How Six States Are Implementing Principal Evaluation Systems

Delaware • Iowa • New Mexico • North Carolina • Ohio • South Carolina

INTEGRATED LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

WestEd

WestEd.org

Suggested citation: Mattson Almanzán, H., Sanders, N., and Kearney, K. (2011). *How Six States Are Implementing Principal Evaluation Systems*. **San Francisco: WestEd.**

Heather Mattson Almanzán, EdM, is a Senior Research Associate with WestEd's Comprehensive School Assistance Program, specializing in research, content development, and information dissemination on elements critical to school and district reform.

Nancy Sanders, Ph.D., is a professor and educational policy consultant, who directs large, multi-year federal research grants; advises on state policies about standards, assessments, and accreditation; and designs and teaches university degree and certification programs.

Karen Kearney, MA, is the Project Director of the Leadership Initiative at WestEd, formerly the California School Leadership Academy. Kearney directs all aspects of the initiative, which focuses on the role of the principal, superintendent, and teacher leaders in comprehensive school restructuring.

WestEd, 730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107

How Six States Are Implementing Principal Evaluation Systems

Contents

Introduction

Research and professional leadership standards identify specific ways in which principals directly influence school organization and community relationships and exert less direct, but critically important, influence on teaching quality and instructional effectiveness. Principals' roles are central to supporting and supervising teachers' instructional practices and in guiding organizational purpose and vision, particularly to enact the high expectations for all students in No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the current focus of programs related to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). With this in mind, evaluating principals to improve their performance has become a key school improvement strategy.

Additionally, the School Improvement Grants (SIG), awarded by the U.S. Department of Education to support focused school improvement efforts, emphasize the principal's role in improving student achievement. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 allocated funding to improve state and local education systems through the Race to the Top (RTTT) Fund, providing $4.35 billion in competitive grants for states. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2009), RTTT is designed to encourage and reward states that are creating the conditions for education innovation and reform. Two core areas of focus in the RTTT Fund strongly highlight the importance of principals in educational reform:

* Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction

* Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals

Principals of schools needing significant improvements must expand their knowledge and develop new skills. Research indicates considerable principal turnover in low-performing urban and rural schools that also have less experienced principals. The challenge to states is how to collect and analyze data about principal performance that will guide both improving practice and achieving goals. Data systems to inform teachers and principals require effective evaluation methods that are linked with

systems of support to recruit, develop, reward, and retain principals on the job, particularly in struggling schools.

Purpose

This report provides state and district policymakers with information about currently operating state policies and systems of principal evaluation. In particular, policymakers seek evaluation policies and strategies for improvement and accountability of principals for school outcomes. Because state systems are complex and have very different policy contexts, the information in the following pages provides snapshots rather than full details about states' principal evaluation systems.

This policy brief does not endorse any particular state model or policy approach to

principal evaluation. Rather, given the array of strategies available, these data are intended to inform policy deliberation and foster communication among states and districts seeking to develop and use effective principal evaluation strategies. When available, the web sources and addresses are provided so that users can directly access the descriptions and resources for additional details.

Methods

A template for describing state policies and systems of principal evaluation was developed in response to policy makers' requests for information. A scan of state websites to determine what and how much information was available was then used to refine the template and identify comparable data across state systems. Categories of data in the template were revised during the process so that information is as clear and consistent as possible across the states' different approaches. State education agency (SEA) websites were the primary source of data, and SEA staff in each state reviewed the information for accuracy.

Many states indicate that changes are currently under way in their principal evaluation systems. Six states were identified for this report because they have several years of policy development and experience with implementing their principal evaluation systems. These states also provide information on their websites about the policies and systems. The information from these states captures the most significant issues in state systems and describes a range of state approaches to the evaluation of principals. The six states included here are:

- ➤ Delaware
- ➤ Iowa
- ➤ New Mexico
- ➤ North Carolina
- ➤ Ohio
- ➤ South Carolina

State Profile Categories

Each state template is organized according to the following categories:

» **Summary**
Short descriptions provide a broad overview of state approaches. These may help orient readers to elements of the state system that best fit their own interest areas.

» **Policy Context**
System Development: Differences in how states developed their principal evaluation systems provide a context for understanding each system's structure and features. Each of the states engaged in development processes over several years from inception to current implementation.

State and District Responsibilities: Traditionally, principal evaluation has been a broad state requirement, with districts responsible for the content, processes, and uses of data. In these states, principal evaluation is still required by states but varies in shared responsibilities of states and districts for the content, processes, and data uses.

» **Structure of the System**
Purpose: The evaluation literature emphasizes the importance of clear purpose in designing a system that provides valid, reliable, fair, and useful data for decision-making. Different types of purposes are reported in these states, including specifying how the results should be or are being used.

Features: State documents describe major features of the principal evaluation systems highlighting specific approaches,

commitments, and strategies such as engaging practitioners, using research, or requiring specific measures.

Components: States use a variety of basic components in a system for principal evaluation, such as formative and/or summative meetings, data collection tools, reviews, and reports. The components provide the structure for those implementing the system.

Process and timeline: The principal evaluation systems have varied requirements and options for scheduling and carrying out evaluation processes. The evaluation process and timeline may also vary for new principals or those struggling to meet expectations.

Alignment to leadership standards: All of these states report that national professional leadership standards were an important contributor to the principal evaluation system. Leadership standards were also often used in developing the evaluation instruments and reporting frameworks.

Sources of information and measures: Some of the state documents indicate the types of information and/or products that should be collected as evidence of performance. They suggest data sources and artifacts that are appropriate for particular performance ratings.

Ratings: Some states describe their evaluation ratings and provide examples of their rating scales or scoring rubrics.

Implementation

Differentiation: Some states implement their system for all principals. Others describe ways in which principal evaluation practices are altered for specific administrators, for example, assistant principals, new principals, or principals who are identified as needing improvement. The practices vary in content of the evaluation, frequency of observations, and type of evidence used.

Connection to Student Achievement: All six states indicate that student achievement data must be considered as part of the principal evaluation process. Detailed data are not available from the web sources.

Evaluator Details: Evaluator expertise and training is key to quality and consistency of evaluation. Some states describe criteria for evaluator selection, roles of evaluators, and requirements for evaluator training.

Tools, Instruments, and Forms: Examples of state resources and other documents are listed that could be useful to other districts and states. Sources for these resources are provided at the end of each state report.

Changes in Progress: When reviewing these summaries, some SEA staff indicated modifications to their systems are under way. Additionally, three states profiled in the overview received RTTT grants that may modify their current principal evaluation systems. Planned changes or extensions are described.

Principal Evaluation Policies and Practices: Delaware

Summary

The Delaware Performance Appraisal System for Administrators (DPAS II), as outlined by the state department of education, must be implemented by all districts. The system consists of five equally weighted features: vision and goals; culture of learning; management; professional responsibilities; and student improvement. Under revised regulations, student growth will be the critical factor for determining leader effectiveness. DPAS II focuses on professional growth, continuous improvements, and quality assurance. This system differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories; takes student growth into account; and requires the provision of timely and constructive feedback.*

Policy Context	
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	A committee of educators, primarily administrators, developed DPAS II in response to legislation requiring new methods of personnel assessment in Delaware's schools. The design of DPAS II was driven by the Delaware Administrative Standards, adapted from the Interstate School Leaders' Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. It aligns the evaluation of school and district administrators with student learning and school improvement. DPAS II became effective for all public schools and charter schools beginning with the 2008-2009 school year.
	The state continues to solicit feedback on DPAS II and refine the system accordingly. Delaware regulations require the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) to conduct an annual evaluation of DPAS II, including, at a minimum, a survey of teachers and evaluators. (*Source: Race to the Top Application*)
STATE AND DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	Districts must implement DPAS II as outlined by the state department of education.
Structure of the System	
PURPOSE	DPAS II has the following purposes: » Professional growth – focused on enhancing an educator's skills and knowledge » Continuous improvement – focused on an educator's commitment to continuously improving performance so that student achievement is continuously enhanced » Quality assurance – focused on the collection of credible evidence about an educator's performance

*All information is taken from the first source listed at end of this state, unless parenthetically noted.

PURPOSE (CONTINUED)	Districts participating in the Race to the Top application will be required to use educator evaluations as a primary factor in teacher and principal development, promotion, advancement, retention, and removal.
FEATURES	DPAS II is grounded in research and an understanding of leader performance in high-achieving schools. The DPAS II system provides a strong focus on teaching and learning. The data and evidence collected as part of the process should be embedded in the administrator's ongoing work. Administrator progress and success is measured in five features: 1. Vision and Goals 2. Culture of Learning 3. Management 4. Professional Responsibilities 5. Student Improvement
COMPONENTS	» Goal setting » Conferences (formative and summative) » Surveys » Data collection
PROCESS AND TIMELINE	*Inexperienced administrator* conferences typically occur three times over a one-year evaluation cycle: » In the late summer or early fall for agreement on goals » Mid-year for progress discussions followed by completion of a Formative Feedback Form » Late spring or early summer for a summative conference, followed by a completed Summative Evaluation Form

PROCESS AND TIMELINE (CONTINUED)	*Experienced administrator* conferences typically occur at least four times over a one- or two-year evaluation cycle: » During the summer or early fall of the first year for agreement on goals » Mid-year each year to discuss progress » During the summer of the first year to review progress on goals and establish goals for the upcoming year » At the end of the second year to discuss results and complete the summative evaluation The timing of this cycle is recommended, and districts may change it depending on their needs.
ALIGNMENT TO LEADERSHIP STANDARDS	The design of DPAS II was driven by the Delaware Administrative Standards, which align with the ISLLC standards.
SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND MEASURES	State guidance provides possible sources of evidence for each of the five required features. Examples of evidence include descriptions of procedures and processes, district or building policies, individual professional growth plans, and student achievement results.
RATINGS	Currently, each of the five components of DPAS II is weighted equally and assigned a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory on the Summative Evaluation. » Satisfactory Performance – Demonstrates acceptable performance by meeting at least three of the four criteria outlined in each of the five components of DPAS II for Administrators. » Unsatisfactory Performance – Demonstrates unacceptable performance on two or more of the four criteria outlined in each of the five components of DPAS II for Administrators. The Summative Evaluation includes one of three overall ratings: » Ineffective indicates that the administrator has received zero, one, or two Satisfactory Component Ratings out of the five Appraisal Components, and the administrator has received an Unsatisfactory Component Rating in the Student Improvement Component. If an administrator's overall Summative Evaluation rating is determined to be Needs Improvement for the third consecutive year, the administrator's rating shall be re-categorized as Ineffective.

RATINGS (CONTINUED)	» Needs Improvement indicates that the administrator has received one or two Satisfactory Component Ratings out of the five Appraisal Components, including a Satisfactory rating in the Student Improvement Component. Or, the administrator has received three or four Satisfactory Component Ratings out of the five Appraisal Components and the administrator has received an Unsatisfactory rating in the Student Improvement Component. » Effective indicates that the administrator has received a Satisfactory Component Rating in at least three Appraisal Components including the Student Improvement Component, and the administrator does not meet the requirement for Highly Effective. » Highly Effective indicates that the administrator has a Satisfactory Component Rating in four of the five Appraisal Components and that the administrator's students on average achieve high rates of student growth, that is, more than one grade-level improvement in an academic year.

Implementation

DIFFERENTIATION	Inexperienced administrators and administrators whose performance appraisals state Needs Improvement or Ineffective must participate in an annual appraisal cycle. Experienced administrators whose performance is Effective or Highly Effective may be appraised over a two-year period. Individual school administrators are not expected to attain high performance levels on all standards at the same time in their careers. More likely, they will focus time and energy on certain standards and performances directly related to their current administrative role. Therefore, performance on standards may vary over an administrator's career depending on the school or district's needs and the administrator's role within the school or district.

Connection to student achievement	The fifth component of DPAS II is student improvement. Evidence of principal performance includes analyzing multiple measures for both the overall level of student performance and the equitable distribution of performance among sub-groups of students. Data may include, but are not limited to:
	» School accountability data
	» State assessment online scores
	» District-administered tests
	» Longitudinal studies
	» Scores of external tests (SAT, AP)
	Under revised regulations, student growth will be the critical factor for determining leader effectiveness. The exact definition and measurement of student growth will be determined between January 2010 and July 2011, when the new regulations go into effect.
Evaluator details	Evaluators need to complete DPAS II training developed by the DDOE. The training includes techniques for observation and conferencing, content and relationships of ISLLC standards, and a thorough review of the *DPAS II Guide for Administrators* and activities in which participants practice implementation of DPAS II procedures. Upon completion, evaluators receive a certificate of completion, which is valid for five years and is renewable upon completion of professional development focused on DPAS II as specified by the DDOE.
Tools, instruments, and forms	DPAS II Forms include:
	» Goal Form – Administrator
	» Delaware Administrator ISLLC Standards Survey Form
	» Professional Responsibilities Form – Administrator
	» Formative Feedback Form – Administrator
	» Summative Form – Administrator
	» Improvement Plan – Administrator
	» Challenge Form – Administrator
	(All are found in *Delaware Performance Appraisal System: Guide for Administrators.* See sources at the end of this state.)

Changes in Progress	Under the revised regulations, student growth will be the critical factor for determining teacher and leader effectiveness. The exact definition and measurement of student growth will be determined between January 2010 and July 2011, when the new regulations go into effect. The Delaware Secretary of Education will determine the definition and means for assessing student growth. It will represent some level of change in achievement data for an individual student between two points in time, as well as any other measures that are determined to be rigorous and comparable across classrooms, in accordance with the new regulations.
	The state will recruit, train, and deploy a corps of "development coaches." These coaches will support principals, superintendents, and charter directors in the transition to a more rigorous, transparent evaluation process, reduce the administrative burden to evaluators, and improve the accuracy and calibration of DPAS II assessments.
	(Source: RTTT Application)

Sources

Delaware Department of Education. *Delaware Performance Appraisal System: Guide for Administrators*. 2008. Retrieved October 22, 2010, from
http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/default.shtml

Delaware Department of Education. *Race to the Top Application*. Retrieved February 24, 2011, from
http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase1-applications/index.html

Principal Evaluation Policies and Practices: Iowa

Summary

Iowa is a district-based system within broad parameters set by the state, with extensive models, resources, examples, and training that were developed in collaboration with intermediary organizations and professional associations. The state adapted the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards for the Iowa Standards for School Leaders (ISSL), with 35 research-based criteria, as the foundation for state's principal evaluation system. Standards, timelines and district responsibilities are major features of the state's approach to principal evaluation.*

Policy Context	
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	In 2006, Iowa adopted the ISSL, modeled after the ISLLC standards but modified to include additional research with 35 criteria as the basis for the state's administrator evaluation system. During the 2007 legislative session, districts were directed to develop and implement an evaluation system for administrators. The Iowa Department of Education (IDE) worked in collaboration with intermediary organizations and professional associations, such as the School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) and the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB), to develop and provide examples and samples of principal evaluation program components for districts to use or adapt. (*Source: NASBE*)
STATE AND DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	Districts must align their evaluation systems with the ISSL and follow the state requirements about the minimum frequency for evaluation. The state also sets forth overall guidance about the administrator evaluation system and works with intermediate agencies and associations to provide models and examples for districts to use when developing their systems.
Structure of the System	
PURPOSE	The system is focused on professional growth and improving principal performance related to state standards and district goals for school improvement.
FEATURES	The system: » Aligns local evaluation with the ISSL » Is intended to acknowledge strengths and improve performance » Connects academic, social, emotional, and developmental growth for all students in the building/system

*All information is taken from the first source listed at end of this state, unless parenthetically noted.

FEATURES (CONTINUED)	» Recognizes the importance of a principal's role in improving the culture of the learning community » Includes research-based criteria about effective principal behaviors, which are substantiated by measurable data from multiple sources, and are legal, feasible, accurate, and useful » Provides opportunities for personal and professional growth as a facilitator/leader of learning » Is ongoing and connected to school improvement goals » Aligns building and district goals with community members' vision for education.
COMPONENTS	» State leadership standards » District decisions about Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP) and Comprehensive School Improvement Plans (CSIP) » Evaluator training » Yearly reviews » Three year summative evaluations.
PROCESS AND TIMELINE	Each district and local board of education develops the review form and criteria for principal evaluation, using resources from IDE and others. Following their initial year, career administrators are evaluated annually based on the six ISSLs. The minimum requirement of Iowa law is that persons new to administration have a comprehensive evaluation during their initial year of employment. Best practice is for administrators who assume a new administrative position to have a summative evaluation during their first year in the new position. After the initial comprehensive/summative evaluation, the law requires an annual formative assessment around the principal's IPDP. The three-year summative evaluation requires documentation of competence on the six ISSLs, meeting district expectations drawn from the district's CSIP and building improvement plan, IPDP attainment, and other supporting documentation.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE (CONTINUED)	The process includes:
	1. The principal and superintendent/designee clarify vision, mission, and district goals.
	2. The principal and superintendent/designee review the job description and performance review process, forms, indicators, timelines, and possible supporting documents/information/data to be used to measure performance.
	3. The principal, in collaboration with the superintendent/designee, develops an IPDP that aligns district, school, and individual goals that are measurable and attainable. Districts can use processes, such as a SMART goal framework and/or other resources available. Samples can be found on School Administrators of Iowa (SAI) website under "Resources."
	4. The superintendent/designee reviews processes and forms with new administrators.
	5. The principal completes a self-assessment of performance on the leadership standards and criteria. Documents and data used to support the measurable outcomes are prepared and presented to the superintendent/designee.
	6. The principal and superintendent/designee discuss annual progress reports regarding IPDP goals.
	7. Changes may be made as a result of the discussions. Remediation targets (if any) are included in the final document(s) as a confidential, personnel record.
	8. A copy of the final written performance review form is placed in the principal's personnel folder.
	(Source: SAI)
ALIGNMENT TO LEADERSHIP STANDARDS	Both the State Board of Education and the Board of Educational Examiners adopted the six ISSL standards. The standards, modeled after the ISLLC standards and modified to include additional research, and the accompanying 35 criteria serve as the foundation for Iowa's leadership system. *(Source: NASBE)*
RATINGS	Districts are allowed to make their own ratings determinations.
Implementation	
DIFFERENTIATION	Districts can determine how to differentiate the evaluations.

CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	The comprehensive administrator review process must connect academic, social, emotional, and developmental growth for all students in the building/system.
EVALUATOR DETAILS	Evaluators must have completed training to be licensed and renew their license every five years. During the past two years, the Evaluator Advisory Committee, represented by schools, area education agencies, colleges/universities, Board of Educational Examiners, SAI, IASB, and the IDE have been meeting to analyze data regarding evaluation, reading and reflecting on research, and seeking best practices in evaluations that improve teaching and learning. The committee is designing Evaluator Approval Levels and training, and providing two levels of training online.
TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, AND FORMS	» Iowa Standards for School Leaders » Principal Leadership Performance Review Instrument, which contains the Principal Performance Standards and Criteria » Iowa Individual Administrator Professional Development Plan » Evaluator Training and Approval (All are found on the Administrator Evaluation page of the IDE website. See sources at the end of this state.)

Sources

Iowa Department of Education (IDE). (n.d.) *Administrator Evaluation*. Retrieved July 19, 2010, from
http://www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1447&Itemid=2448

National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE). (n.d.). *Iowa: Case Study*. Retrieved July, 22, 2010, from
http://nasbe.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10045

School Administrators of Iowa (SAI). (n.d.). *Principal Leadership Performance Review: A Systems Approach*. Retrieved July 26, 2010, from
http://www.sai-iowa.org/principaleval

Principal Evaluation Policies and Practices: New Mexico

Summary

New Mexico law required the Public Education Department to adopt a highly objective uniform statewide standard of evaluation (HOUSSE-P), which includes data sources linked to student achievement and an education plan for student success (EPSS). Evaluation of school principals and assistant school principals is linked to the leaders' level of responsibility at each school level, along with rules for the implementation of the evaluation system. This evaluation system was developed over a two-year period ending in 2008. All districts and charter schools are required to follow the evaluation format set forth by the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED).

Policy Context	
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	Beginning in spring 2006, the NMPED convened a series of design teams and work groups, consisting of a diverse set of educational stakeholders, to develop the HOUSSE-P. During summer and fall 2007 they developed the Summer Leadership Academy, where practitioners were trained and provided feedback on the Handbook for the HOUSSE-P; developed the Secondary Scope of Responsibility competency focused on secondary schools; implemented fall regional training where practitioners provided additional feedback; reviewed all feedback; and revised the HOUSSE-P Handbook.
	By October 15, 2008, each public school district and charter school was required to adopt policies, guidelines, and procedures for annual principal and assistant principal performance evaluation that meet the requirements of rule 6.69.7 of the New Mexico Administrative Code. This rule also established that the format of this evaluation would be established by the NMPED and should be uniform throughout the state in all public school districts and charter schools.
STATE AND DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	The Public Education Department of New Mexico was required to provide the highly objective uniform statewide standard of evaluation, and each school district and charter school is required to meet those requirements.
Structure of the System	
PURPOSE	The primary purpose of this statewide evaluation system is to enhance the performance of principals and assistant principals.

FEATURES	All principals are required to be proficient in five broad domains that have supporting, measurable competencies and indicators: Instructional Leadership, Communication, Professional Development, Operations Management, and (secondary principals only) Scope of Responsibility in Secondary Schools. The HOUSSE-P adheres to the principles of the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession and should be based upon established standards of leader performance: » Use multiple measures to assess performance. » Use knowledgeable and fair decision-makers as evaluators. » Provide data for reflection and growth. » Focus upon a limited number of professional goals. » Foster self-diagnosis, self-reflection, and self correction. » Be flexible enough to account for the varying complexities of the role. » Acknowledge the various career stages of the principalship.
COMPONENTS	The following components are required: » Self-Assessment » Professional Development Plan (PDP) » Self-Reflection on the PDP » Summative Evaluation
PROCESS AND TIMELINE	Evaluations are required every year of employment, but additional evaluations may be conducted at the discretion of the principal's supervisor or at the request of the principal. At the beginning of employment and continuing regularly throughout the school year, the principal and supervisor should discuss district and school goals for supporting student success that focus on the principal's capacity to meet the performance expectations related to the New Mexico Principal Leadership Competencies and Indicators (NMPLCI) and to accomplish the school's EPSS goals.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE (CONTINUED)	Principals complete a self-assessment that provides the basis to reflect on individual strengths, needs, and growth for professional development. The professional development plan provides a format for the principal and the supervisor to discuss and then develop professional development goals, divided into two stages. Stage I should be completed no later than 40 days after the principal commences his or her contract. Stage II takes place as a mid-year conference when progress on the PDP should be reviewed, discussed, and refined as appropriate. At the beginning of the school duties annually, the principal and the supervisor begin discussions that address how the principal will meet EPSS performance expectations, ensuring consistency with NMPLCI. The discussions include developing an action plan, identifying needed assistance and resources, timelines, and sources of performance data, as indicated on the PDP. During the year, the supervisor conducts no fewer than two site visits to the school. These site visits include random classroom observations to assess the school as a whole and to determine instructional implementation aligned with district and school goals/initiatives. Before the Summative Evaluation is written, the principal completes the Self-Reflection template, where he or she provides a self-assessment of the progress made in meeting the goals set in the PDP as well as a consideration of other strategies to use if employment is continued. For the end-of-the-year Summative Evaluation, the principal and the supervisor meet to review evidence of completion of the PDP. The PDP, Self-Reflection on PDP, and Summative Evaluation are included in the principal's personnel file.
ALIGNMENT TO LEADERSHIP STANDARDS	When creating New Mexico's principal evaluation system, the design teams reviewed literature on effective leadership practice and national standards, as well as the standards of other states to create the NMPLCI. The NMPLCI are divided into four broad domains for all principals: Instructional Leadership, Communication, Professional Development, and Operations Management. For secondary principals serving in middle and/or high schools, proficiency in domain five – Scope of Responsibility in Secondary Schools – is required.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND MEASURES	The principal and the supervisor should collaborate in identifying and collecting multiple types of data that can inform the self-reflection and evaluation process. Data should be collected periodically from important referent groups including faculty, staff, parents, students, and supervisors. All data should be collected and analyzed to understand the principal's abilities and growth trends in each competency area. Some examples of data include: » Student performance data » Self-assessment » Yearly district site visit » Principal classroom visits » National standardized tests » Climate surveys » Teacher surveys » Student attendance » Teacher attendance » Teacher turnover » Dropout rates » Discipline referrals » Parent participation in school processes » Graduation rates » Suspension rates » Course failure rates
RATINGS	In the summative evaluation, principals are rated according to the domains of the NMPLCI as either: 1. Does not meet competency. 2. Meets competency.

Implementation	
DIFFERENTIATION	By statute, NMPED was required to develop an evaluation system that was "linked to the leaders' level of responsibility at each school level." System principles recognize the following: » The evaluation process should be flexible enough to account for the varying complexities of the principal's role. » Various levels of experience and job responsibilities require differing levels of support by others.
CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	New Mexico statutes 22-10A-11(G) require NMPED to adopt a highly objective uniform statewide standard of evaluation, which includes data sources linked to student achievement. In gathering evidence for their evaluation, principals are asked to provide student performance data.
TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, AND FORMS	» Self-Assessment (Form A) » Professional Development Plan (Form B) » Self-Reflection on Professional Development Plan (Form C) » Summative Evaluation (Form D) (All are found in *HANDBOOK for Highly Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) for Principals and Assistant Principals in the State of New Mexico.* See source below.)

Sources

New Mexico Public Education Department, Educator Quality Division. *HANDBOOK for Highly Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) for Principals and Assistant Principals in the State of New Mexico.* 2010. Print. Retrieved February 27, 2011 from http://teachnm.org/administrators/principal-and-assistant-principal-evaluation-process.html

Principal Evaluation Policies and Practices: North Carolina

Summary

The North Carolina School Executive evaluation system includes the evaluation process for principals and assistant principals. The evaluation process incorporates required components and a number of optional forms. The required components include an orientation; self-assessments; goal setting and pre-evaluation conferences; data collection and documentation; evaluator observations; mid-year performance conversations; consolidated performance assessments completed by the principal and assistant principal; and a summative meeting. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction provides extensive training materials to support districts in implementing this evaluation system. An intermediate agency developed this system for North Carolina, and developed a corresponding online evaluation system to enter data and document the evaluation process. *

Policy Context	
System Development	A pilot was conducted in fall 2007 and approved by the State Board of Education in May 2008. The final version of the principal evaluation manual was published in August 2009. Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) developed and validated the evaluation instrument for principals. McREL also developed a corresponding online evaluation system to enter data and document the evaluation process. In fall 2010, the evaluation of assistant principals was added to this system and in fall 2011, an aligned instrument for use with instructional central office staff was approved.
State and district responsibilities	The state requires a specific process that districts must implement.
Structure of the System	
Purpose	The purpose of the principal evaluation process is to assess the principal's performance in relation to the North Carolina Standards for School Executives in a collegial and non-threatening manner. The principal performance evaluation process will: » Serve as a guide for principals as they reflect upon and improve their effectiveness as school leaders.

*All information is taken from the first source listed at end of this state, unless parenthetically noted.

PURPOSE (CONTINUED)	» Inform higher education programs in developing the content and requirements of degree programs that prepare future principals. » Focus the goals and objectives of districts as they support, monitor, and evaluate their principals. » Guide professional development for principals. » Serve as a tool in developing coaching and mentoring programs for principals. North Carolina uses evaluations to inform decisions regarding the following: » Development of principals through the provision of relevant coaching, induction support, and professional development » Promotion and retention of principals » Granting of tenure and full certification to principals » Removal of ineffective tenured and untenured principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures *(Source: RTTT Application)*
FEATURES	The principal takes the lead in conducting the evaluation process through self-assessment, reflection, and gathering input from the various stakeholders with an interest in the school leadership. The input and evidence gathered by the principal are not intended to become part of a portfolio. Rather, they should provide a basis for self-assessment, goal-setting, professional development, and demonstration of performance on specific standards.
COMPONENTS	» Orientation » Principal self-assessment » Pre-evaluation meeting » Data collection and documentation » Evaluator observations » Mid-year performance conversation » Consolidated performance assessment completed by the principal » Summative meeting to discuss the principal's self-assessment, consolidated assessment, and the evaluator's summary evaluation of the principal

Process and timeline	Step 1: Orientation – The superintendent/designee conducts an orientation with all of the district principals.
	Step 2: Pre-Evaluation Planning – The principal completes a self-assessment using the North Carolina School Executive: Principal Evaluation Rubric.
	Step 3: Meeting Between Principal and Superintendent/Designee – The principal and superintendent/designee discuss the results of the self-evaluation, preliminary performance goals, and the evidence and data to be gathered for the evaluation process.
	Step 4: Data Collection – The principal collects the data agreed upon in Step 3. These data may include the artifacts listed for each standard on the rubric; feedback from parents, students, and the school community; documentation of professional development completed during the year; and other data to document achievement of performance goals. The superintendent/designee visits the school during this period to observe the environment and interact with teachers and other members of the school community.
	Step 5: Mid-Year Evaluation Between Principal and Superintendent/Designee – The principal and superintendent/designee focus on the status of goal attainment and mid-year adjustments to action plans that must be made to achieve goals by the end of the school year.
	Step 6: Consolidated Performance Assessment – The principal synthesizes the information obtained under Steps 4 and 5 to prepare a consolidated assessment or comprehensive view of performance throughout the year. This brief summary of the data and artifacts used to judge performance should be provided to the superintendent/designee well in advance of the performance discussion at which final performance levels are discussed.
	Step 7: Meeting Between Principal and Superintendent/Designee – The principal and superintendent/designee discuss progress in completing the evaluation process, including the self-assessment, consolidated assessment, and superintendent's summary evaluation of the principal, which have been prepared in advance of the meeting. Should additional data or artifacts need to be brought into the discussion, the principal has them readily available to share. At this meeting, the principal and superintendent/designee agree upon performance goals and recommendations for the Professional Growth Plan.

ALIGNMENT TO LEADERSHIP STANDARDS	Relevant national reports and research focused on identifying the leadership practices that impact student achievement, along with the Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, were considered in developing of the seven North Carolina Standards for School Executives.
SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND MEASURES	Sources of evidence are derived from the principal's self-assessment and feedback process. Feedback from a variety of sources should be collected, including the superintendent, assistant principal, teachers, school staff, community, and students. This evidence may be gathered by: » Focus group discussions (teachers, parents, students, staff) » Interviews » Questionnaires » Agendas and meeting minutes » Surveys Additional evidence could include: » Degree to which school improvement plan strategies are implemented, assessed, and modified » Evidence of an effectively functioning, elected School Improvement Team » Results from the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions Survey » Student achievement data » Curriculum planning data » Student dropout data » Teacher retention data » Number of teachers pursuing school executive credentials, National Board Certification, or advanced licensure in their teaching areas » Record of professional development provided to staff and an assessment of its impact on student learning » Evidence of visible support from the parent community, e.g., Parent Teacher Association attendance, meeting agendas, bulletins

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND MEASURES (CONTINUED)	» Evidence of team development » Evaluation of classroom lessons » Work of Professional Learning Communities within and tangential to the school » Documented use of formative assessment instruments to impact instruction » Development and communication of goal-oriented personalized education plans for identified students, for example English for Speakers of Other Languages, exceptional children, special education students
RATINGS	A rubric was developed to align with and exemplify the North Carolina Standards for School Executives to be used in conjunction with the standards descriptions. Principal performance is rated as follows: Developing: Principal demonstrated adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) during the period of performance, but did not demonstrate competence on standard(s) of performance. Proficient: Principal demonstrated basic competence on standard(s) of performance. Accomplished: Principal exceeded basic competence on standard(s) of performance most of the time. Distinguished: Principal consistently and significantly exceeded basic competence on standard(s) of performance. Not Demonstrated: Principal did not demonstrate competence on or adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) of performance. If the "Not Demonstrated" rating is used, the evaluator must comment about why it was used.

Implementation

DIFFERENTIATION	Evaluation instruments were field-tested for assistant principals during the 2009-2010 school year. The State Board of Education approved the use of the evaluation process for School Executives for assistant principals in September 2010. An aligned instrument for use with instructional central office staff was field tested with the standards and evaluation process during the 2010-2011 school year. This instrument was approved for use in September 2011.

CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	Student achievement data are required as evidence, including student testing data and student dropout data, and results of formative assessments.
EVALUATOR DETAILS	Evaluator responsibilities: » Know and understand the North Carolina Standards for School Executives. » Participate in training to understand and implement the Principal Evaluation Process. » Supervise the Principal Evaluation Process and ensure that all steps are conducted according to the approved process. » Identify the principal's strengths and areas for improvement and make recommendations for improving performance. » Ensure that the contents of the Principal Summary Evaluation Report contain accurate information and accurately reflect the principal's performance.
TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, AND FORMS	» Evaluation training PowerPoint » Timeline » Evaluation process graphic » Crosswalk between standards and recommended artifacts » Principal evaluation scenario » Rubric for Evaluating North Carolina Principals and Self-Assessment Form (Required) » Example of how to score the rubric » Principal Summary Evaluation Rating Form (Required)

Tools, instruments, and forms (continued)	» Principal Summary Evaluation Worksheet (Optional) » Goal Setting Worksheet » North Carolina School Principal: Summary Goal Form » Mid-Year Evaluation: Progress Toward Achieving Goals (Required meeting; form online) » Principal Evaluation Process Documentation (Optional) » The North Carolina Standards and Their Practices (Includes very detailed description and potential artifacts for each standard) » Principal Directions Manual for North Carolina Educator Evaluation System (NCEES) Online Evaluation System** (All materials except Principal Directions Manual are found in *North Carolina School Executive: Principal Evaluation Process Manual*. See sources at end of state.) (**Principal Directions Manual for NCEES Online Evaluation System can be found on the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction's Professional Development website. See sources at the end of state.)
Changes in progress	Student growth is currently cited as an important outcome for several standards evaluated by the Principal Evaluation Process. To further emphasize that student growth data are essential parts of the evaluation process, beginning in the 2010-11 school year, principal evaluations will be expanded to include an eighth standard, requiring specific documentation of a principal's impact on student growth. After adoption of the student growth component in 2010-11, the definition of an effective principal will be an educator whose students' growth (in the aggregate) meets expectations (one year of expected growth) and whose ratings on the other standards that comprise the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System are at the level of proficient or higher. The definition of a highly effective principal will be an educator whose students' growth (in the aggregate) significantly exceeds expectations (more than one year of expected growth) and whose ratings on all other standards that comprise the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System are at the level of accomplished or higher. Failure to meet a certain performance level on any standard will result in a series of interventions that, if improvement does not occur, can end in dismissal. (*Source: RTTT Application*)

Sources

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) and the North Carolina State Board of Education. *North Carolina School Executive: Principal Evaluation Process Manual.* 2009. Print. Retrieved September 23, 2010, from http://www.ncpublicschools.org/profdev/training/principal/

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. *North Carolina School Principal Evaluation Process Training,* PowerPoint Presentation. 2009.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. *Professional Development.* n.d. Retrieved from February 18, 2011, from http://www.ncpublicschools.org/profdev/training/online-evaluation/

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. *Race to the Top Application.* Retrieved January 11, 2011, from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase2-applications/north-carolina.pdf

Principal Evaluation Policies and Practices: Ohio

Summary

The Ohio Principal Evaluation System (OPES) is a resource model with no required components that is available to districts to use as they find appropriate. It can be used in whole or part, in current or adapted form. It is designed to be research-based, transparent, fair, and adaptable to the specific contexts of Ohio's districts (rural, urban, suburban, large, and small). The evaluation system comprises three broad components or dimensions, each of which is weighted equally: a goal setting process; a system of formative assessment and coaching; and measures of effectiveness based on multiple data sources.*

Policy Context	
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	In 2006-2007, using standards and research linking school leadership to student achievement and best practice, Ohio developed a state model to evaluate principals, the OPES, which is closely aligned with the Ohio Standards for Principals and Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. The OPES was developed collaboratively by Ohio superintendents, school administrators, higher education faculty, and representatives from Ohio's administrator associations. In 2008-2009, the OPES was piloted in 19 districts statewide with more than 140 principals; evaluation results from the pilot were subsequently used to modify the OPES. In 2009-2010, efforts focused on scaling this work statewide. *(Source: NASBE)*
STATE AND DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	The OPES is a resource model. Districts can implement all, parts, or none of it. It is recommended that there be consistency in use of whatever components are employed across all principals in the district.
Structure of the System	
PURPOSE	The system was created to ensure: » Professional growth through ongoing dialogue between principals and evaluators » Continuous improvement through fostering the growth of knowledge and skills over time » Quality assurance through ensuring high levels of effectiveness Results are used for: » Incentives

*All information is taken from the first source listed at end of this state, unless parenthetically noted.

PURPOSE (COUNTINUED)	» Placement » Dismissals » Professional development
FEATURES	The system was designed to be: » Fair and equitable » Research-based » Transparent » Understandable and easy to use for both principals and their evaluators » Adaptable to local conditions and needs (allows for tailoring work and targets of performance to the wide variety of contexts throughout the state – in terms of type of school, job assignment, career stage, or type of community) » Formative (developmental) and summative (evaluative)
COMPONENTS	The evaluation system comprises three broad, equally weighted components: » A goal-setting process in which standards-based goals are crafted, targets of performance are established, and sources of evidence are identified » A system of formative assessment and coaching that is based on examination of practice against the Ohio Standards for Principals and analysis of student learning data tied to achievement goals » Measures of effectiveness based on multiple data sources (student learning outcomes and skills and knowledge)
PROCESS AND TIMELINE	» Meet to establish goals and objectives for the evaluation period, including reviewing and discussing relevant data sources that inform the goals. » Meet to establish the action plans and evidence indicators to be used for formative and summative evaluation; review data collection requirements and establish a timeline for regular communication and feedback that includes face-to-face meetings.

Process and timeline (continued)	The recommendations for implementation are as follows: » Schedule a minimum of two formative conferences (principal and evaluator) at routine intervals during the evaluation period. At the initial conference, the evaluator should lead a review of the evaluation process, discuss the expectations for both the employee and supervisor, and review the work associated with the goal-setting process. » Administer a 360-degree assessment and parent survey (optional). » Provide the principal with appropriate and timely feedback, resources, and guidance to assist the principal in achieving goals and objectives following conferences. » Formally observe the principal performing assigned duties during the evaluation year; include a pre- and post-observation conference. A written report to the principal describing areas of reinforcement and opportunities for refinement should follow the post-observation conferences. » Conduct a summative evaluation conference followed by a final written evaluation.
Alignment to leadership standards	The OPES is tightly aligned and scaffolded with the Ohio Standards for Principals and ISLLC standards.
Sources of evidence and measures	Fifty percent of the OPES is based on performance data, including impact on student indicators as demonstrated through value-added scores, student attendance, graduation rates, number of suspensions and expulsions, and percentage of all students in advanced placement classes. The other 50 percent reflects the demonstrated knowledge and skills based on the Ohio Standards for Principals. (*Source: Race to the Top Application*) Districts can choose from the following instruments: » McREL's Balanced Leadership Profile » Vanderbilt's Assessment of Leadership in Education Examples of evidence include: » Indicators of student achievement (external and internal data sources) » School or district improvement plans » Customer satisfaction data » 360 assessment by teachers who are supervised by the administrator

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND MEASURES (CONTINUED)	» Self-assessment using Ohio Standards for Principals » Working Conditions Survey » Observations (sources may include walk-throughs, staff meetings, professional development meetings, an evaluation conference with a teacher or staff member, and/or analysis of student work samples)
RATINGS	A performance rating rubric, under development, will differentiate principal effectiveness using five rating categories (ineffective, developing, effective/proficient, highly effective/accomplished, distinguished). The performance rubric includes indicators that describe observable and measurable behaviors based on Ohio's Standards for Principals for each of the five rating categories.
Implementation	
DIFFERENTIATION	The OPES allows for tailoring work and targets of performance to the type of school, job assignment, career stage, and type of community. (*Source: Ohio Department of Education PPT*) Modifications may also need to be made for assistant, associate, and vice principals. In those cases where assistant principals have a specialized area of responsibility (e.g., student discipline, curriculum) rather than the more general set of assignments associated with the principal, districts need to use only part of the system (e.g., the goal development process).
CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	Indicators of student achievement, both internal and external, are considered.
EVALUATOR DETAILS	State implementation guidance suggests that in the first year of implementation districts focus on evaluator training and administration of OPES.
TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, AND FORMS	» Professional Growth and Development Plan » Analysis of Student Learning Needs » Evidence Criteria » Performance Rating Rubric

Tools, instruments, and forms (continued)	» Goal Setting Processes and Instruments: Self-Assessment on Ohio's Standards for Principals, Analysis of Student Learning Needs, Goal Setting, Professional Growth Plan
	» Formative Assessment and Coaching Form
	» Summary Evaluation Form
	(All are found in the *Ohio Principal Evaluation System Workbook*. See sources below.)
Changes in progress	This system is currently in 140 schools and will be expanded through RTTT.
	Beginning in 2010-11, Ohio will collect and publicly report baseline data that include effectiveness ratings resulting from annual principal evaluations. RTTT's goal is that by 2013-14, all participating districts and charter schools will have fully credentialed principal evaluation systems, and 90 percent of principals will be rated as effective, highly effective, or distinguished.
	Additionally, Ohio will identify multiple measures of student growth that will be a component in determining principal effectiveness ratings.
	RTTT districts have agreed to use the OPES model or design a local evaluation system aligned to state and federal criteria. Currently, the Ohio Department of Education and the Buckeye Association of School Administrators have launched a training for RTTT districts. Over 40 districts are involved, and there are plans to launch a second cohort in spring 2011.
	(Source: RTTT Application)

Sources

Ohio Department of Education. *Ohio Principal Evaluation System Workbook*. 2009. Print.

National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE). *Ohio: Licensure/Assessment Policies*. n.d. Retrieved October 15, 2010, from http://nasbe.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10044

Ohio Department of Education. *Ohio Principal Evaluation System: Guide for Assessing School Leaders* (Draft Plan). PowerPoint presented to the Principal Evaluation Guideline Committee. June 29, 2007. Print.

Ohio Department of Education. *Race to the Top Application*. Retrieved February 21, 2011, from http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/phase2-applications/index.html

Principal Evaluation Policies and Practices: South Carolina

Summary

The South Carolina Program for Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP) provides guidance and resources to districts for principal evaluation and professional development. The South Carolina Department of Education conducted a three-year, statewide, collaborative process of developing nine performance standards that are research and standards-based, with evaluation criteria and rubrics for an evaluation instrument, and with statewide evaluator training as a key component. Research on the evaluation instrument provides evidence of reliability and validity. The evaluation is a year-long process of goal setting, data collection, and meetings with the supervisor/evaluator for feedback, coaching, and ratings. The process is focused primarily on professional development and improvement.*

Policy Context	
SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	Legislation for principal evaluation (1997, 2009) required the development of performance standards for school principals and a performance evaluation instrument. The South Carolina Department of Education conducted a three-year process to develop nine principal performance standards, evaluation criteria, and the PADEPP. The Department carried out a collaborative, statewide process to develop the process with a committee of practicing professionals, university faculty, the South Carolina Education Policy Center, community stakeholders, and job experts.
	The performance criteria for each standard were reviewed internally by the Department and in a statewide review by all district-level administrators. A pilot field study of the evaluation instrument was conducted to gather reliability and validity data and information about implementation, technical accuracy, and reactions to the instrument.
	The principal evaluation instrument was determined to be valid and reliable for measuring the degree to which a principal's performance meets the state standards, according to *The Personnel Evaluation Standards* by the Joint Committee on Standards in Educational Evaluation (JCSEE). The system was also found to have significant benefits to participants in providing evaluation throughout the year, informing professional development about organizational learning, and prompting reflection on the requirements for improvement.
STATE AND DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES	The state requires districts to formally evaluate principals using the Performance Standards and Criteria for Principal Evaluation. In lieu of the state process, districts may request permission to use an alternative evaluation process that meets state requirements and national standards.

*All information is taken from the first source listed at end of this state document, unless parenthetically noted.

Structure of the System	
PURPOSE	The PADEPP is intended to: » Guide districts in conducting formal and informal evaluations of principals. » Be used for a principal's professional development planning and improvement. » Inform district decisions regarding re-employment, compensation, and promotion.
FEATURES	The PADEPP has the following features: » Focuses on professional development planning by the principal and supervisor » Aligns professional development plans with school improvement goals » Provides job-embedded guidelines for professional development activities providing evidence for evaluation and improvement » Identifies extensive written and online resources for professional development and system improvement » Provides research and evidence about the system and instrument meeting the national Personnel Evaluation Standards for educators » Provides guidance, orientation, and training about the evaluation process for principals and evaluators
COMPONENTS	» State Principal Performance Standards and Criteria » Orientation and Procedures/Assurance Forms, with a list of the major activities to be completed prior to and during the evaluation of the principal » Principal Evaluation Instrument with detailed rubrics for each of nine South Carolina Leadership Standards » Guidelines and rating forms (Independent and Consensus Summative Rating Forms) » Professional Development Guide with print and web-based resources and job-embedded development activities for each standard

COMPONENTS (CONTINUED)	» Principal Professional Development Plan and Directions » Evaluator training to collect and document data relative to a principal's performance; analyze the data to identify strengths and weaknesses; provide feedback, counsel, coach, and assist the principal to improve effectiveness; and formally evaluate the principal in a valid, reliable manner to make a summative judgment regarding the principal's performance

PROCESS AND TIMELINE	The principal and evaluator meet for a minimum of three conferences annually:
	
	1. The principal receives orientation to PADEPP, standards and criteria, and state regulations.
	
	    a) The evaluator meets with the principal to discuss the Principal Evaluation Instrument, procedures, and goals (by September 15 or within one month of hire date).
	
	    b) The evaluator clarifies questions concerning PADEPP standards and criteria.
	
	    c) The evaluator informs the principal of district expectations and requirements for data collection.
	
	2. Progress Checks and Feedback – The evaluator meets with the principal to review progress toward goals and criteria.
	
	3. A summative conference is held at the end of the year.
	
	    a) Based on identified strengths and weaknesses and the school's strategic plan, the principal develops an annual Professional Development Plan (with the supervisor's approval of the principal's goals).
	
	    b) At the completion of the evaluation process, the evaluator and the principal complete and sign the Principal Procedures/Assurance Form to document that the principal's evaluation has been conducted as required.

ALIGNMENT TO LEADERSHIP STANDARDS	The statewide development process included review of Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and literature, resulting in adaptation of the six ISLLC standards and addition of three research-based standards.

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE AND MEASURES	The PADEPP Principal Evaluation Instrument recommends using multiple indicators including student achievement. Evaluation rubrics require evidence of activities that indicate performance on each standard, such as the following: » Set and communicate high standards for curricular/instructional quality and student achievement. » Demonstrate proficiency in analyzing research and assessment data. » Ensure the use of data from state and locally mandated assessments and educational research to improve curriculum, instruction, and student performance. » Observe staff and assist in the implementation of effective teaching and assessment strategies to promote student learning. » Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional programs to promote student learning development guidelines. Professional development guidelines suggest activities with evidence and artifacts, such as the following: » Analyze assessment data, identify performance gaps, and lead brainstorming sessions with teachers and/or parents to address gaps. » Conduct a validity study on stakeholders' perceptions of existing performance levels and student achievement. Compare these findings to hard data related to performance levels and student achievement. Address differences as warranted. » Develop in-school teams to work on areas of need identified through surveys, test data analysis, and other sources.
RATINGS	A three-point rubric has performance descriptors for each standard: ratings of Exemplary, Proficient, and Improvement Needed.

Implementation

DIFFERENTIATION	Individual goal setting and a data plan provide for differences in context and role.

CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	The PADEPP rubrics provide general guidelines, such as the following: » Demonstrates proficiency in analyzing research and assessment data » Ensures the use of data from state and locally mandated assessments and educational research to improve curriculum, instruction, and student performance
EVALUATOR DETAILS	The South Carolina Department of Education provides superintendents and their designees with training to enable them to support and evaluate their first-year principals. Specifically, the training ensures that participants have the knowledge and skills necessary to collect and document data relative to a principal's performance; analyze the data to identify strengths and weaknesses; provide feedback to the principal in terms of the PADEPP performance standards; and counsel, coach, and assist the principal to improve effectiveness. Additionally, the training ensures that participants are prepared to formally evaluate the principal in a valid, reliable manner and to make a summative judgment regarding the principal's performance. The Department provides school districts with ongoing technical assistance in the form of training, consultation, and advisement.
TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, AND FORMS	» Performance Standards and Criteria for South Carolina Principal Evaluation » Evaluation Instrument with performance-based rubrics on each standard » Forms to organize and schedule activities and data collection (Principal Procedures/Assurance Form about orientation, formative conferences, progress check, and feedback) » Summative forms for independent and consensus ratings » Professional Development Plan Directions » Principal Professional Development Plan » Professional Development Guide with job-embedded development activities, print resources, and websites categorized by performance standards » Research evidence for different types of validity and reliability of raters and the system All are found in the *Program for Assisting, Developing and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP)*. See sources at the end of this state.

Changes in progress	» The state is implementing a new tiered licensure structure.
	» State regulation has been amended to provide data that inform principal preparation and inservice leadership programs about principal performance.

Sources

South Carolina Department of Education. *Program for Assisting, Developing and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP)*. n.d. Retrieved December 1, 2010, from http://www.scteachers.org/leadership/principalperformance.cfm

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (JCSEE). (1988). *The Personnel Evaluation Standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

WestEd

WestEd.org