- Feedback from community regarding particular initiatives and/or programs
- Feedback from Title I or other programs (choose questions that relate to specific issues under the influence of the administrator being evaluated)
- Community satisfaction surveys (choose questions that relate to specific issues under the influence of the administrator being evaluated)
- Previous or currently used rating scales from validated instruments (choose items or scales that relate to specific issues under the influence of the administrator being evaluated)

Caution: Be very careful about asking parent and community stakeholders to "rate" or "score" an administrator's performance **directly**. Very few people would know enough about the actual work of an individual administrator to provide valuable, actionable feedback across a broad range of performance related issues. It is better to seek targeted feedback on specific conditions and stakeholder experiences that relate directly to goals and priorities for administrators and their sphere of influence. Remember also to be careful and avoid "personality" based surveys and instruments as it is virtually impossible to control administration of them in such a way that they will yield valid and reliable information.

Training and Support
School ADvance offers a comprehensive program of training support: goschooladvance.org/training-opportunities/

The Evaluation Frameworks and Rubrics
School ADvance offers evaluation frameworks and rubrics for building, district, including superintendents, and non-instructional administrators, plus support staff at all levels. To access examination copies for review please go to: goschooladvance.org/evaluation-tools/

Appendix A

Comprehensive Instructional Personnel Performance Review and Evaluation Systems Conclusions from a Review of the Literature

Introduction

This document is offered as a general guide and framework for districts seeking to build a comprehensive system that (a) meets the intent and the letter of statutory, policy, and research-based performance evaluation practices; (b) reflects the research on effective performance assessment, development, and assessment practices; and (c) can be managed with available people resources. To achieve all three, this system framework emphasizes individual responsibility for building a body of evidence that can be used to evaluate each teacher's and administrator's work and guide their professional growth. The system framework also emphasizes a collaborative process between the individual being evaluated, supervisors, and peers. Finally, this system framework establishes performance review and improvement as a key school improvement function in the school and school district, which completes the triad of (1) District Improvement Plans; (2) Building Improvement Plans; and (3) Individual Improvement Plans. In each of the critical elements identified below, the link between these three levels of improvement should be explicit.

The Framework – School ADvance is designed in accordance with the following research supported six principles or characteristics found in a review of the literature on effective performance assessment and feedback systems:

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

The above framework provides six general principles or critical elements for developing a ***Comprehensive Personnel Performance Review and Evaluation System for School Leaders, Teachers, and other Personnel***. The pages of this appendix provide a definition for each of the six characteristics or principles in the framework along with the research supported tools and strategies provided by School ADvance to support that characteristic or principle.

With these elements, this framework can assist teachers, administrators, and boards of education in answering the three important questions for their own work.

1. Where am I in the development of my practice and impact?
2. Where do I need to grow next to meet the priority needs of my school, district, or classroom?
3. How will I further develop my practice for increased positive impact?

Moreover, the same general principles that shape this framework also align with the broader research on student learning and can be applied to a system of student evaluation as well. In districts seeking systemic responses to achieving better results, this alignment can be an important feature.

Studies on the Principle of Authentic

Definition: The System recognizes and rewards the use of evidence-based practice to achieve better student outcomes

Tools – Sets of research-validated standards: observation protocols and guides, research validated performance assessments, work samples

Strategies – Ideas for putting the principle or characteristic to work in the district performance assessment and feedback system

1. **Examine performance through the lens of research validated performance and practice standards utilizing multiple sources of practice evidence**
2. **Insure that the standards and validated practices are current and interpreted contextually**

***Sources* – Studies that offer support for each specific principle or characteristic**

Kimball, S. M. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16(4), 241-268.

Summary: Standards-based teacher evaluation systems constitute a performance competency model with the potential to improve instruction by affecting teacher selection and retention, motivating teachers to improve their skills, and promoting a shared conception of good teaching.

Teachers from in this study, which was conducted across three districts, generally saw the system's standards, procedures, and outcomes as fair.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Qualitative case study of three school districts with similar evaluation systems

Topic:
Validity of Standards-Based Evaluation Systems

Key Findings:
1. Teachers in this study conducted across three districts generally saw the systems standards, procedures, and outcomes as fair.
2. The new systems based on Danielson's framework for teaching established more structure, provided increased opportunities for teacher input and dialogue, and drew on multiple data sources for evaluation decisions.

Odden, A. (2004). Lesson learned about standards-based teacher evaluation systems. *Peabody Journal of Education 79*(4), 126-137.

Summary: Provides evidence that standard-based teacher evaluation scores are useful for research based on measuring teacher effects on student learning. This study shows links between higher evaluation scores with greater value-added student learning gains.

Teachers' scores from well-designed, practice-based teacher evaluation systems could be considered measures of instructional practice that can be used in studies that try to identify the effects of communities, schools, and teachers on student learning.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2006). What are principals expected to do? Congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(3), 221-237.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative and qualitative methods of content analysis in examining principal evaluation instruments in 132 school districts in Virginia.

Key Findings:

1. Five major categories of standards emerged:
    a. Facilitation of vision
    b. Instructional program
    c. Responsibilities related to organizational management
    d. Responsibilities related to community relations
    e. Language that addressed responsibility to the larger society
2. Greatest emphasis was found around responsibilities related to instructional quality and staff/parent communication, followed by managing a school budget and analyzing test results.
3. Inconsistencies were present in evaluation instruments Implication:

This study shows the need for school districts to align their principal evaluation instruments with both state and professional *standards*; whereby reducing role conflict and consequent role strain.

Quotations:
"Evaluation instruments are powerful tools for influencing the behavior of principals, reinforcing the adage 'that what gets measured is what gets done'" (p. 231).

Milanowski, A. (2004). The relationship between teacher performance evaluation scores and student achievement: Evidence from Cincinnati. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 33-53.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative study analyzing relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student achievement (within Cincinnati Public Schools with 48,000 students and 3,000 teachers in more than 70 schools).

Purpose Statement:
To analyze the relationship between teacher evaluation system (based on standards framework of Danielson's (1996) Framework for Teaching) and student achievement (based on value-added framework)

Key Findings:

1. Evaluation system based on a set of teaching standards derived from the Framework for Teaching (Danielson, 2006). Sixteen performance standards were grouped into four domains.
2. Teachers were evaluated using the rubrics based on two major sources of evidence: six-classroom observations (4 completed by teacher evaluators and 2 by principals and assistant principals), and a portfolio prepared by teachers.
3. Considerable training for teachers and evaluators were given first; only those who met standards for evaluators were allowed to evaluate.
4. End results showed that scores from a rigorous teacher evaluation system can be substantially related

to student achievement and provide criterion-related validity evidence for the use of the performance

evaluation scores as the basis for a performance-based pay system or other decisions with consequences for teachers. (Results showed an average correlation of 0.27 for science, 0.32 for reading, and 0.43 for mathematics).

Implications:

1. Results support the use of the assessment system as a basis for teacher evaluation and pay differentiation and other human resource management purposes such as needs assessment for professional development or performance remediation.
2. Results also suggest that teacher evaluation scores may be useful as representation of teaching practices that affect student learning (for relatively rigorous, *standard*-based systems).

DiPaola, M., & Stronge, J. H. (2001). Superintendent evaluation in a standards-based environment: A status report from the states. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15*(2), 97-110.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative study using data collection process and interviews

Purpose Statement:
To determine to what extent the performance criteria in current practice of superintendent evaluation were compatible with the professional *standards*.

Key Findings:

1. Many of the evaluation processes currently in use have their roots in scientific management with printed rating forms (checklists) and management by objective.
2. The essential criterion most absent from state standards was the accuracy standard, which requires valid, reliable, and systematic data, free from bias.
3. No information on the extent of school board training in the evaluation method was seen. Implications:
    1. It is critically important that board members be trained adequately to evaluate superintendents especially since turnover in the ranks of school board members are high.
    2. Greater compatibility among evaluation instruments, actual duties of the superintendent, and the *standards* that guide the profession.

Quotations:
"An evaluation framework focusing on multiple data sources and clearly-defined job responsibilities is advocated as a vital component of comprehensive superintendent evaluation" (p. 98).
Those models "that have the greatest potential to meet the essential criteria for quality personnel evaluation include duties-based evaluation, superintendent portfolios, and the use of student outcome measures." (p. 106).

Condon, C., & Clifford, M. (2010). *Measuring principal performance: How rigorous are commonly used principal performance assessment instruments? A quality school leadership issue brief.* Learning Point Associates. 1120 East Diehl Road Suite 200, Naperville, IL 60563-1486. Tel: 800-252-0283; Fax: 630-649-6722; Web site: http://www.learningpt.org.

Key Findings:

1. Principal standards include six domains that deal with the following areas: setting vision for learning, developing learning culture, ensuring effective management, collaboration, acting in ethical manner, and understanding political, social, legal, and cultural context.

2. In scanning 20 school principal performance assessments, few have been rigorously developed with differing approaches to assessing school principal performance (such as focusing evaluation based on seeing principals as change facilitators vs. another system that focused on principals as instructional leaders). Plus, these assessments took differing approaches to data collection.
3. Principal performance assessment data will achieve desired ends if principals and supervisors view the data as credible and actionable and give assessment data considerable weight during principal performance evaluations.

Borman, G. D., & Kimball, S. M. (2005). Teacher quality and educational equality: Do teachers with higher standards-based evaluation ratings close student achievement gaps? *Elementary School Journal, 106*(1), 3.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Used standards-based evaluation ratings for about 400 teachers and achievement results for over 7,000 students from grade 4-6 in Washoe County, Nevada .
Purpose Statement:
To investigate the distribution and achievement effects of teacher quality in Washoe County

Key Findings:
1. Classrooms with high concentrations of minority students were taught by teachers with lower evaluation scores
2. Teachers with higher evaluation scores made progress in closing the achievement gaps separating poor and non-poor children in reading and math

Implication:
If a key component of teacher quality is an ability to close achievement gaps, national efforts should place more high-quality teachers in high-poverty Title I schools.

Gallagher, H. A. (2004). Vaughn Elementary's innovative teacher evaluation system: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 79-107.

Summary: Study provides evidences for the validity of standards-based rubrics to measure teaching practices related to student learning. For instance, results indicated a strong, positive and statistically significant relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student achievement in reading and a positive relationship was seen in math achievement as well. Variations of results are due to both teachers and evaluators having a more pedagogical knowledge and better alignment to *standards* and assessment in reading than in math.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Assessing teacher education: The usefulness of multiple measures for assessing program outcomes. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(2), 120- 138.

Key Findings:
Effective evaluation tools are organized into two parts:

1. Perceptual data on what candidates feel they have learned in the program (through surveys and interviews of teachers).
2. Independent measures of what they have learned (data from pretests and posttests, performance assessments, work samples, employers' surveys, and observations of practice).

Quotation that supports use of multiple sources of evidence:

"Although each [measurement tool] has limitations, we have found them powerful in the *aggregate* for shedding light on the development of professional performance and how various program elements support this learning" (p. 135).

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 60-79.

Purpose Statement:
To evaluate different parts of an evaluation system, pointing out deficiencies in each with recommendations.
Key Findings:

1. Researchers conclude that *multiple* data sources should be included in teacher evaluation, with procedures that are well designed and conducted correctly as well for these various data sources. It is important to remember that no individual data source is available for each kind of teacher.
2. Main areas of teacher evaluation system are summarized below:
    a. Teachers should be included in system development and vigorous, multiple, and variable data systems are needed.
    b. Problem is limitations of test scores for some teachers and expenses in good commercial scoring.
    c. Formative evaluations provide information that shapes practice while summative evaluations make decisions about teachers such as retention, advancement, and dismissal. Therefore, these two functions need separate procedures and persons who perform them. But the problem is difficulty in allocating the people and time to achieve distinct separation. Therefore, justification of costs should be based on effects on student learning.

Quotations:
"No single data source is valid for every teacher in a school, and no individual data source is available for each teacher" (p. 63).

Epstein, J. L. (1985). A question of merit: Principals' and parents' evaluations of teachers. *Educational Researcher, 14*(7), 3-10.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative study using multiple regression analysis of parent and principal ratings of teachers (from 11 school districts in Maryland with 1,051 parents and 20 principals for seventy-seven 1st, 3rd, and 5th grade teachers)
Purpose Statement:
To discover how parents and principals rate the same teacher and how these two raters contribute to the system.

Key Findings:

1. Parents and principals emphasize different aspects of teaching in judging teachers' merit, with principals looking at situational factors vs. parents who are influenced by teacher connection with families and quality of classroom life their children experience.
2. Teachers earn higher ratings from parents when they use parent involvement activities more often, send more communication home, and maintain good classroom discipline.

Quotations:
"Because there is no single set of skills that perfectly define effective teaching, measures of *many* aspects of teaching by multiple judges are likely to yield the fairest and most comprehensive evaluation of teachers" (p. 8).

DiPaola, M. F. (2007). Revisiting superintendent evaluation. *School Administrator, 64*(6), and 18.

Summary: According to the author, because board members have limitations and a superintendent's job is complex, multiple data sources are needed, including formal observation, informal observation, district goal achievement, student achievement gains and client satisfaction (survey data).
Quotations:
"A fair and unbiased evaluation of superintendent performance must be based on *multiple* sources of data that reflect performance in the many facets of the position."

Hershberg, T., & Robertson-Kraft, C. (2010). Rewards and supports. *School Administrator, 67*(3), and 28-31.

Purpose Statement:
To describe the most effective and valid pay-for-performance system

Key Findings:

1. First of all, evaluation systems should take a balanced approach, using *multiple* sources of data to gauge teacher effectiveness.
2. It must use both outputs, that is empirical data from value-added assessment, and inputs, that is observational data from sophisticated performance frameworks.
3. For outputs, the measure should be based on growth, the progress students make over the course of the year; and then the effectiveness of instruction can make an important empirical contribution to teacher evaluation. This system should use multiple years of data, include students with incomplete records, and account for contributions of other teachers, and judge on criteria.
4. For input data, it should include observations that are carried out by using sophisticated protocols instead of subjective judgments, and rubrics that are used to differentiate among levels of performance.

Other Quotations for this topic:
Gallagher, H. A. (2004). Vaughn Elementary's innovative teacher evaluation system: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 79-107.

Vaughn's knowledge and skills based pay system "contains an understanding of teaching as a cognitively complex activity; it uses *multiple* sources of data on teacher performance, has a content-specific understanding of high-quality teaching, and uses multiple evaluators" (p. 87).

Yonghong, C., & Chongde, L. (2006). Theory and practice on teacher performance evaluation. *Frontiers of Education in China, 1*(1), 29-39.
“multidimensional” (p. 29)

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., Gareis, C. R., & Beers, C. S. (2003). The efficacy of portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development: Do they make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(5), 572-602.

“inclusively as one significant source of information in a multiple data source system of evaluation” (p. 593).

DiPaola, M. F. (2007). Revisiting superintendent evaluation. *School Administrator, 64*(6), and 18.
"A fair and unbiased evaluation of superintendent performance must be based on multiple sources of data that reflect performance in the many facets of the position" (p. 8).

McGreal, T. L. (1982). Effective teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership, 39*(4), 303-305.
“Use of alternative sources of data (including observations)” (p. 304).

Kane, T. J., Taylor, E. S., Tyler, J. H., & Wooten, A. L. (2010). *Identifying effective classroom practices using student achievement data. NBER working paper no. 15803.*National Bureau of Economic Research. 1050 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138-5398. Tel: 617-588-0343; Web site: http://www.nber.org.libproxy.library.wmich.edu.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative study of peer review tied to student achievement at Cincinnati district from 2000 to 2009 school years (approximately 21,000 students in grades 3-8 in 2000 school year).

Key Findings:

1. Cincinnati's Teacher Evaluation System (TES) uses teacher evaluators who are given research-based evaluation rubric with multiple classroom *observations* taking place during a year (4 by trained peer

evaluators and 1 by local administrator).

2. TES rating system based on Charlotte Danielson's rubric with four domains, 15 standards, and 32 elements of effective teaching.
3. Results showed *classroom observations* can capture elements of teaching that are related to student achievement (positive and non-trivial relationship).

Protheroe, N. (2002). Improving instruction through teacher observation. *Principal, 82*(1), 48-48-51.
Purpose:
To provide examples of programs to teach principals effective classroom observation and teacher- evaluation techniques; emphasizes link between teacher evaluation and professional development.

Findings:

1. Effective teacher observation can not only assess teacher competency but also help them improve their practice. This happens through ongoing teacher observations that are explicitly tied to teachers' professional growth and professional development.
2. The observation process has to be differentiated to accommodate the needs of different teachers, ranging from those who require intervention or remediation to those who excel but want support for ongoing learning and growth.
3. Teachers will change their thinking and behavior if they feel safe and supported by the teacher-principal relationship, and if focused descriptive records of actual teaching and learning events are the basis for reflection by both teacher and principal during post-conferencing.
4. Establishing professional standards for instruction is also vital.
5. Training for principals on how to observe and provide rich feedback on teacher-student interaction and delivery of instruction ... especially when performance is not meeting standards.

Gallagher, H. A. (2004). Vaughn Elementary's innovative teacher evaluation system: Are teacher evaluation scores related to growth in student achievement? *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 79-107.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative and qualitative study by using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to estimate value-added teacher effects and then analyzing documents and conducting interviews with teachers.

Key Findings:

1. Results indicate a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship between teacher evaluation scores and student achievement in reading
2. For math, a positive, although not statistically significant relationship is seen
3. This variation of results is due to teachers and the evaluators, who are conducting the *observation*, not having a more pedagogical knowledge and better alignment to standards and assessment in reading than in math.

Implication:
Using subject-specific *observations* conducted by evaluators who have expertise in instruction of the subject they are evaluating can improve the validity of the teacher evaluation system.
Quotations:
Vaughn's knowledge and skills based pay system "contains an understanding of teaching as a cognitively complex activity; it uses multiple sources of data on teacher performance, has a content-specific understanding of high-quality teaching, and uses multiple evaluators" (p. 87).

Mujis, D. (2006). Measuring teacher effectiveness: Some methodological reflections. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 12*(1), 53-74.
Summary: Classroom observations are able to capture information about teachers' instructional practices. "The

detailed recording of actual behaviors possible during classroom observation allows for fine-grained exploration of

behaviors, which would be hard to achieve in survey-style studies" (p. 58) It can track a teacher's growth and suggest needed professional development.

Jacob, B., & Lefgen, L. (2006). When principals rate teachers: The best--and the worst--stand out. *Education Next, 6*(2), 58-64.

Purpose Statement:

To find out how effective are principals in evaluating teachers when compared to student achievement:

1. A positive correlation is seen between a principal's assessment of how effective a teacher is at raising student achievement with a value-added approach (0.32 for reading and 0.36 for math).
2. Despite principals' success with the top and bottom of the distribution, principals are significantly less successful at distinguishing among teachers in the middle of the ability distribution.

Implication:

Principals are able to identify the very best teachers and the least competent teachers, but their "inability to distinguish between a broad middle range of teacher quality suggests caution in relying on principals for fine-grained performance determinations" (p. 5).

Setting Student Growth Standards Based on Academic Assessments

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). No child left behind and high school reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 76*(4), 642-667.

Summary: Author provides evidence for states and schools to utilize performance assessments that motivate student achievement and measure learning more effectively. One method includes "using value- added measures of individual student progress rather than cross-sectional averages that compare one year's scores to the next" (p. 661).

Hershberg, T. (2004). The revelations of value-added: An assessment model that measures student growth in ways that NCLB fails to do. *School Administrator, 61*(11), 10.

Summary: Value-added assessment approach isolates the impact of instruction on student learning, thereby providing detailed information at the classroom level.

Quotation: ". . . value-added assessment also will serve as the foundation for an accountability system at the level of individual educators" (p. 14).

Sanders, W. L. (2000). Value-added assessment from student achievement data: Opportunities and hurdles. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 14*(4), 329-339.

Summary: The author of this study submits that a rigorous value-added assessment approach is the fairest, most objective way to hold districts and schools accountable. This value-added type model is a vast improvement from raw test score averages of the past.

Milanowski, A. (2004). The relationship between teacher performance evaluation scores and student achievement: Evidence from Cincinnati. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 33-53.

Summary: Results support the use of the assessment system as a basis for teacher evaluation and pay differentiation and other human resource management purposes such as needs assessment for professional development or performance remediation.

Studies About Work samples and Evidence of Results.

Clare, L., & Aschbacher, P. R. (2001). Exploring the technical quality of using assignments and student work as indicators of classroom practice. *Educational Assessment, 7*(1), 39-59.

Summary: The reliability and consistency of the assignment ratings from this study produced statistically significant results. Results also indicate that the quality of the assignments was statistically significantly associated with the quality of observed instruction and *student work*. The authors conclude that this method shows promise for use in large-scale evaluation settings and identifies important dimensions of practice that could support teacher self-evaluation and reflection.

Matsumura, L. C., Garnier, H., Pascal, J., & Valdes, R. (2002). Measuring instructional quality in accountability systems: Classroom assignments and student achievement. *Educational Assessment, 8*(3), 207-229.

Summary: This study explored the quality of classroom assignments piloted in the Los Angeles Unified School District's proposed new accountability system. Study results indicated a fair level of agreement among the raters who scored the assignments and a high level of internal consistency within each dimension of assignment quality. Article concluded that the *classroom assignment* measure appears to be measuring important aspects of instructional practice that make a difference in student learning and achievement.

Borko, H., Stecher, B. M., Alonzo, A. C., Moncure, S., & McClam, S. (2005). Artifact packages for characterizing classroom practice: A pilot study. *Educational Assessment, 10*(2), 73-104.

Summary: Pilot studies were conducted in a small number of middle school science and mathematics classrooms to provide initial information about the reliability, validity, and feasibility of *artifact* collections as measures of classroom practice. The studies yielded positive results, indicating that the associated scoring guide have promise for providing accurate representations of what teachers and students do in classrooms.

Other Quotations on this topic:

Olebe, M., Jackson, A., & Danielson, C. (1999). Investing in beginning teachers--the California model. *Educational Leadership, 56*(8), 41-44.
"Teachers who look at student work to inform teaching choices are teachers who can have an impact on student achievement" (p. 3).

McGreal, T. L., Broderick, E., & Jones, J. (1984). Artifact collection. *Educational Leadership, 41*(7), 20-21.

“Random samples of student efforts on these artifacts should be collected” (p. 21).

Studies on the Principle of Professional

Definition of Professional: The System builds personal commitment and efficacy for growth and improvement
Tools: Performance assessment tools (self and external), S.M.A.R.T Goals, Professional Development Plans PDPs)
Strategies:

1. **Conduct and regularly update self-assessments**
2. **Maintain a comprehensive performance and growth profile**
3. **Identify high priority growth edges**
4. **Develop personal growth plans**
5. **Maintain performance portfolios of high quality evidence:** This body of work can be used by evaluators and/or subjected to a juried process of review against the accepted performance and practice standards for that position in that school (district). See below under “combination of supervisor and peer review” (p. 21)

Sun, M., & Youngs, P. (2009). How does district principal evaluation affect learning-centered principal leadership? Evidence from Michigan school districts. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*(4), 411-445.
Type of Research & Methodology:
This quantitative study utilized Hierarchical Multivariate Linear models to investigate relationships between principals' behaviors and district principal evaluation system (included 13 districts in Michigan with 19 administrators surveyed in 2006-07 and 138 principals; included 49 elementary schools, 17 middle schools, and 19 high schools).
Purpose Statement: To investigate relationships between principals' behaviors and district principal evaluation purpose, focus, and assessed leadership activities

Key Findings:

1. Principals are more likely to engage in learning-centered leadership behaviors when:
    a. The purposes of evaluation included principal professional development, school restructuring, and accountability
    b. The focus of evaluation was related to instructional leadership
2. When evaluation addressed leadership in *school goal setting*, curriculum design, teacher *professional development* and evaluation, and monitoring student learning

Implications:

1. These results indicate the need for districts to go beyond using evaluation results for personnel or salary decisions but employ them to determine principal *professional development*, promote school restructuring efforts, and hold leaders accountable for student learning.
2. The focus of evaluation seems to affect the extent to which principals engaged in Learner-Centered Leadership

Holtzapple, E. (2003). Criterion-related validity evidence for a standards-based teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 17*(3), 207-219.
Summary: Study provides evidence for validity of standards-based rubrics to provide substantive feedback to teachers to productively inform the direction of their *professional development*.

Castallo, R. (1999). Superintendent evaluation. *American School Board Journal, 186*(8), 23-26.
Purpose Statement:
To determine more adequate systems for evaluating superintendents
Key Findings:

1. Like rubrics that provide criteria and examples the teachers can compare against a student's work so as to make an assessment, the board should *establish goals* for the superintendent to achieve, then design rating system to give the superintendent clear ideas for improving performance in that area (also called the Rubric Approach).
2. Together, the board and superintendent should select evaluation criteria and determine the tools and methods for collecting data to support the evaluation.

Quotations:
"By not providing insights, feedback, and constructive criticism, board members deprive their superintendent of the opportunity to grow" (p. 26).

Studies Related to Performance Portfolios:

Jun, M., Anthony, R., Achrazoglou, J., & Coghill-Behrends, W. (2007). Using ePortfolioTM for the assessment and professional development of newly hired teachers. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning, 51*(4), and 45-50.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Qualitative study using surveys (150 early-career teachers & 45 administrators) and in-depth reflection journal for 25 randomly-selected teachers.

Purpose Statement:

To report the findings of Teacher Education Program at the University of Iowa by addressing the teachers' and administrators' perception of using ePortfolio for teacher evaluation

Key Findings:

1. 90% of administrators indicated they would encourage their teachers to build and maintain ePortfolio because it offers them the advantage of having constant access to their teachers' samples while offering teachers prompt feedback.
2. 70% of teachers confirmed the benefit of easy access and updates as they made revisions or additions to their portfolio during review. Other teacher benefits include ample storage space, an efficient organizational scheme, portability, interactive presentation capability, and multiple linkage opportunities.
3. 78% of teachers and 90% of administrators reported easier communication about materials collected for the performance review.

Quotation:
"The extent to which an ePortfolio will have a positive impact on teacher quality depends on both the teacher and administrator involved in the evaluation process" (p. 50).

Pecheone, R. L., Pigg, M. J., Chung, R. R., & Souviney, R. J. (2005). Performance assessment and electronic portfolios: Their effect on teacher learning and education. *Clearing House, 78*(4), 164.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative study using surveys after six months of using pilot study at three University of California campuses submitting their teacher portfolios electronically (72 participants: 50 students, 9 supervisors, 12 scorers).

Key Findings:
Positive:

1. Feature found most valuable by teachers was capacity to get supervisor feedback online while still working on the portfolio
2. Feature found most valuable by supervisors was capacity to work on the portfolio from any computer via the web
3. 78% of supervisors and 72% of students thought that completing the portfolio electronically was either slightly or much more valuable than completing it on paper and by videotape

Negative:

1. Time consuming technical problems such as formatting inconsistencies, large files, etc.

Implications:

2. Adequate training is vital in the use of any new system and periphery technologies
3. Importance of establishing standards for portfolio and file formats, size, and video compression

Quotation:
"What is needed, in part, are electronic platforms that seamlessly and effectively enable users to upload portfolio artifacts and share their work with peers and faculty supervisors for formative feedback and review" (p. 175).

St. Maurice, H., & Shaw, P. (2004). Teacher portfolios come of age: A preliminary study. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 15-25.

Type of Research & Methodology:
Survey sent to 75 school administrators to collect data about their value of teacher portfolio. Purpose Statement:
To discover the opinions about administrators' uses of teacher portfolio and whether they were prepared to use them in evaluating teachers.

Key Findings:

Though administrators are not opposed to portfolios, the portfolio development process seems to depend on voluntary situations. In other words, though a large number of administrators reported reviewing portfolios in recruitment (77%) and were prepared to use portfolios for all beginning teachers (77%), only 29% reported that they now review teacher portfolio as part of their required evaluations of teaching.

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., Gareis, C. R., & Beers, C. S. (2003). The efficacy of portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development: Do they make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(5), 572-602.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Mixed design of qualitative and quantitative strategies (portfolio review, surveys, focus groups, and archival record analysis) within WJC County school district in Virginia, which used portfolios in their review for 3 years
Purpose Statement:
To determine the efficacy of portfolios in the evaluation of teacher performance for accountability and professional development purposes

Key Findings:
1. Portfolio system was particularly useful in documenting teacher performance in areas of assessment and professionalism
2. Helped administrators in making finer distinctions about quality of teacher performance ("broader and richer portrayal" p. 594)
3. Though teachers and administrators saw portfolios as fair and accurate measures of performance, an area of concern is feasibility in the time demands for its development

Quotation: "One implication is that collecting data on portfolios is a huge and complex task" (p. 22).

Attinello, J. R., Lare, D., & Waters, F. (2006). The value of teacher portfolios for evaluation and professional growth. *National Association of Secondary School Principals.NASSP Bulletin, 90*(2), 132-132-152.
Summary: This study examines the value of a district-wide, portfolio-based teacher evaluation system across 19 school districts at all levels. Results indicate that teachers and administrators perceive that a teacher portfolio were more accurate and comprehensive than the traditional snapshot observation and suggests that portfolios show promise as a tool for teacher evaluation and professional growth.

Other Quotations:
Beck, J., & Weiland, L. (2001). Teacher portfolios: Pathways to teacher empowerment. *Science Scope, 24*(6), 60-63.
"A learning portfolio's primary purpose is to help teachers reflect on what they have learned, set goals, and highlight their growth and progress toward those goals" (p. 61).
"As a communication tool, portfolio development establishes a collaborative relationship between the administrator, the teacher, and others" (p. 63).

Hackmann, D. G., & Alsbury, T. L. (2005). Standards-based leadership preparation program improvement through the use of portfolio assessments. *Educational Considerations, 32*(2), 36-45.
"...paradigm shift to a learner-centered approach to instruction . . . necessitates a similar shift from assessments used to monitor learning to assessments used to promote and diagnose learning" (p. 36).

Professional work samples, web pages, FaceBook, tuning protocols, student work:
Note: Sources given above (under “work samples and evidences of results”; pg. 12)
And student achievement data:

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 60-79. Key Findings:

1. Researchers conclude that multiple data sources should be included in teacher evaluation, with procedures that are well designed and conducted correctly as well for these various data sources. It is important to remember that no individual data source is available for each kind of teacher.
2. *Pupil Achievement*: the need for adjusted gain scores is critical (difference between pre- and post-instruction test scores). Plus, teachers should be included in system development and vigorous, multiple, and variable data systems are needed.
3. Problem is limitations of test scores for some teachers and expenses in good commercial scoring.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining "highly qualified teachers": What does "scientifically- based research" actually tell us? *Educational Researcher, 31*(9), 13-25.

Key Findings:

Several aspects of teachers' qualifications have been found to bear relationship to student achievement including:

- general academic and verbal ability
- subject matter knowledge
- knowledge about teaching and learning as reflected in teacher education courses d) teaching experience

Quotations:

"Studies using *value-added student achievement data* have found that student achievement gains are much more influenced by a student's assigned teacher than other factors like class size and class composition" (p. 13).

Hershberg, T. (2004). The revelations of value-added: An assessment model that measures student growth in ways that NCLB fails to do. *School Administrator, 61*(11), 10.

Type of Research & Methodology:

Descriptive study of value-added approach

Topic:

Value-added Assessment

Key Findings/Implications:

1. Value-added isolates the impact of instruction on student learning, thereby providing detailed information at the classroom level.
2. Article also includes examples from 3 school districts that have used value-added systems with positive results in increased student learning.
3. Only when educators understand the power of value-added approach can they learn to guide instruction and professional development to see significant learning gains in their students.

Quotations:

"...value-added models 'might actually provide less-biased and more precise assessments of teacher effects'" (p. 14).

". . . value-added assessment also will serve as the foundation for an accountability system at the level of individual educators" (p. 14).

Sanders, W. L. (2000). Value-added assessment from student achievement data: Opportunities and hurdles. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 14*(4), 329-329.

Type of Research & Methodology:

Descriptive study of value-added approach

Topic:

Value-added Assessment

Key Findings/Implications:

1. Value-added isolates the impact of instruction on student learning, thereby providing detailed information at the classroom level.
2. Article also includes examples from 3 school districts that have used value-added systems with positive results in increased student learning.

Ginsberg, R., & Thompson, T. (1992). Dilemmas and solutions regarding principal evaluation. *Peabody Journal of Education, 68*(1), 58-74.

Key Findings:
Because the nature of the work principals preform is difficult to specify for traditional evaluation schemes (since it's situational and principals are faced with myriad of expectations):

1. Evaluating principals requires a more through and experientially grounded approach where process and product evaluation are combined into one model
2. This model is the "Consumer-Oriented Outcome-Based Principal Evaluation", which is made up of:
3. Evaluation is not based on preset standardized goals but instead is *outcome-based* (i.e. principals given opportunity to document accomplishments; also test results, drop-out and attendance rate, etc.)
4. consumer-oriented: teachers and students are particularly key contributors to evaluation of performance (through surveys, interviews, etc.)

Kearney, K. (2005). Guiding improvements in principal performance: ACSA and WestEd have developed a community of practice aimed at finding ways to improve principal guidance, support and evaluation. *Leadership, 35*(1), 18.

Key Findings:

1. The point of quality leadership is to ensure improved teaching and *increased student achievement*; this can serve as a filter for sorting what is really important
2. California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders identified research-based behaviors that most frequently *yield positive student results*.
3. What is needed is standard-based, rigorous, fair and likely to bring coherence to the overall *accountability* system.

Other Quotations:

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 12-15.

"collect and submit artifacts from their practices in individual portfolios" *[Note: these artifacts serve as boy of evidence* (pg. 14).

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., Gareis, C. R., & Beers, C. S. (2003). The efficacy of portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development: Do they make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(5), 572-602.

"selection of artifacts provided valid *evidence* to administrators that professional responsibilities are being met" (p. 592).

Beck, J., & Weiland, L. (2001). Teacher portfolios: Pathways to teacher empowerment. *Science Scope, 24*(6), 60-63.

"artifacts should demonstrate growth . . . acquisition of a particular skill, competency, or piece of knowledge" (pg. 61).

Studies on the Principle of Purpose Driven

Definition of Purpose Driven: The System is driven by measurable improvement targets for student success Tools – Student work, student achievement data, other sources of student results (attendance, behavioral, participation, academic, perception, etc.)

Strategies:

1. **Each individual completes a district approved profile of student results for their work and participates in a process of identifying targets for improved student results. This can be done with**

a supervisor and/or through a combination of supervisor and peer review.

2. **Performance priorities for each person are based on priority school and/or district improvement priorities**

Goldstein, J. (2005). Debunking the fear of peer review: Combining supervision and evaluation and living to tell about it. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 18*(4), 235-252.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Mixed method longitudinal study of one urban district's peer assistance and review (PAR) program through interviews and surveys (involved 10 coaches who supported 88 teachers across 28 schools)
Topic:
Peer Review (combining supervision and
evaluation) Purpose Statement:
To discover if combining supervision and evaluation is a conflict of interest as some scholars would argue.

Key Findings:
1. Despite the combination of formative and summative assessment done by their coaches, the participating teachers reported a high degree of trust in their coaches.
2. The few teachers who did not report a high degree of trust in their coaches were low-performing teachers.
3. Study also confirmed that trust is a strong predictor of reported help received, and in turn reported likelihood to continue teaching.

Implication:
Ongoing assessment should match serious critique with support for improvement since a coach usually can give a more accurate appraisal than a one-time skilled observer.
Quotation:
"If we are serious about the dual purpose of teaching evaluation--improving instruction and ensuring quality- -then educators should spend less time concerned with providing 'unconditional support' for teachers and more time creating the conditions for quality teaching" (p. 249).

Kane, T. J., Taylor, E. S., Tyler, J. H., & Wooten, A. L. (2010). *Identifying effective classroom practices using student achievement data. NBER working paper no. 15803.*National Bureau of Economic Research. 1050 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02138-5398. Tel: 617-588-0343; Web site: http://www.nber.org.libproxy.library.wmich.edu.
Type of Research & Methodology
Quantitative study of *peer review* tied to student achievement at Cincinnati district from 2000 to 2009 school years (approximately 21,000 students in grades 3-8 in 2000 school year).
Topic:
Peer Review tied to student achievement
Purpose Statement:
To find out the validity of peer review in recognizing effective teaching tied to student achievement.

Key Findings:
1. Cincinnati's Teacher Evaluation System (TES) uses teacher evaluators who are given research-based evaluation rubric with multiple classroom observations taking place during a year (4 by trained peer evaluators and 1 by local administrator).
2. TES rating system based on Charlotte Danielson's rubric with four domains, 15 standards, and 32 elements of effective teaching.
3. Results showed classroom observations can capture elements of teaching that are related to student achievement (positive and non-trivial relationship).

Peterson, K. D., Kelley, P., & Caskey, M. (2002). Ethical considerations for teachers in the evaluation of other teachers. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16*(4), 317-324.

Purpose Statement:

To explore ethical behavior for teachers serving in the evaluation of colleagues and to propose topics for ethical behavior for these teachers

Key Findings:

1. In evaluating peer review materials from various programs, no explicit codes of ethics were found
2. Author believes that teacher evaluation activity warrants the "unique and necessary perspective of a classroom teacher" (p. 321).
3. Sample statements of ethical guidelines at end of article includes the following four sections: preamble, ethical activity in teacher colleague evaluation means that teachers DO, ethical activity in teacher colleague evaluation means that teachers limit their behavior by NOT, & ethical activity in colleague evaluation means that teachers MAY.

Quotations:

"Involving teachers in the evaluation of colleague teachers shares control and direction for teacher performance documentation, values, and standards with other evaluation system participants such as administrators and policy makers". (p. 321).

Studies on the Principle of Adaptive –

Definition of Adaptive:
The System fosters exploration, action research, self-assessment, reflective practice Tools:

1. **School ADvance processes for adapting performance priorities to current contextual conditions, goals, and priorities**
2. **S.M.A.R.T. Goals, action research plans, Individual Development Plans (PDPs), Differentiated Instruction Plans**

Strategies:

1. **Develop comprehensive school and district performance profiles**
2. **Identify school and district performance growth priorities**
3. **Match administrator performance priorities to school and district growth priorities**
4. **Each individual develops performance improvement plans that account for variations in student characteristics, learning profiles, and special needs.**

Hackmann, D. G., & Alsbury, T. L. (2005). Standards-based leadership preparation program improvement through the use of portfolio assessments. *Educational Considerations, 32*(2), 36-45.

Key Findings:

In this qualitative study, many artifacts were more theoretical in nature, demonstrating limited connections to administrative practice. But analysis of students' reflective writings showed understanding of content knowledge and skills.

Recommendations:

Include requiring students to include citations from literature base within their reflections in order to promote connections to practice. Another recommendation is providing opportunities to guide students' self-reflection of high quality artifacts.

Quotations:

"...paradigm shift to a learner-centered approach to instruction . . . necessitates a similar shift from assessments used to monitor learning to assessments used to promote and diagnose learning" (p. 36).

Olebe, M., Jackson, A., & Danielson, C. (1999). Investing in beginning teachers--the California model. *Educational Leadership, 56*(8), 41-44.

Key Findings:

1. The first building block is to encourage new and veteran teachers to use a common language to talk about teaching (thus the creation of six domains of teaching with five to six elements each)

- The second building block to quality is to provide a common set of scales that describe teaching practice at different levels in light of the teaching standards (thus a scale with four levels of practice).
- The formative assessment system relies on two assessment modes for collecting evidence of teaching: formal peer observations and structured inquiries with an individual induction plan for mapping future professional development.
- This creates a cycle of planning, teaching, reflecting, and applying.

Quotations:

"Teachers who look at student work to inform teaching choices are teachers who can have an impact on student achievement" (p. 3).

Studies on the Principle of Data Informed
Definition of Data Informed:
The System uses multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data tied to student achievement and evidence based practice

Tools:
Digital tools for data capture, access, and system components

Strategies:

1. **Build the capacity to aggregate, interpret, and portray multiple sources of performance and impact evidence in a secure, interactive, and easy to navigate digital environment.**
2. **Provide professional development and technical assistance to help users achieve comfort and success with the system.**
3. **Professional development and technical support with a feedback loop for continuous refinement and development of the data system.**

Studies for this Principle are maintained under a separate literature report and updated regularly.

Studies on the Principle of Inclusive

Definition of Inclusive:
The *System serves all, with alignment between student, teacher, administrator, and board evaluation goals, strategies and processes*

Heneman, H. G., & Milanowski, A. T. (2004). Alignment of human resource practices and teacher performance competency. *Peabody Journal of Education, 79*(4), 108-125.

Summary: Article presents a framework illustrating the alignment of educational HR management practices to a teacher performance competency model, which in turn is aligned with student achievement goals. The article also identifies and illustrates the various HR practices that could be aligned to the performance competency model and to each other. These HR practices include recruitment, selection, induction, mentoring, professional development, compensation, performance management, and instructional leadership.

Kimball, S. M. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 16(4), 241-268.

Summary: In this qualitative study of three school districts with similar teacher

evaluation systems, the author writes: "Alignment of organizational resources can maximize the impact of teacher evaluation systems" (p. 252). In this type of system, various aspects of the human resource systems all work together to promote a common vision of instruction.
"Human resource alignment around evaluation system standards of teaching will help improve teacher and administrator acceptance and knowledge of the standards and feedbacks based on the standards" (p. 263).

Pecheone, R. L., Pigg, M. J., Chung, R. R., & Souviney, R. J. (2005). Performance assessment and electronic portfolios: Their effect on teacher learning and education. *Clearing House, 78*(4), 164.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Key Findings: Positives:
Quantitative study using surveys after six months of using pilot study at three University of California campuses submitting their teacher portfolios electronically (72 participants: 50 students, 9 supervisors, 12 scorers).

1. Feature found most valuable by teachers was capacity to get supervisor feedback online while still working on the portfolio
2. Feature found most valuable by supervisors was capacity to work on the portfolio from any computer via the web
3. 78% of supervisors and 72% of students thought that completing the portfolio electronically was either slightly or much more valuable than completing it on paper and by videotape

Negative:
Time consuming technical problems such as formatting inconsistencies, large files, etc.
Implications:

1. Adequate training is vital in the use of any new system and periphery technologies
2. Importance of establishing standards for portfolio and file formats, size, and video compression

Quotation:
"What is needed, in part, are electronic platforms that seamlessly and effectively enable users to upload portfolio artifacts and share their work with peers and faculty supervisors for formative feedback and review" (p. 175).

Jun, M., Anthony, R., Achrazoglou, J., & Coghill-Behrends, W. (2007). Using ePortfolioTM for the assessment and professional development of newly hired teachers. *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning, 51*(4), 45-50.
Purpose Statement:
To report the findings of Teacher Education Program at the University of Iowa by addressing the teachers' and administrators' perception of using ePortfolio for teacher evaluation
Key Findings:

1. 90% of administrators indicated they would encourage their teachers to build and maintain ePortfolio because it offers them the advantage of having constant access to their teachers' samples while offering teachers prompt feedback.
2. 70% of teachers confirmed the benefit of easy access and updates as they made revisions or additions to their portfolio during review. Other teacher benefits include ample storage space, an efficient organizational scheme, portability, interactive presentation capability, and multiple linkage opportunities.
3. 78% of teachers and 90% of administrators reported easier communication about materials collected for the performance review.

Quotations:
"benefits of ePortfolio for easy access and updates" (p. 47)
"The extent to which an ePortfolio will have a positive impact on teacher quality depends on both the teacher and administrator involved in the evaluation process" (p. 50).

Heath, M. (2005). Are you ready to go digital?: The pros and cons of electronic portfolio development. *Library Media Connection, 23*(7), 66.
Summary:

There is an increasing need for educators to have professional portfolios, which are considered to be authentic tools for evaluating the knowledge, skill, beliefs and attitudes of prospective educators. Electronic portfolios are gaining in popularity and their relative pros and cons are examined.
Quote:
“electronic portfolios are much easier to reproduce, distribute, and access” (p. 66).

Sawchuk, S. (2010). Teacher evaluation. *Education Week, 30*(7), 5.
Summary:
One of the key components of this report is the recommendation of evaluation systems to have regular feedback. Evaluations should encourage frequent observations and constructive critical feedback.
Quotation:
“even the most elegantly designed system will need to be improved over time ...district leaders should make any necessary adjustments to the design or implementation of the evaluation system every year.” (p. 9).

Hope Street Group (2010). Policy 2.0. Using open innovation to reform teacher evaluation systems.

Summary:
The team of researchers gathered by Hope Street began by wrestling with the challenge of defining effective teaching and agreed that “no teacher is effective unless students are growing.” The report then lists
refinement and development of the teacher evaluation system as one of their eight key components of recommendations.
Quote:
“Teacher evaluation systems themselves must be periodically evaluated and refined” (p. 9).

Stein, R. F. (1995). Superintendent evaluation--more than a technical process. *Journal of School Leadership, 5*(2), 183-196.
Purpose Statement:
Key Findings:
To determine how to take into consideration many perspectives and the need for correcting deficiencies in the evaluation system when completing the evaluation process.
District should have a process in place for correcting deficiencies and coping with the consequences of a critical evaluation by considering the symbolic, human resource, and political frame.

Summary
The six principles or key characteristics included in the School ADvance framework for effective performance assessment and feedback are grounded in the assumption (supported by research) that evaluation is not something we do to people; rather, it is a process of adaptive learning and growth that requires an internal locus of control:

Campbell, R. J., Kyriakides, L., Muijis, D., & Robinson, W. (2003). Differential teacher effectiveness: Towards a model for research and teacher appraisal. *Oxford Review of Education, 29*(3), 347-362.

Summary: This study presents the need for a differential teacher evaluation model that incorporates five dimensions of differences related to:

1. teacher activity, outside as well as inside the classroom
2. curriculum subject
3. pupil background factors
4. pupil personal characteristics
5. cultural and organizational contexts of teaching

Darling-Hammond, L. (1983). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 53*(3), 285-285-328.
Summary: This article concludes that there are four minimal conditions for a successful implementation of a teacher evaluation system:

1. All stakeholders in the system have a shared understanding of the criterion and processes for teacher evaluation
2. All stakeholders understand how these criteria and processes relate to the dominant symbols of the organization, that is, there is a shared sense that they capture the most important aspects of teaching, that the evaluation system is consonant with educational goals and conceptions of teaching work
3. Teachers perceive that the evaluation procedure enables and motivates them to improve their performance; and principals perceive that the procedure enables them to provide instructional leadership
4. All stakeholders in the system perceive that the evaluation procedure allows them to strike a balance "between adaptation and adaptability, between stability to handle present demands and flexibility to handle unanticipated demands" (Weick, 1982, p. 674); that is, that the procedure achieves a balance between control and autonomy for the various actors in the system.

Prestine, N. A., & McGreal, T. L. (1997). Fragile changes, sturdy lives: Implementing authentic assessment in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33*(3), 371-400.
Summary: The author of this article calls for a change in the culture of schools such that local control is given to each school with flexible parameters for growth and developing new ways of encouraging, supporting, and protecting diverse approaches to changes.
Quote: “Changes work best when they are decided on by the level responsible for implementation” (pg. 397).

Brown, G., Irby, B. J., & Neumeyer, C. (1998). Taking the lead: One district's approach to principal evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 82*(602), 18-25.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Qualitative study within Judson ISD (Texas) of their Administrative Portfolio Appraisal System through interviews with 6 administrators and three follow-up focus groups (two with central admin. and one with all principals)

Key Findings:

1. The Portfolio system is more effective than the previous checklist system b/c it is *personalized and individualized*. It keeps the focus on goals and self-evaluation.
2. The Administrator Portfolio Appraisal System addressed current systems' weaknesses by stressing *self-assessment*, collegial-evaluation processes, refocusing and planning, and informed practice. The program promoted unity and trust among all administrators, fostered open dialog, helped principals focus on goals, and validated positive coaching and mentoring outcomes.

Quotation: "We need to have a philosophical change; this is moving from an old dictatorial system to one of collaboration" (p. 22).

Other Quotations for “adaptive learning”:
Hazi, H. M., & Rucinski, D. A. (2009). Teacher evaluation as policy target: Viable reform venue or just another tap dance? *ERS Spectrum, 27*(3), 31-40.
“encourage local interpretation and flexibility” (p. 38).

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 60-79.
“appropriate to each individual” (p. 63).

Pennington, M. C., & Young, A. L. (1989). Approaches to faculty evaluation for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(4), 619-646.
“contextual factors” (p. 643).

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 12-15.
"differentiated system" (p. 13).

McGreal, T. L. (1982). Effective teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership, 39*(4), 303-305.
"amount of flexibility" (p. 303).

Other Quotations for "locus of control":

Peterson, K. (2004). Research on school teacher evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin, 88*(639), 60-79.
"individual choice" (p. 67).

Danielson, C. (2001). New trends in teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 12-15.
"place teachers in more active and professional roles" (p. 13).

Tucker, P. D., Stronge, J. H., Gareis, C. R., & Beers, C. S. (2003). The efficacy of portfolios for teacher evaluation and professional development: Do they make a difference? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(5), 572-602.
"teachers in our study felt empowered by the greater role they played in their own evaluation. In order to take responsibility for their own learning, growth, and performance, individuals need to know (a) Where am I right now in my learning and performance? (b) Where should I focus next to learn, grow, and improve? (c) How should I proceed to reach that next level of performance?" (p. 593).

Collaborative analysis of multiple sources of evidence
Sources already given above, plus:

Davis, S. H., & Hensley, P. A. (1999). The politics of principal evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13*(4), 383-403.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Qualitative study involving in-depth interview with twenty administrators in Northern California (14 principals and 6 superintendents)
Purpose Statement:
To obtain firsthand knowledge of how principals and superintendents perceive the evaluation process in their district
Key Findings:

1. Most principals did not find the formal evaluation process helpful in shaping or directing their professional development or in promoting school effectiveness.
2. Superintendents generally agreed that formal evaluation processes provided useful and meaningful information about principal performance.
3. Principals evaluation methods lack consistency in terms of content, process, and purpose with little observations (only "snapshot" views)
4. Evaluation tends to emphasize district-wide goals or superintendent goals vs. specific school site goals and/or developmental needs, which tends to homogenize principal performance goals throughout district

Implications:

1. Principal evaluation needs to be clear, consistent, and purposeful
2. Principals should take an *active role* in all phases of the evaluation process to *help shape and set job performance goals and objectives*.

"Principals must take an active role in all phases of the evaluation process . . . Active involvement implies that principals must make an effort to help shape both the evaluation process and job performance goals and objectives". (p. 401).

Goldstein, J., & Noguera, P. A. (2006). A thoughtful approach to teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 63*(6), 31-37.
Quote: ". . . cooperative approach, in which the district administration and the teachers union share responsibility for supporting and evaluating teachers in the program." (p. 35).

DeSander, M. K. (2000). Teacher evaluation and merit pay: Legal considerations, practical concerns. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 14*(4), 307-317.
Summary: In building an effective teacher evaluation system, the study establishes that the following practical concerns should be met:

1. Teacher support of the system must be established
2. Teacher participation in the development and implementation to build integrity and ownership in the system.

Quote: "The increasing success of merit pay evaluation systems demonstrate that it can work when there is legal integrity in the system, adequate financial commitments and a collaborative and collegial development and implementation process" (p. 315).

Epstein, J. L. (1985). A question of merit: Principals' and parents' evaluations of teachers. *Educational Researcher, 14*(7), 3-10.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative study using multiple regression analysis of parent and principal ratings of teachers (from 11 school districts in Maryland with 1,051 parents and 20 principals for seventy-seven 1st, 3rd, and 5th grade teachers) Topic: Parent evaluation; multiple judges in evaluation
Purpose Statement:
To discover how parents and principals rate the same teacher and how these two raters contribute to the system
Key Findings:

1. Parents and principals emphasize different aspects of teaching in judging teachers' merit, with principals looking at situational factors vs. parents who are influenced by teacher connection with families and quality of classroom life their children experience.
2. Teachers earn higher ratings from parents when they use parent involvement activities more often, send more communication home, and maintain good classroom discipline.

Quotations:
"Because there is no single set of skills that perfectly define effective teaching, measures of many aspects of teaching by multiple judges are likely to yield the fairest and most comprehensive evaluation of teachers" (p. 8).

Wilkerson, D. J., Manatt, R. P., Rogers, M. A., & Maughan, R. (2000). Validation of student, principal, and self-ratings in 360 degree feedback (registered) for teacher evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 14*(2), 179-192.
Type of Research & Methodology:
Quantitative study measuring relationship between student achievement (with pre- and post-tests) to teacher performance measured by principals, students, and self-ratings by teachers (988 students, 35 teachers, and 4 principals).
Purpose Statement:
To measure whether a relationship exists between student achievement on a criterion-referenced tests and performance ratings of teachers by their students, selves, and principals.
Key Findings:
The best predictor for student achievement on the criterion-referenced tests was student ratings, with high, positive correlations in all three core subject areas (more valid feedback than teachers or principals)
Implication:
Student feedback as practiced in this study is relatively inexpensive, much less than the expense of clinical supervision methods performed by a principal.
Quotations:
"Evaluations based on inputs from a full circle of appraisers are being referred to as 360 degree feedback" (p. 181).

"Feedback from teachers, peers, and parents is needed to complete the circle" (p. 190).

Other Quotations:

McGreal, T. L. (1982). Effective teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership, 39*(4), 303-305.

Summary: Author suggests that different requirements for tenured and non-tenured teachers: for non-tenured teachers, goals are established with regular observations in 2 to 3 day consecutive visit sequence with student descriptive data collected. Focus should be on improving instruction with teachers being an active participant in goal-setting process and data sources that are related to established goals.

Quote: “cooperative activity” (p. 304).

Beck, J., & Weiland, L. (2001). Teacher portfolios: Pathways to teacher empowerment. *Science Scope, 24*(6), 60-63.

“as a communication tool, portfolio development establishes a collaborative relationship between the administrator, the teacher, and others” (p. 63).

Other Sources on Purpose driven improvement that aligns with the purposes of the school and school district

Namit, C. (2008). Sharpening a district's leadership model. *District Administration, 44*(13), 54-59.

Purpose Statement:

To compare traditional school board governance model with the policy governance model Key Findings:

1. Under Carver's Policy Governance model, the board sets up a process in which each board member takes a turn at assessing the work of the board at each meeting and the school board also conducts an annual self- assessment, usually in March.
2. Under the Policy Governance model, an efficient method for performing board self-assessment is to have board members anonymously fill out a survey ranking the board's performance of each governance process policy on a scale and encouraging comments.
3. The traditional governance model evaluates the superintendent in the middle of the school year and at a final summative evaluation. However, in the Policy Governance model, the superintendent is evaluated throughout the year.
4. This is accomplished by requiring the superintendent to give the board 20-30 monitoring reports- -periodic reports that update the board on the superintendent's implementation of the policies-- regarding different board policies.
5. The board must evaluate each monitoring report
6. The annual summative evaluation is a review of all the school board's Ends and Executive Limitation monitoring reports.

Quotations:

"'Integrating a superintendent evaluation process with a school board self-assessment has helped us build a stronger team around a *common set of expectations*,' according to Rick Schulte, superintendent of the Oak Harbor (Wash.) School District." (p. 58).

"When the school board and superintendent integrate the board self-assessment, superintendent evaluation, and *goal development processes*, this pulls together the thinking of the leadership team in setting its priorities, while establishing a road map for success." (p. 59).

Hoyle, J. R., & Skrla, L. (1999). The politics of superintendent evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13*(4), 405-419.

Purpose Statement:

To explore the politics of superintendent evaluation and provide strategies for improvement Key Findings:

1. Massive inconsistencies in current superintendent evaluation practices are seen with only 50% of evaluations that follow the criteria in job descriptions and input from sources other than the board only included in 10% of evaluations.

Recommendations by author include:

2. Clarifying the evaluation process at contract time (how often, what evidences used, who will evaluate, etc.)
3. Base evaluation on the job description and *district strategic plan* (a well thought-out job description should be closely *aligned with district vision*)
4. Use multiple sources of data and clearly delineate the data-gathering process (360-degree feedback model of gathering stakeholder inputs)
5. Use the best criteria for evaluating superintendent performance (ex. AASA Professional Standards for the Superintendency that's tailored for specific district)
6. Combined board-superintendent Training

Quotations:

"The old saying 'what gets measured gets done' is pertinent to the goals that should be embedded in both the superintendent's job description and the district's strategic plan." (p. 415).

Banks, P. A., & Maloney, R. J. (2007). Changing the subject of your evaluation. *School Administrator, 64*(6), 10.

Purpose Statement:

To find methods of making superintendent evaluation less subjective

Key Findings:

1. Evaluation must shift focus from the superintendent to the district as the subject of evaluation (i.e. evaluate the superintendent based on district performance) with tightly focused organizational performance measured by clearly defined outcomes for students.
2. Steps for implementation include: board setting expectations, board monitoring organizational performance monthly by looking at each performance area, superintendent reports performance data with evidences, and board evaluation
3. Evaluation dialogue focused on organizational questions (e.g., are we accomplishing our most important *district goals*?) vs. personal and political ones (e.g. how did the superintendent do this year?).

Other Quotations:

McGreal, T. L. (1982). Effective teacher evaluation systems. *Educational Leadership, 39*(4), 303-305.

“data sources should relate to the established goals” (p. 305).

Disagreement (The Other Side):

Hazi & Rucinski, 2009. “investing in time to build teacher knowledge would be more productive” (p. 38).

Appendix B

School ADvance Standards Alignment Document 1
The School ADvance Administrator Evaluation rubrics incorporate domains of practice and/or performance criteria that align to the 2008 ISLLC (2015 2.0) Professional Standards for School Leaders developed by the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium in the following manner.

Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

ISLLC – Function	School ADvance Domain/Factor	School ADvance Characteristic
A) Collaboratively develop and implement shared vision and mission	2) Leadership: Vision for Learning and Achievement	*Shared Vision*: Solicits and includes staff, parents, students, and community input in creating a shared vision for the school
B) Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning	2) Leadership: Leadership work and Behavior	*Informed:* Ensures that school goals are based on evidence of need from school and student data and works with staff to examine and interpret multiple sources of evidence from school and student data in setting goals
C) Create and implement plans to achieve goals	2) Leadership: Leadership work and Behavior	Informed: And works with staff to develop high fidelity school improvement plans
D) Promote continuous and sustainable improvement	2) Leadership: Leadership Work and Behavior	*Strategic and Systemic*: And ensure that individual staff establish both short and long term priorities for their work based on school and district goals and ensures that the school maintains focus on priorities
E) Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans	2) Leadership: Leadership work and Behavior	*Informed*: And develops evaluation plans for selected strategies that include the collection of school and student data to monitor and adjust implementation as needed to achieve the school goals

Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

ISLLC- Function	School ADvance Domain/Factor	School ADvance Characteristic
A) Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations	3) Programs: High Quality/Fidelity/Reliability Instructional Programs	*Instruction*: An establishes regular times and places for teachers to collaboratively plan and review instruction based on observations and evidence of student learning
B) Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program	3) Programs: High Quality/Fidelity/ Reliability Instructional Programs	*Curriculum*: Ensures that all staff have and are using curriculum documents including essential performance standards, learning objectives and other curriculum references for their grade level, content and program areas
C) Create a personalized and motivating learning environment for students	3) Programs: High Quality/Fidelity/Reliability Instructional	Instruction: And works with staff to identify student needs for differentiated learning and respond with differentiated instructional strategies to meet those

	Programs	needs
D) Supervise instruction	5) Systems: Human Capacity Development	*Performance Evaluation*: And makes regular classroom visits, providing formal and informal feedback to teachers and uses classroom visits to monitor the effectiveness of curriculum implementation, instruction and assessment practices
E) Develop assessment and accountability systems to monitor student progress	3) Programs: High Quality/Fidelity/ Reliability Instructional Programs	*Assessment*: Works with staff to develop and consistently utilize assessments to monitor and report on student learning
F) Develop the instructional and leadership capacity of staff	5) Systems: Human Capacity Development	*Leadership Development*: And develops a collaborative culture where all building staff share responsibility and

		leadership for student and school success and provides training, resources and support
G) Maximize time spent on quality instruction	3) Programs: High Quality/Fidelity/ Reliability Instructional Program	*Instruction*: Makes classroom observations to monitor and encourage quality instructional practices
H) Promote the use of the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning	5) Systems: Technology Integration and Competence	*Learning and Teaching w/Technology*: And ensures that staff have the necessary training, support, and direction to use instructional technology as designate and/or appropriate for student mastery of the district curriculum
I) Monitor and evaluate the impact of the instructional program	3) Programs: High Quality/Fidelity/ Reliability Instructional Program	*Instruction:* And works with staff to monitor implementation an evaluate the effectiveness of instructional strategies based on evidence of student learning

Standard 3: An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

ISLLC - Function	School ADvance Domain	School ADvance Characteristics
A) Monitor and evaluate the management and operational systems	3) Programs: Safe, Effective, Efficient School Operations	*Allocation and Management of Resources*: Ensures that the school establishes procedures for fiscal and resource management and accountability and regularly monitors the school's fiscal management and financial status
B) Obtain, allocate, align, and efficiently utilize human, fiscal and technological resources	3) Programs: Safe, Effective, Efficient School Operations	*Allocation and Management of Resources*: And establishes a process for aligning and realigning fiscal, human and material resources as needed to support the school goals and sustain priority strategies to achieve those goals
C) Promote and protect the welfare and safety of students and staff	3) Programs: Safe, Effective, Efficient School Operations	*Policies, Laws, and Procedures*: Establishes school routines and processes to carry out policies and laws pertaining to safety student and parental rights, school compliance, and school governance
D) Develop the capacity for distributed leadership	5) Systems: Human Capacity Development	*Leadership Development*: Recognizes the teacher leadership within the building and develops a collaborative culture where all building staff share responsibility and leadership for student and school success
E) Ensure teacher and organizational time is	5) Systems: Human Capacity Development	*Productivity*: Establishes regular and reliable school routines and procedures and modifies school routines and focus to support quality instruction and student learning

Standard 4: An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

ISLLC- Function	School ADvance Domain	School ADvance Characteristics
G) Collect and analyze data and information pertinent to the educational environment	4) Processes: Community Building	*Relationships*: And regularly assesses the needs of stakeholders within the school community (e.g. staff, students, families, etc.)

B) Promote understanding, appreciation, and use of the community's diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources	4) Processes: Community Building	*Relationships:* And ensures that the school responds to the needs and values of the diverse school community
C) Build and sustain positive relationships with families and caregivers	4) Processes: Community Building	*Inclusion:* And enlists parents to participate in school organizations, committee, and governance and engage in activities that are meaningful to them
D) Build and sustain productive relationships with community partners	4) Processes: Community Building	*Inclusion:* And collaborates with all segments of the community in ways that contribute to the success of all students.

Standard 5: An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

ISLLC- Function	School ADvance Domain	School ADvance Characteristics
H) Ensure System Of accountability for every student's academic and social success	4) Processes: Evidenced Based and Data Informed Decision Making	*Data Systems*: Assists teachers in using the school's data system to collect, analyze, and interpret multiple forms of data to monitor their own effectiveness in achieving student achievement targets
B) Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior	2) Leadership: Leadership Work and Behavior	*Resilient:* And uses habits of reflection and introspection to assess personal effectiveness and establish personal improvement goals
C) Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity	2) Leadership: Vision for Learning and Achievement	*Personal Vision*: Sets expectations for and monitors staff, parents, and students to treat each other with civility, respect, and dignity
D) Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making	2) Leadership: Leadership Work and Behavior	*Fair, Legal, Honest, Ethical and Professional:* Establishes a personal track record of ethical decision making and maintains transparency in personal and school decision making processes
E) Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling	2) Leadership: Vision for Learning and Achievement	*Shared Vision*: Ensures that the school vision is clear in setting learning expectations for all students and is persistent in helping the school achieve its vision of learning for all students and monitors progress

Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

ISLLC - Function	School ADvance Domain	School ADvance Characteristics
A) Advocate for children, families, and caregivers	4) Processes: Community Building	*Relationship*: Regularly assesses the needs if stakeholders within the school community (e.g., parent, families) and ensures that the school responds to the needs and values of the diverse community
B) Act to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning	5) Systems: Human Capacity Development	*Professional Development*: Contributes research or research findings to inform professional learning at the school and/or district level and serves on local, state or national professional learning projects or initiatives
C) Assess, analyze, and anticipate emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt leadership strategies	2) Leadership: Leadership Work and Behavior 5) Systems: Human Capacity Development	*Informed:* Works with staff to evaluate research supported practices and strategies based on school and student data *Professional Development*: Has knowledge of and incorporates into his learning plan evidenced-based practices for schools and school leaders

Appendix C

School ADvance Alignment with Central Office/Superintendent Specialty Endorsement Standards

Points of Learning in Superintendent Specialty Endorsement Program		**Alignment**				
		ISLLC Standards	**Balanced Leadership 7 Positive Correlates – McREL**	**ETS Job Domains**	**TSSA Standards**	**WestEd Findings**
A.	***Leadership: Where It Starts; How It Grows*** Vision, Values, Beliefs Guiding Principles Emotional Intelligence and Self Assessment Ethics, Integrity and Authenticity Personal Growth and Learning Developing, Mentoring, and Coaching Others Distributed (including teacher) Leadership Learning Leadership Servant Leadership	1, 5	Change agent Flexibility Ideals/beliefs Intellectual stimulation Optimizer **Superintendent Correlate**: Goal Setting Process	2, 7	1, 3	Vision High Quality Professional Development Communication
B.	***Can't Manage? Can't Lead!*** Locating, Aligning, and Leveraging Organizational Resources Human Resources: Negotiations, Collective Bargaining, Hiring, Induction, Supervision, Corrective Action, Evaluation Due Process and Dismissal Finances, Facilities and Operations Safety and Crisis Management Technology Applications	3	Change agent Flexibility Optimizer **Superintendent Correlate**: Resource Alignment	2, 5	3, 4	Roles & Structures High Quality Professional Development

Points of Learning in Superintendent Specialty Endorsement Program		Alignment				
		ISLLC Standards	**Balanced Leadership 7 Positive Correlates – McREL**	**ETS Job Domains**	**TSSA Standards**	**WestEd Findings**
C.	***Relationships & Communication: Getting Real*** Culture and Climate Board of Education Students and Parents Leadership Team, Faculty and Staff Stakeholders, Community Leaders and Senior Citizens	1, 4	Flexibility Ideals/beliefs Optimizer **Superintendent Correlate**: Relations with the Schools Board Alignment	1, 2, 4	3, 4	Vision Communication Roles and Structures
D.	***Why We Do What We Do: Data-informed Planning & Decision Making*** Measurable goals and outcomes Systematic collection and analysis of Input, process, and outcome data Monitoring climate and culture Evaluation and Accountability Continuous Improvement Focused on Quality Indicators Reflective Practice Technology Integration	1, 3, 4	Change agent Knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment Intellectual stimulation Monitors/evaluates **Superintendent Correlate**: Monitoring and Evaluation	3, 6	5	Data-driven Decision Making
E.	***Organizational Development: Forging a Dynamic Learning System*** Systems Thinking and Systemic Systemic Change processes Professional Growth and Development Group Development and Group Processes Learning Organization – Shaping a Culture for Learning Collaboration Conflict Resolution Organizational Health Change & Transition	2, 4	Change agent Flexibility Ideals/beliefs Intellectual stimulation Optimizer **Superintendent Correlate**: Board Alignment Resource Alignment	2, 7, 8	2	High Quality Professional Development Roles and Structures Data-driven Decision Making

Points of Learning in Superintendent Specialty Endorsement Program		Alignment				
		ISLLC Standards	**Balanced Leadership 7 Positive Correlates – McREL**	**ETS Job Domains**	**TSSA Standards**	**WestEd Findings**
F.	***Champion for Teaching and Learning: If Not Us, Then Who?*** Shared Vision, Beliefs and Mission Guaranteed, Viable, and engaging Curriculum Aligned Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Technology Integration Research, Standards and Best Practices Continuous Improvement in Pedagogy and Student Achievement Professional Learning Communities Reflective Teaching and Leadership Feedback to Students and Parents	2	Ideals/beliefs Intellectual stimulation Knowledge of curriculum, instruction and assessment Monitors/evaluates **Superintendent Correlate**: Goals for Student Achievement and District Instructional Program	3, 4, 5, 6	2, 5	High Quality Professional Development Roles & Structures Data-driven Decision Making
G.	***Politics Everywhere...Influencing Everything!*** Regulations: Local, State and Federal Political Dynamics: Local, State and Federal Policy and Legislation Issues of the Marketplace Board Policies and Administrative Guidelines Environment Scanning, Information Gathering and Future Relationships, Responsibility and Resource Roles Diversity and Engagement	4, 6	Change agent Flexibility Ideals/beliefs Optimizer **Superintendent Correlate**: Relations with schools (and others)	4, 8, 9	6	Vision Communication Data-driven Decision Making High Quality Professional Development