



# Incorporating Retention of Effective and Highly Effective Teachers in Principal Evaluations

August 2015

## Introduction

The quality of a teacher's instruction is widely understood to be the most important school-based factor in student learning. High-quality instruction is particularly important in low-performing schools where students are less likely to be served by highly effective teachers from year to year.<sup>1</sup> Many principals have relied on recruitment of and professional development for teachers to improve the quality of instruction in their buildings. Yet recent studies suggest that recruitment and professional development alone do not have a lasting impact on the instructional quality in the school.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, we know that highly effective and ineffective teachers typically leave schools at about the same rates, suggesting that schools are not doing enough to retain their best.<sup>3</sup> By taking positive steps to retain their strongest teachers, principals can maximize the impact of teacher retention on instructional quality. This paper refers to quality-conscious teacher retention efforts as "selective retention."

As of spring 2014, at least 38 States had passed laws calling for more comprehensive principal evaluations, which paved the way for policies

that support school-level selective retention.<sup>4</sup> As they work to redesign their principal evaluation systems, States can encourage principals to focus on selective retention by including it as one of multiple measures of principal effectiveness. In fact, at least eight States, including Oklahoma and Georgia, as well as a small number of local educational agencies (LEAs) and the District of Columbia, have begun to include new quality-conscious teacher retention measures in their principal evaluation instruments.<sup>5</sup>

Among States incorporating selective retention in principal evaluation scores, current efforts are in three categories:

- Requiring a selective retention measure in at least one of the pre-approved State principal evaluation models, which LEAs are required to choose.
- Identifying selective retention as a required measure in otherwise locally developed principal evaluation systems, and perhaps drafting a model evaluation framework containing selective retention that LEAs can choose to adopt to ensure compliance.
- Identifying selective retention as an optional measure to meet a required component of a locally-developed principal evaluation system (for example, requiring an LEA to evaluate a principal's "human resources management" abilities and suggesting selective retention as one of many possible ways to do so).

<sup>1</sup> Reform Support Network (2014). *Recruiting and Retaining Highly Effective Turnaround Teachers*. (Washington, D.C.). <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/recruiting-retaining-turnaround-teachers.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Hassel, B.C., & Hassel, E.A. (2010). "Opportunity at the Top: How America's Best Teachers Could Close the Gaps, Raise the Bar, and Keep Our Nation Great." (Chapel Hill, NC: Public Impact). <http://opportunityculture.org/opportunity-at-the-top/>

<sup>3</sup> The New Teacher Project (2012). *The Irreplaceables: Understanding the Real Retention Crisis in America's Urban Schools*. (Brooklyn, New York). <http://tntp.org/irreplaceables>

<sup>4</sup> Research current as of April 4, 2014.

<sup>5</sup> Many of these evaluation frameworks are still in draft form as of the date of publication.

**The Reform Support Network, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, supports the Race to the Top grantees as they implement reforms in education policy and practice, learn from each other, and build their capacity to sustain these reforms, while sharing these promising practices and lessons learned with other States attempting to implement similarly bold education reform initiatives.**

## Why Selective Retention Matters

While decades of research have confirmed that the most important driver of student outcomes is teacher quality, more recent studies have identified principal quality as the second most important.<sup>6</sup> In particular, principals' efforts to recruit the best possible teachers and develop their professional skills can have a substantial impact on student achievement. This is especially the case in low-performing schools, where teacher talent is all the more crucial for bridging wide achievement gaps. Even so, only about half of States purport to measure principals' success at recruiting, developing, supporting, assessing and rewarding the general population of teachers in their buildings in any manner.<sup>7</sup>

Of these early adopters, fewer still have revised their principal evaluation systems to specifically incorporate selective retention of effective and highly effective teachers as one of their multiple measures of principal effectiveness. Where teacher retention appeared as a measure in principal evaluations before 2009, it was more commonly reported as a single number or percentage, not disaggregated by teacher effectiveness. For example, North Carolina's current principal evaluation, adopted in 2005, is based in part on the total percentage of all teachers retained. A small number of new studies have persuasively advocated for a more purposeful approach, however, than measuring retention of all teachers, regardless of their effectiveness levels.

Recent research around teacher retention examined data from four large urban LEAs and found that the most effective and least effective teachers were retained at the average school at very similar rates, with an average of 6 to 17 percent of the most

effective and 6 to 21 percent of the lowest performers leaving their schools each year.<sup>8</sup> The study further found that two-thirds of high performers surveyed had never been encouraged by their principals to stay, leading to the hypothesis that a lack of State- and LEA-imposed accountability for selective teacher retention had led to complacency among leaders.<sup>9</sup>

This brief examines policies in the handful of States and LEAs that are beginning to address this issue by measuring *selective* teacher retention as a desired measure of a principal's success. Though the evidence base directly supporting selective teacher retention leading to greater student achievement is only just beginning to build, the indisputable point that teacher quality matters lends considerable weight to the idea that retaining our most effective teachers will greatly benefit students, especially those in the lowest-performing schools. The policies reviewed in this brief provide ideas for other States and LEAs to consider to more effectively promote selective retention.

## 2014 Legislative Landscape

Legislation in effect as of the 2014 legislative session indicates that States differ in the flexibility they allow LEAs to draft their own local principal evaluations. Some States require all LEAs to adopt one of a small number of pre-approved frameworks. Others require specific measures, often designing an evaluation model that LEAs may adopt to ensure compliance. Still other States outline broad parameters that they recommend the LEAs measure via selective retention and/or other enumerated data.<sup>10</sup> Table 1 identifies States that require selective retention as a component of principal evaluation in every LEA statewide (via a pre-approved State evaluation or a required selective retention parameter), as well as those that recommend selective retention (as a way to measure a required parameter that is broader in scope).

<sup>6</sup> Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). "School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results" (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development).

<sup>7</sup> George W. Bush Institute and Alliance to Reform Education Leadership (2013). "Operating in the Dark: What Outdated State Policies and Data Gaps Mean for Effective School Leadership" (Dallas, Texas). <http://www.bushcenter.org/alliance-reform-education-leadership/arel-state-policy-project>

<sup>8</sup> *Irreplaceables*, p. 13.

<sup>9</sup> *Irreplaceables*, p. 4.

<sup>10</sup> Center for Great Teachers and Leaders at American Institutes for Research (2012). "State Principal Evaluation Policies: State Roles." <http://resource.tqsource.org/statevaldb/StateRoles.aspx>

**Table 1. State Examples of Selective Retention**

State	Selective Retention Required or Recommended?	Selective Evaluation Description	Authority
Florida	<i>Required</i> measure in the evaluation of the LEA's choosing	Principal evaluations at the LEA level must include "recruitment and retention of effective and highly effective classroom teachers" and "improvement in the percentage of instructional personnel evaluated at the highly effective or effective level." <sup>11</sup>	Fla. Stat. § 1012.34(3)(a)(1)(c) (3) <sup>12</sup>
Georgia	<i>Required</i> measure in the evaluation of the LEA's choosing	Statute requires measuring "the principal's ability to attract and retain highly effective teachers." <sup>13</sup> The "Leader Keys" model assesses principals on three different strands that produce an overall effectiveness measure. For the <i>Leader Assessment on Performance</i> strand, principals must show that they "foster effective human resources management through the selection, induction, support and retention of quality instructional and support personnel." The evaluation also includes a quantitative measure of retention of effective teachers. <sup>14</sup>	Ga. Code § 20-2-210 (b)(2)(D) <sup>15</sup>
Oklahoma	<i>Required</i> measure in one of the two evaluation models for the LEA's use <sup>16</sup>	The models that the State has adopted for all LEAs include "observable and measurable characteristics of personnel and site management practices that are correlated to student performance success, including, but not limited to organization and school management, including retention and development of effective teachers and dismissal of ineffective teachers." <sup>17</sup>	Okla. Stat. §70-6-101.16(B)(6) <sup>18</sup>
Colorado	Recommended measure that LEAs may choose to adopt	One of the elements suggested by the Governor's Council for Educator Effectiveness under the Human Resource Leadership Standard is the principal's "recruiting, hiring, placing, mentoring, and recommendations for dismissal of staff," as well as the "overall count and percentage of effective teachers that reflects the school's improvement priorities." <sup>19</sup>	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 22-9-105.5 <sup>20</sup> (created the Governor's Council for Educator Effectiveness authorized to develop evaluation recommendations)
Indiana	Recommended measure that LEAs may choose to adopt	Under the "Teacher Effectiveness" domain, Indiana suggests that LEAs measure "hiring and retention:" specifically, effective principals "consistently us[e] teachers' displayed levels of effectiveness as the primary factor in recruiting, hiring and assigning decisions." <sup>21</sup>	Ind. Code sec. 20-28-11.5-8 (a)(2) <sup>22</sup> (authorizes the Department of Education to develop evaluation recommendations)

<sup>11</sup> Fla. Stat. § 1012.34(3)(a)(1)(c) (3)

<sup>12</sup> <http://laws.flrules.org/2011/1>

<sup>13</sup> Ga. Code § 20-2-210 (b)(2)(D)

<sup>14</sup> Also see the sample rubric in the appendix. Georgia Department of Education (2014). "Leader Keys Effectiveness System Implementation Handbook." <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/FY15%20TKES%20and%20LKES%20Documents/LKES%20Handbook-%20%20FINAL%205-30-14.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> <http://ga.elaws.us/law/section20-2-210>

<sup>16</sup> Oklahoma TLE Commission. "Report to the Oklahoma State Legislature and Governor on the Recommendations of the TLE Commission and the Adoption of the TLE by the Oklahoma State Board of Education." <http://ok.gov/sde/sites/ok.gov.sde/files/TLE-ReportLeg.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> Okla. Stat. §70-6-101.16(B)(6)

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.oklegislature.gov/osStatuesTitle.aspx>

<sup>19</sup> Colorado State Council for Educator Effectiveness (2011). "Report and Recommendations." [http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/educatoreffectiveness/downloads/report%20%26%20appendices/scee\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/educatoreffectiveness/downloads/report%20%26%20appendices/scee_final_report.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/colorado/>

<sup>21</sup> Indiana Department of Education (2014). "RISE Evaluation and Development System: Evaluator and Principal Handbook [final]." [http://www.riseindiana.org/sites/default/files/files/RISE%20Handbook%20for%20principals\\_FINAL\(2\).pdf](http://www.riseindiana.org/sites/default/files/files/RISE%20Handbook%20for%20principals_FINAL(2).pdf)

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.in.gov/legislative/ic/code/title20/ar28/ch11.5.html>

**Table 1. State Examples of Selective Retention (continued)**

State	Selective Retention Required or Recommended?	Selective Evaluation Description	Authority
Minnesota	Recommended measure that LEAs may choose to adopt	To measure how principals manage teachers “for quality instruction and professional growth,” the Minnesota Department of Education recommends that indicators include “a cohesive approach to recruitment, placement, induction and retention that promotes highly qualified and effective staff.” <sup>23</sup>	Minn. Acts H.F. 26 (2011) (created the Principal Evaluation Workgroup, empowering it to convene and develop a model principal evaluation system) <sup>24</sup>
New Jersey	Recommended measure that LEAs may choose to adopt	The New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force recommends that “differential retention” account for 10 percent of principal evaluations, and that their evaluations also take into account the principal’s ability to recruit and retain effective teachers, and their ability to “exit ineffective teachers.” <sup>25</sup>	N.J. Exec. Order No. 42 (2010) (authorizes the Educator Effectiveness Task Force) <sup>26</sup>
New York	Recommended measure that LEAs may choose to adopt	The State Statute requires that “at least one goal must address the principal’s contribution to improving teacher effectiveness, which shall include one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers, the correlation between student growth scores of teachers granted tenure as opposed to those denied tenure; or improvements in the proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric.” <sup>27</sup>	N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c (2)(h)(5)(i) <sup>28</sup>

<sup>23</sup> Minnesota Department of Education et al. (2012). “Measuring Principal Performance in Minnesota: A Report, a Model, and Recommendations.” [http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET\\_FILE&dDocName=041370&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary](http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=041370&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary)

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/?id=123b.147>

<sup>25</sup> New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force (2011). “Interim Report.” <http://www.state.nj.us/education/educators/effectiveness.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> <http://nj.gov/infobank/circular/eocc42.pdf>

<sup>27</sup> New York Education Law § 3012-c (2)(h)(5)(i)

<sup>28</sup> [http://law.onecle.com/new-york/education/EDN03012-C\\_3012-C.html](http://law.onecle.com/new-york/education/EDN03012-C_3012-C.html)

## LEA Examples

Just as States have acted in the last three years to integrate selective retention into required or recommended new principal evaluation tools, so too have many LEAs. Language from the school year (SY) 2013–2014 version of the evaluation tool used in the District of Columbia, one of the earliest and most prominent adopters of selective retention evaluation, appears in Table 2 below, along with Hillsborough County Public Schools and Orange County Public Schools (both in Florida), two of the 10 largest LEAs by enrollment in the country.

**Table 2. LEA Examples of Selective Retention**

LEA	Selective Evaluation Description
District of Columbia	<p>The IMPACT evaluation tool for SY 2013–2014 assesses a principal across two major components: Student Achievement Goals and Leadership Framework Standards (LFS). The LFS measures six different leadership actions; “Instruction” is weighted at 25 percent of the LFS, while each of the other five actions, including “Talent,” are weighted at 15 percent.<sup>29</sup> “Talent” includes the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Attracts, selects, develops, and retains key talent to maximize staff members’ performance and student learning.”</li> <li>• “Evaluates staff members, provides support, and removes low performers.”</li> <li>• “Retains key staff and builds leadership capacity.”</li> </ul> <p>Principals must also submit their “Highly Effective and Effective Teacher Retention Rate” (quantitative measure).<sup>30</sup></p>
Hillsborough County, Florida	<p>Selective retention is one of seven “human resources” indicators that contribute toward 10 percent of a principal’s evaluation. A principal who “requires action” “[d]oes not effectively distinguish between high- and low-performing teachers. May fail to recognize high performers or support those who struggle. Avoids conflict, difficult conversations, or work required to exit persistently low-performing teachers. May transfer low-performers elsewhere.” An “exemplary” principal, on the other hand, “[g]ives high-performing teachers increasing responsibility and challenges. Effectively develops or exits all persistently low-performing teachers.”<sup>31</sup></p>
Orange County, Florida	<p>Under “Domain 2: Instructional Leadership,” 17 indicators combine to contribute to 40 percent of principals’ total scores. One of these indicators is “recruitment and retention: the leader employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served.”<sup>32</sup></p>

<sup>29</sup> District of Columbia Public Schools (2013). “School Leaders: IMPACT,” The District of Columbia Public Schools Effectiveness Assessment System for School-Based Personnel, 2013–14.

<sup>30</sup> “School Leaders: IMPACT,” p. 13.

<sup>31</sup> School District of Hillsborough County (2014). “Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Handbook [final].” <http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/doc/list/hillsborough-principal-pipeline-and-leadership-development/about/142-633/>

<sup>32</sup> Orange County Public Schools (2012). “School Leader Evaluation Model.” [https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/leadership/Documents/OCPS\\_Principal\\_Leadership\\_Evaluation\\_Proposal.pdf](https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/leadership/Documents/OCPS_Principal_Leadership_Evaluation_Proposal.pdf)

## Key Decision Points for States and LEAs

Early implementation of selective retention policies has revealed five key decision points for future implementers to take into account.

### 1. What Teacher Retention Data Can the LEA Collect?

Identifying the retention data and determining how evaluators will use them are considerations that will influence principal performance. States and LEAs that use selective retention measures in principal evaluations are incentivizing principals' retention of both effective and highly effective teachers. Some States—such as Oklahoma and New Jersey—also require or recommend measuring the number of ineffective teachers who leave schools, which should drive principals to more aggressively counsel out underperformers. One LEA that considered such quantitative measurements during early evaluation system drafts proposed omitting certain teachers from selective retention calculations to precisely capture the retention data most related to quality. Hillsborough County excluded retirees from its “modified teacher retention report” and allowed LEA officials discretion to adjust principals' ratings when teachers were promoted to leadership positions, when a principal had successfully counseled out low performers or amidst expected turnover accompanying the arrival of a new principal.

### 2. What Measures Can LEAs Use to Assess Principal Impact on Selective Retention?

States and LEAs typically include quantitative measures of teacher retention and dismissals—usually a percentage—rather than examine the specific actions a principal has taken to encourage effective and highly effective teachers to stay. Georgia, however, includes retention numbers alongside evidence from staff surveys about the principal's retention efforts (see Appendix B). For instance, a principal could receive the lowest rating on the qualitative selective teacher retention component if “[s]taff report that input and effort are not valued by their leaders,” or the highest

rating when “[t]he work environment of the school/LEA leads staff to view themselves as members of a team who support each other for a common purpose” and “[c]elebrations of staff and student achievements are common practice.”

### 3. What Autonomies Will Principals Require to Effectively Impact Selective Retention?

Principals may require a certain level of decision-making authority over the placement, development and dismissal of their teachers to successfully retain a higher percentage of those who are most effective. At least two State task forces formed to draft required or recommended principal evaluations have urged that principals be allowed greater autonomy over personnel decisions before being held accountable for them. In New Jersey, for instance, a task force recommended that the commissioner “develop policies to ensure principals and superintendents have responsibility for personnel decisions.”<sup>33</sup> Colorado's task force came to a similar conclusion, insisting that, “at the very least, principals should be able to select staff from a pool of qualified candidates maintained by the district.”<sup>34</sup>

### 4. How Accurate Are Teacher Performance Ratings?

Teacher evaluation systems that fail to accurately place teachers into different performance levels will limit the effectiveness of a differential retention measure. A Reform Support Network publication, “[Promoting Evaluation Rating Accuracy: Strategic Options for States](#),” reviews teacher evaluation results in two representative States with reformed teacher evaluation systems. The publication found that, in spite of new evaluations designed to more accurately distribute teachers' ratings along a bell curve, the results do not yet meet that goal. In pilots, new evaluation systems identified a negligible additional percentage of

<sup>33</sup> New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force (2011). “Interim Report.” <http://www.state.nj.us/education/educators/effectiveness.pdf>

<sup>34</sup> Colorado State Council for Educator Effectiveness (2011). “Report and Recommendations.” [http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/educatoreffectiveness/downloads/report%20%26%20appendices/scee\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/educatoreffectiveness/downloads/report%20%26%20appendices/scee_final_report.pdf)

teachers with a summative rating of “ineffective”—generally only about two percent more—even while student growth returns suggested a more widely distributed spread.<sup>35</sup>

When teacher evaluation ratings cannot accurately discriminate among effective and ineffective teachers, measures of selective retention are meaningless. A principal cannot affect the ratio of effective to non-effective teachers if no ratio exists. Tracking of selective retention depends on the development and thoughtful implementation of teacher evaluation systems that differentiate teachers according to effectiveness, as well as on principals’ willingness and capacity to assign accurate ratings to all teachers.

## 5. What Is the Weight of This Measure in the Overall Evaluation?

States and LEAs take varying approaches to the weight of selective retention measures in principal evaluation ratings. New Jersey sets selective retention as its own discrete category with a weight of 10 percent of the overall evaluation. The bulk of States and LEAs, however, incorporate selective retention rates under a broader category of leadership such as “human resources,” “managing operations” or as one of many goals an evaluator may choose to consider

<sup>35</sup> Reform Support Network (2013). “Promoting Evaluation Rating Accuracy: Strategic Options for States.” <http://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/implementation-support-unit/tech-assist/evaluation-rating-accuracy.pdf>

that demonstrate the principal’s contribution to “instructional leadership” or “improving teacher effectiveness.” In these systems, principals’ selective retention efforts are one of many factors without specific weight in the overall evaluation.<sup>36</sup>

## Conclusion

A handful of pioneering States and LEAs have begun holding principals accountable for not only the number of teachers they retain from year to year, but more specifically for the number of *effective and highly effective* teachers, since these are the ones who are best equipped to improve student outcomes. The process of implementing this “selective retention” measure presents a host of challenges for agencies in charge of principal evaluation. By attending to key decision points identified in this brief, States and LEAs wishing to incent strategic human resources practices that keep the best teachers in the classroom may address some of the challenges encountered by early implementers.

<sup>36</sup> Language from Florida’s principal evaluation legislation illustrates other elements States tend to include when including teacher retention in a composite measure: “Instructional leadership” encompasses not only “recruitment and retention of effective and highly effective classroom teachers,” but also “performance measures related to the effectiveness of classroom teachers in the school, the administrator’s appropriate use of evaluation criteria and procedures... improvement in the percentage of instructional personnel evaluated at the highly effective or effective level, and other leadership practices that result in student learning growth.”

# Appendix A – Relevant Language from State Legislation, Regulation or Program

## Oklahoma

- *Authority:* Okla. Stat. §70-6-101.16(B)(6)
- *Example language:* “B. The Teacher/Leader Evaluation System [TLE] shall include the following components: ...6. An evidence-based qualitative assessment tool for the leader qualitative portion of the TLE that will include observable and measurable characteristics of personnel and site management practices that are correlated to student performance success, including, but not limited to:
  - a. organizational and school management, including retention and development of effective teachers and dismissal of ineffective teachers,
  - b. instructional leadership,
  - c. professional growth and responsibility,
  - d. interpersonal skills,
  - e. leadership skills, and
  - f. stakeholder perceptions.”

## Florida

- *Authority:* Fla. Stat. § 1012.34(3)(a)(1)(c) (3)
- *Example language:* “3. Instructional leadership. For school administrators, evaluation criteria must include indicators based upon each of the leadership standards adopted by the State Board of Education under §1012.986, including performance measures related to the effectiveness of classroom teachers in the school, the administrators’ appropriate use of evaluation criteria and procedures, recruitment and retention of effective and highly effective classroom teachers, improvement in the percentage of instructional personnel evaluated at the highly effective or effective level, and other leadership practices that result in student learning growth...”

## Georgia

- *Authority:* Ga. Code § 20-2-210 (b)(2)(D)
- *Example language:* “(D) For assistant principals and principals, the annual evaluation shall also include multiple additional measures that shall be aligned with impacts on student achievement results. These measures shall include multiple school observations each year by appropriately trained and credentialed evaluators. When sufficient data becomes available from the department to calculate performance measures, these measures shall also include the principal’s ability to attract and retain highly effective teachers, effectively manage the school, and establish a positive climate for learning, and other measures aligned with student achievement for students in all subgroups.”
- *Example language from State model evaluation:* The State is piloting the “Leader Keys Evaluation System.” Principals are evaluated on three different strands: leader assessment on performance standards, governance and leadership and student growth and academic achievement. The three strands contribute to an overall Leader Effectiveness Measure. Retention of effective teachers is included under the Leader Assessment on Performance Standards strand: “The leader fosters effective human resources management through the selection, induction, support, and retention of quality instructional and support personnel.” In addition, the strand requires “documentation from multiple data sources... ([including] retention [rates] of effective teachers) to provide a comprehensive view of a leader’s practice utilizing eight rubric-based performance standards.”<sup>37</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Georgia Department of Education (2013). “Leader Keys Effectiveness System Implementation Handbook, 2013–14.” <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/LKES%20Handbook%202013.pdf>



## Colorado

- *Authority:* Colo. Rev. Stat. § 22-9-105.5 (created the Governor’s Council for Educator Effectiveness authorized to develop evaluation recommendations)
- *Example language:* The State Council for Educator Effectiveness recommends assessment of selective retention under Element 4.2, Standard IV (“Principals demonstrate human resource leadership”): “Recruiting, Hiring, Placing, Mentoring, and Recommendations for Dismissal of Staff: Principals establish and effectively manage processes and systems that ensure a high-quality, high-performing staff, including an overall count and percentage of effective teachers that reflects the school’s improvement priorities.”

The Council also notes that “[i]n order for principals to be fairly evaluated on this Element 4.2, they must have the authority to make decisions about the staffing of their schools. The Council recommends that LEAs adopt procedures that provide principals such authority in a way that permits the fair assessment of a principal’s performance under this Element. At the very least, principals should be able to select staff from a pool of qualified candidates maintained by the district.”

The Council recommends language for the State to adopt in legislation: “Districts shall adopt procedures that give principals the authority to make or share in the making of decisions about recruiting, hiring, training, mentoring, and dismissing staff in a way that permits the fair assessment of a principal’s performance on human resources leadership under the Colorado Principal Quality Standards.”<sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Colorado State Council for Educator Effectiveness (2011). “Report and Recommendations.” [http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/educatoreffectiveness/downloads/report%20%26%20appendices/scee\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/educatoreffectiveness/downloads/report%20%26%20appendices/scee_final_report.pdf)

## Indiana

- *Authority:* Ind. Code sec. 20-28-11.5-8 (a)(2) (authorizes the Department of Education to develop evaluation recommendations)
- *Example language from State model evaluation:* As evidence of performance to Standard 1.1.1 (Hiring and Retention) under 1.1 (Human capital manager) under Domain 1 (Teacher Effectiveness, which is one of two domains, the other being “Leadership Actions”) in its State principal evaluation instrument, Indiana suggests that LEAs measure “hiring and retention:” specifically, effective principals “consistently us[e] teachers’ displayed levels of effectiveness as the primary factor in recruiting, hiring and assigning decisions.”<sup>39</sup>

## Minnesota

- *Authority:* Acts H.F. 26 (2011) (created the Principal Evaluation Workgroup, empowering it to convene and develop a model principal evaluation system)
- *Example language from State model evaluation:* “Minnesota Department of Education recommendations for LEA evaluations: Under Performance Measure 3, “Manages human resources for quality instruction and professional growth,” recommended indicators include “Implements a cohesive approach to recruitment, placement, induction and retention that promotes highly qualified and effective staff.”<sup>40</sup>

## New Jersey

<sup>39</sup> Indiana Department of Education (2014). “RISE Evaluation and Development System: Evaluator and Principal Handbook [final].” [http://www.riseindiana.org/sites/default/files/files/RISE%20Handbook%20for%20principals\\_FINAL\(2\).pdf](http://www.riseindiana.org/sites/default/files/files/RISE%20Handbook%20for%20principals_FINAL(2).pdf)

<sup>40</sup> Minnesota Department of Education et al. (2011). “Measuring Principal Performance in Minnesota: A Report, a Model, and Recommendations.” [http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET\\_FILE&dDocName=041370&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary](http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=041370&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary)

- *Authority:* N.J. Exec. Order No. 42 (2010) (authorizes the Educator Effectiveness Task Force)
- *Example language from State model evaluation:* The New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force recommends that the principal's effectiveness in human capital management responsibilities include "differential retention of effective teachers (hiring and retaining effective teachers and exiting poor performers)" to comprise 10 percent of the evaluation, explaining that "[t]he following indices should be used to measure differential retention:
  - Principal's effectiveness in improving teacher effectiveness (i.e., growth of teachers' ratings);
  - Principal's effectiveness in recruiting and retaining effective teachers;
  - Principal's effectiveness in exiting ineffective teachers."

The Task Force goes on to note that "[i]t is critical to note that principals can only be judged against this measure if they are given a clear role in teacher hiring, organizing professional development, dismissing ineffective teachers, and more . . . Current New Jersey law States that superintendents are responsible for most of these personnel decisions. To make the individual school accountable for its student achievement outcomes, the school principal must be given more control over the inputs. The Commissioner should develop policies to ensure principals and superintendents have responsibility for personnel decisions."<sup>41</sup>

## New York

- *Authority:* N.Y. Education Law § 3012-c (2)(h)(5)(i)
- *Example language from State model evaluation:* From N.Y. Education Law sec. 3012-c (2)(h)(5) (i): "For evaluations of building principals for the two thousand twelve–two thousand thirteen school year and thereafter, the remaining portion of these sixty points shall include, in addition to

<sup>41</sup> New Jersey Educator Effectiveness Task Force (2011). "Interim Report." <http://www.state.nj.us/education/educators/effectiveness.pdf>

the requirements of subparagraph three of this paragraph, at least two other sources of evidence from the following options: feedback from teachers, students, and/or families using State-approved instruments; school visits by other trained evaluators; and/or review of school documents, records, and/or State accountability processes. Any such remaining points shall be assigned based on the results of one or more ambitious and measurable goals set collaboratively with principals and their superintendents or district superintendents as follows:

- at least one goal must address the principal's contribution to improving teacher effectiveness, which shall include one or more of the following: improved retention of high performing teachers, the correlation between student growth scores of teachers granted tenure as opposed to those denied tenure; or improvements in the proficiency rating of the principal on specific teacher effectiveness standards in the principal practice rubric."

## LEAs

### District of Columbia Public Schools

- *Source:* 2013–2014 IMPACT evaluation tool<sup>42</sup>
- *Description and example language:* The IMPACT evaluation tool for 2013–2014 assesses a principal in two major categories: Student Achievement Goals and Leadership Framework Standards (LFS). The final IMPACT rating is calculated via a rubric that varies according to school level.<sup>43</sup> The LFS measures six different leadership actions; "Instruction" is weighted at 25 percent of the LFS, while the other five, including "Talent," are weighted at 15 percent.<sup>44</sup>
  - "Attracts, selects, develops, and retains key talent

<sup>42</sup> District of Columbia Public Schools (2013). "School Leaders: IMPACT, The District of Columbia Public Schools Effectiveness Assessment System for School-Based Personnel, 2013–14."

<sup>43</sup> "School Leaders: IMPACT," p. 64.

<sup>44</sup> "School Leaders: IMPACT," p. 13.

to maximize staff members' performance and student learning." Indicators relevant to retention of effective and highly effective teachers, at Level 4, the "Highly Effective" level, are as follows:

- "Engages in annual reviews of staff assignments to ensure that all staff members are in positions that best suit their skillsets, areas of expertise, and passions to maximize student learning outcomes, even if this requires significant changes to current placements."
- "Evaluates staff members, provides support, and removes low performers." Relevant indicators at Level 4 include:
  - "Gives honest and timely feedback to low performers throughout the school year and has difficult conversations, as needed [Same as Level 3].
  - Always counsels out, or uses IMPACT to dismiss, consistently low performers [Same as Level 3].
  - Does not rely on excessing, reductions-in-force, or other mechanisms to remove underperforming staff members."
- "Retains key staff and builds leadership capacity." Relevant indicators at Level 4 include:
  - "Invests in high performers by offering them special professional development opportunities, giving them greater responsibility, and involving them in the key decisions that affect the school [Same as Level 3]
  - Identifies and develops high performers with leadership potential for key school or district leadership roles (e.g., giving them opportunities to work on stretch assignments, coach others, lead task forces). The result is the retention of all high performers except for those who are promoted, retire, or resign for reasons unrelated to the school."

- Principals are also required to submit the following data to instructional superintendents on a bi-yearly basis:

- Same Day Attendance Entry
- Teacher Attendance Rate
- Highly Effective and Effective Teacher Retention Rate
- Administrative Team Instructional Assignments
- Professional Development Attendance
- Staff Satisfaction Survey Results
- Staffing Model and Assignments
- AP/API Needs Assessment
- Teachers are Assigned to Specific Area (walkthrough)
- Timeliness of Filling Vacancies
- Review of Sample Staff IMPACT Comments
- Student Caseload Assignments for Support Positions
- Strategic Plan for Professional Development<sup>45</sup>

### Hillsborough County, Florida

- *Source:* School District of Hillsborough County (2014). "Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Handbook." <http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/doc/list/hillsborough-principal-pipeline-and-leadership-development/about/142-633/>
- *Description and example language:* Selective retention is one of seven "human resources" indicators that contribute toward 10 percent of a principal's evaluation. A principal who "requires action"[d]oes not effectively distinguish between high- and low-performing teachers. May fail to recognize high performers or support those who struggle. Avoids conflict, difficult conversations, or work required to exit persistently low-performing teachers. May transfer low-performers elsewhere."

<sup>45</sup> "School Leaders: IMPACT," pp. 25–32.

An “exemplary” principal, on the other hand, “[g]ives high-performing teachers increasing responsibility and challenges. Effectively develops or exits all persistently low-performing teachers.”<sup>46</sup>

## Orange County, Florida

- *Source:* “School Leader Evaluation Model” (2012).

<sup>46</sup> School District of Hillsborough County (2014). “Principal and Assistant Principal Evaluation Handbook.” <http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/doc/list/hillsborough-principal-pipeline-and-leadership-development/about/142-633/>

- *Description and example language:* Under “Domain 2: Instructional Leadership,” there are 17 indicators. Altogether these indicators contribute to 40 percent of the evaluation score. “Indicator 4.1” is “recruitment and retention: the leader employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served.”<sup>47</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Orange County Public Schools (2012). “School Leader Evaluation Model.” [https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/leadership/Documents/OCPS\\_Principal\\_Leadership\\_Evaluation\\_Proposal.pdf](https://www.ocps.net/es/hr/PDS/leadership/Documents/OCPS_Principal_Leadership_Evaluation_Proposal.pdf)

# Appendix B – Sample Principal Evaluation Rubrics

## Georgia Department of Education: Leader Keys<sup>SM</sup> System

### Georgia Department of Education Leader Keys Effectiveness System

#### Performance Standard 5: Human Resources Management

*The leader fosters effective human resources management through the selection, induction, support, and retention of quality instructional and support personnel.*

#### Sample Performance Indicators

*Examples may include, but are not limited to:*

##### The leader:

- Screens, recommends, and assigns highly qualified staff in a fair and equitable manner based on school needs, assessment data, and local, state, and federal requirements.
- Supports formal building-level employee induction processes and informal procedures to support and assist all new personnel.
- Provides a mentoring process for all new and relevant instructional personnel and cultivates leadership potential through personal mentoring.
- Manages the supervision and evaluation of staff in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements.
- Supports professional development and instructional practices that incorporate the use of achievement data, and results in increased student progress.
- Effectively addresses barriers to teacher and staff performance and provides positive working conditions to encourage retention of highly-qualified personnel.
- Makes appropriate recommendations relative to personnel transfer, retention, and dismissal in order to maintain a high performing faculty.  
Recognizes and supports the achievements of highly-effective teachers and staff and provides them opportunities for increased responsibility.

Level IV <i>In addition to meeting the requirements for Level III</i>	Level III <i>Level III is the expected level of performance.</i>	Level II	Level I
The leader <b>continually</b> demonstrates expertise in the process of selection, induction, support, and retention of instructional personnel resulting in a highly productive staff (e.g. highly satisfied stakeholders, increased student learning, and development of leadership capacity among staff). <i>(Leaders rated Level IV continually seek ways to serve as role models and collaborative leaders.)</i>	The leader <b>consistently</b> fosters effective human resources management through the selection, induction, support, and retention of quality instructional and support personnel.	The leader <b>inconsistently</b> selects, inducts, supports, <b>or</b> retains quality instructional and support personnel.	The leader <b>inadequately</b> selects, inducts, supports, <b>or</b> retains quality instructional and support personnel.

Source: Georgia Department of Education (2014). "Leader Keys Effectiveness System Implementation Handbook." <https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/FY15%20TKES%20and%20LKES%20Documents/LKES%20Handbook-%20%20FINAL%205-30-14.pdf>

# Indiana Department of Education: "RISE Indiana Evaluation Rubric." Continuum of Improvement and Examples of Evidence of Measure 1.1.1: "Hiring and Retention"

## Domain 1: Teacher Effectiveness

Great principals know that teacher quality is the most important in-school factor relating to student achievement. Principals drive effectiveness through (1) their role as a human capital manager and (2) by providing instructional leadership. Ultimately, principals are evaluated by their ability to drive teacher development and improvement based on a system that credibly differentiates the performance of teachers based on rigorous, fair definitions of teacher effectiveness.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<b>1.1 Human Capital Manager</b>				
1.1.1 <b>Hiring and retention</b>	<p><b>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring the effectiveness of the systems and approaches in place used to recruit and hire teachers;</li> <li>Demonstrating the ability to increase the entirety or significant majority of teachers' effectiveness as evidenced by gains in student achievement and teacher evaluation results;</li> <li>Articulating, recruiting, and leveraging the personal characteristics associated with the school's stated vision (i.e. diligent individuals to fit a rigorous school culture).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Principal recruits, hires, and supports teachers by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistently using teachers' displayed levels of effectiveness as the primary factor in recruiting, hiring, and assigning decisions;</li> <li>Demonstrating ability to increase most teachers' effectiveness as evidenced by gains in student achievement and growth;</li> <li>Aligning personnel decisions with the vision and mission of the school.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Principal recruits, hires, and supports effective teachers by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Occasionally using teachers' displayed levels of effectiveness as the primary factor in recruiting, hiring, and assigning decisions OR using displayed levels of effectiveness as a secondary factor;</li> <li>Demonstrating ability to increase some teachers' effectiveness;</li> <li>Occasionally applying the school's vision/mission to HR decisions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Principal <u>does not</u> recruit, hire, or support effective teachers who share the school's vision/mission by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rarely or never using teacher effectiveness as a factor in recruiting, hiring, or assigning decisions<sup>1</sup>;</li> <li>Rarely or never demonstrating the ability to increase teachers' effectiveness by moving teachers along effectiveness ratings;</li> <li>Rarely or never applying the school's vision/mission to HR decisions.</li> </ul>
1.1.2 <b>Evaluation of teachers</b>	<p><b>At Level 4, a principal fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring the use of time and/or evaluation procedures to consistently improve the evaluation process.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Principal prioritizes and applies teacher evaluations by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating the time and/or resources necessary to ensure the accurate evaluation of every teacher in the building;</li> <li>Using teacher evaluations to credibly differentiate the performance of teachers as evidenced by an alignment between teacher evaluation results and building-level performance;</li> <li>Following processes and procedures outlined in the corporation evaluation plan for all staff members</li> </ul>	<p><b>Principal prioritizes and applies teacher evaluations by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating insufficient time and/or resources necessary to ensure the accurate evaluation of every teacher in the building;</li> <li>Using teacher evaluations to partially differentiate the performance of teacher;</li> <li>Following most processes and procedures outlined in the corporation evaluation plan for all staff members.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Principal <u>does not</u> prioritize and apply teacher evaluations by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failing to create the time and/or resources necessary to ensure the accurate evaluation of every teacher in the building;</li> <li>Rarely or never using teacher evaluation to differentiate the performance of teachers ;</li> <li>Failing to follow all processes and processes outlined in the corporation evaluation plan for staff members.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> For new teachers, the use of student teaching recommendations and data results is entirely appropriate.  
Final – 8/1/2012

Source: Indiana Department of Education (2012). "RISE Evaluation and Development System: Evaluator and Principal Handbook." <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/evaluations/rise-handbook-principals.pdf>

This publication features information from public and private organizations and links to additional information created by those organizations. Inclusion of this information does not constitute an endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any products or services offered or views expressed, nor does the Department of Education control its accuracy, relevance, timeliness or completeness.