



HENDRY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM Evaluation Forms and Procedures for Leadership Practice Effective July 1, 2014

A Comprehensive System for Professional Development and Annual
Evaluation of School Administrators. Aligned with the Florida Principal
Leadership Standards SBE Rule 6A-5.080.
Reviewed and Approved by the Florida Department of Education.

Submitted for Review and Approval
Florida Department of Education



TABLE OF CONTENTS

About Evaluation	3
Training and Reflection	3
Research Framework and References.....	4
District Administrator Assessment.....	6
Scoring Guide.....	11
How to Score the Core Practices.....	12
How to Score the Deliberate Practice.....	15
How to Calculate a Leadership Practice Score.....	17
How to Calculate an Annual Performance Level	18
Data Collection.....	19
Core Practice #1 Rubric.....	20
Core Practice #2 Rubric.....	26
Core Practice #3 Rubric.....	29
Core Practice #4 Rubric.....	32
Core Practice #5 Rubric.....	38
Core Practice #6 Rubric.....	41
Core Practice #7 Rubric.....	44
Core Practice #8 Rubric.....	47
Core Practice #9 Rubric.....	50
Forms	53
Self-Reflection Form.....	53
Deliberate Practice Guidelines and Form.....	56
Feedback Form.....	58
Annual Evaluation Form.....	61
Timeline and Additional Information	62

About Evaluation

The evaluation system adopted by the district is:

- ✓ Based on contemporary research that reveals educational leadership behaviors that, when done correctly and in appropriate circumstances, have a positive impact on student learning and development.

A New Approach to Evaluation: This evaluation system is designed to support three processes:

- **Self-reflection** by the leader on current proficiencies and growth needs (What am I good at? What can I do better?)
- **Feedback** from the evaluator and others on what needs improvement.
- **An annual summative evaluation** that assigns one of the four performance levels required by law (i.e., Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory).

What is Evaluated?

Evaluation of District Administrators is based on observation and evidence about certain leadership behaviors AND the impact of a leader's behavior on others.

The portion of evaluation that involves "impact on others" comes in two components:

1. **Student Growth Measures:** At least 50% of a district's annual evaluation is based on the performance of students in the district on specific state or district assessments (e.g. FCAT, EOC exams).
2. **The Leadership Practice:** This component contributes the remaining percentage of the district administrator's evaluation. Leadership Practice combines results of the Core Practices as defined by the Leadership and Learning Center and an additional Metric – Deliberate Practice. The annual evaluation is based on observation of the leader's actions and the leader's impact on the actions and behaviors of others

The processes and forms described in the following pages are focused on the Core Practice component of evaluation.

Training and Reflection

The content of the district evaluation system informs those evaluated and those doing evaluations of the issues to address and the processes to use.

- Those being evaluated use these documents to guide self-reflection on practices that improve your work.
- Evaluators provide both recurring feedback to guide growth in proficiency in district priorities and provide summative performance ratings.

Research Framework

1. Each research framework is associated with particular approaches to instruction or leadership. The research aligned with the district framework(s) is a useful source of deeper understanding of how to implement strategies correctly and in appropriate circumstances. Evaluators can provide better feedback to sub-ordinates when they understand the research framework
2. Inter-rater reliability: Evaluators in the district should be able to provide sub-ordinates similar feedback and rating so that there is consistent use of the evaluation system across the district. This is promoted by training on the following:
 - a. The “look fors” – what knowledge, skills, and impacts are identified as system priorities by inclusion of indicators in the evaluation system.
 - b. The Rubrics – how to distinguish proficient levels.
 - c. Rater reliability checks. Processes for verifying raters meet district expectations in using the rubrics.
3. Specific, Actionable, and Timely Feedback Processes: What evaluators observe does not promote improvement unless it is conveyed to employees as specific, actionable and timely manner. Training on how to do so is essential.
4. Conferences protocols and use of forms: Know what is required regarding meetings, conference procedures, use of forms, and records.
5. Processes and procedures for implementing the evaluation system
 - a. Evidence gathering: What sources are to be used?
 - b. Timeframes, record keeping
 - c. Scoring rules
6. Student Growth Measures: What are the districts requirements regarding use of student growth measures in the district’s evaluation system?
7. Sources of information about the evaluation system: Where can evaluators and employees access manuals, forms, documents etc. regarding the evaluation process.
8. Additional metrics: Training on any additional metrics use to supplement the practice portion of evaluation.

References

- Bottoms, G., & Fry, B. (2009). *The district leadership challenge: Empowering principals to improve teaching and learning*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Branch, G. F., Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2013). School leaders matter. *Education Next*, 13(1). Retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/school-leaders-matter/>.
- Burch, P. & Spillane, J. (2004) *Leading from the Middle: Mid-Level District Staff and Instructional Improvement*. Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform. Chicago.

Copeland, M. & Honig, M. (2010) From Operations to Teaching and Learning. The School Administrator, AASA. December, 2010. Number 11, Vol. 67

Daly, A. J., & Chrispeels, J. (2008). A question of trust: Predictive conditions for adaptive and technical leadership in educational contexts. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 7(1), 30-63.

Districts Matter: Cultivating the Principals Urban Schools Need (2013). The Wallace Foundation.

Honig, M. (2013). From Tinkering to Transformation: Strengthening School District Central Office Performance. Washington, D.C. American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. June, 4, 2013. No. 4.

Honig, M. (2012). District Central Office Leadership as Teaching: How Central Office Administrators Support Principals' Development as Instructional Leaders. *Education Administration Quarterly*. Vol. 48 no. 4733-774

Honig, M., Copland, M., Rainey, L., Lorton, J. & Newton, M. (2010). Central Office Transformation for District-wide Teaching and Learning Improvement. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Leading for Effective Teaching: A Toolkit for Supporting Principal Success. (2013). Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 27-42.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The role of collective efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528.

Robinson, V. 2011. *Student-centered leadership*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K.J. (2008) The impact of educational leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Education Administration Quarterly*.

Wahlstrom, K., Louis, K., Leithwood, K. & Anderson, S. 2010. *Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Center of Applied Research and Educational Improvement at the University of Minnesota. Commissioned by The Wallace Foundation

Zavadsky, H. (2009). *Bringing School Reform to Scale: Five Award Winning Urban Districts*. Cambridge MA. Harvard Education Press.

District Administrator Assessment

A Multidimensional Leadership Assessment

A **summative performance level** is based % on Student Growth Measures (SGM) and % on a Leadership Practice Score. The Leadership Practice Score is obtained from two metrics:

- Core Practice Ratings
- Deliberate Practice Score

Core Practice #1: Getting Results

This domain contributes **10%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #2: Continuous Improvement of Teaching and Learning

This domain contributes **10%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #3: Building School Leaders' Sense of Efficacy for School Improvement

This domain contributes **10%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #4: Using Data as a Problem Solving Strategy at the District and School Level

This domain contributes **10%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #5: Ensuring Productive Leadership Succession

This domain contributes **5%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #6: Harnessing Family and Community Energies for School Improvement

This domain contributes **5%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #7: Engaging in Professional Learning to Improve Leadership Practices and Student Learning Outcomes

This domain contributes **10%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #8: Using the District's School Administrator Evaluation System Effectively, to Support, Monitor and Evaluate the Effectiveness of School Leaders

This domain contributes **10%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Core Practice #9: Provide Quality Support Services to Principals and Teachers and Contributing to the Success of All Schools

This domain contributes **10%** of the Leadership Practice Score

Districts implement the processes listed below to provide:

- **Guides to self-reflection** on what’s important to success as a district administrator
- **Criteria for making judgments** about proficiency that are consistent among raters
- **Specific and actionable feedback** from colleagues and supervisors focused on improving proficiency
- **Summative evaluations** of proficiency and determination of performance levels



The seven steps are described below:

Step 1: Orientation: The orientation step can occur at the start of a new work year, at the start of a new school year, or at the start of assignment (or new assignment) as a district administrator. The depth and detail of orientation may vary based on prior training and whether changes in evaluation model have occurred, but an annual orientation or re-fresher orientation should occur. The orientation step should include:

- District provided orientation and training on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), applicable State Board of Education rules, and district specific expectations that are subject to the evaluation system.
- All leaders and evaluators should have access to the content and processes that are subject to the evaluation system. All leaders and evaluators should have access to the same information and expectations. This may be provided by the leader's review of district evaluation documents, online modules, mentor sessions, or face-to-face training where awareness of district processes and expectations are identified.
- At the orientation step, each district administrator is expected to engage in personal reflection on the connection between his/her practice and the district evaluation system. This is a "what do I know and what do I need to know" self-check aligned with the district evaluation system indicators.

Step 2: Pre-evaluation Planning: After orientation processes, the district administrator and evaluator prepare for a formal conference to address evaluation processes and expectations. Two things occur:

- District Administrator's self-assessment from the orientation step moves to more specific identification of improvement priorities. These may be student achievement priorities or leadership practice priorities. The district administrator gathers any data or evidence that supports an issue as an improvement priority. This may include District or School Improvement Plans, student achievement data, prior evaluations, and evidence of systemic processes that need work.
- The evaluator articulates a perspective on strengths and growth needs for the district administrator and for student achievement issues in the district.

Step 3: Initial Meeting between evaluatee and evaluator: A meeting on "expectations" held between the district administrator and supervisor to address the following:

- Evaluation processes are reviewed and questions answered.
- Perceptions (of both) from Pre-evaluation Planning are shared.
- Core practices that will be focus issues are discussed.
- Student growth measures that are of concern are discussed.
- District-supported initiatives are discussed.
- Such a meeting is typically face-to-face but may also be via tele-conference or phone. (Meeting issues can be clarified via texts and emails as appropriate.)
- Proposed targets for Deliberate Practice (additional metric) are discussed and determined, or a timeframe for selection of Deliberate Practice targets are set. While a separate meeting or exchange of information may be implemented to complete the Deliberate Practice targets, they should be discussed at the Step 3 Conference given their importance to the district administrator's growth and the summative evaluation.

Step 4: Monitoring, Data Collection, and Application to Practice: Evidence is gathered that provides insights on the district administrator's proficiency on the issues in the evaluation system by those with input into the district administrator's evaluation.

- The district administrator shares with the evaluator or evidence on practice on which the district administrator seeks feedback or wants the evaluator to be informed.
- The evaluator accumulates data and evidence on the district administrator's actions or impact of the district administrator's actions during the routine conduct of work. Such data and evidence may come from site visits, be provided by the district administrator, from formal or informal observations, or from evidence, artifacts or input provided by others. The accumulated information is analyzed in the context of the evaluation system indicators.
- As evidence and observations are obtained that generate specific and actionable feedback, it is provided to the district administrator in a timely manner. Feedback may be provided face-to-face, via email or telephone, or via memoranda/evaluation forms.
- Collegial groups, mentors, communities of practice (CoPs), professional learning communities (PLCs), and lesson study groups in which the district administrator participates may provide specific and actionable feedback for proficiency improvement.
- These monitoring actions occur before and continue after the mid-year Progress Check (step 5).

Step 5: Mid-year Progress Review between evaluatee and evaluator: At a mid-year point, a progress review may be conducted.

- Actions and impacts of actions taken on priorities identified in the Step 3 Initial Meeting are reviewed.
- Any indicators which the evaluator has identified for a specific status update are reviewed. (The district administrator is given notice of these indicators prior to the Progress Check, as the feedback expected is more specific than that for the general indicator overview.)
- The district administrator is prepared to provide a general overview of actions/processes that apply to all of the core practices.
- Strengths and progress are recognized.
- Priority growth needs are reviewed.
- Where there is no evidence related to an indicator and no interim judgment of proficiency can be provided, a plan of action must be made:
 - If the evaluator decides that the absence of evidence indicates unsatisfactory proficiency because actions or impacts of action should be evident if district administrator was proficient, the district administrator is provided notice that the indicator(s) will be addressed in a follow-up meeting.
 - The absence of evidence is explained by lack of opportunity for the evaluator to note anything relevant, and district administrator is asked to provide follow-up data on the indicator prior to the year-end conference.
 - The lack of evidence on one indicator is balanced by substantial evidence on other indicators in the same proficiency area. No follow-up is required until evidence supporting a Needs Improvement (NI) or Unsatisfactory (U) rating emerges.
- Any actions or inactions which might result in an unsatisfactory rating on a core practice if not improved are communicated.
- Any core practice for which there is insufficient evidence to rate proficiency at this stage, but which will be a priority for feedback in remainder of the year, are noted.

- *The Feedback Form* (or district equivalent) is used to provide feedback on all indicators for which there is sufficient evidence to rate proficiency. Notes or memorandums may be attached to the forms as appropriate to reflect what is communicated in the Progress Check.

Step 6: Prepare a consolidated performance assessment: The summative evaluation form is prepared by the evaluator and a performance rating assigned.

- Consider including relevant and appropriate evidence by any party entitled to provide input into the leader's evaluation.
- Review evidence on district administrator's proficiency.
- Use accumulated evidence to rate each core practice area.
- Calculate a core practice score.

Step 7: Year-end Meeting between evaluatee and evaluator: The year-end meeting addresses the core practice score, the Deliberate Practice Score and Student Growth Measures.

- The district administrator's growth on the Deliberate Practice target(s) is reviewed and a Deliberate Practice Score assigned.
- The Core Practice Score and Deliberate Practice Score are combined (as per weighting formula) to generate a Leadership Practice Score.
- If the Student Growth Measurement (SGM) score is known, inform the district administrator how the Leadership Practice Score and SGM Score combine to a summative performance level of Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory.
- If SGM score is not known, inform the district administrator of possible performance levels based on known Leadership Practice Score and various SGM outcomes.
- If recognitions or employment consequences are possible based on performance level, inform leader of district process moving forward.
- Review priority growth issues that should be considered at next year's step 2 and step 3 processes.

Scoring Guide

For District Administrators being evaluated, the summative annual performance level is based on two factors:

- **Student Growth Measures Score (SGM):** The performance of students under the leader’s supervision represents 50% of the annual performance level.
- **Leadership Practice Score:** An assessment of the leader’s proficiency on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). This is based on two metrics:
 - The Core Practice Rating contributes 80% of the Leadership Practice Score.
 - Deliberate Practice (DP): Deep learning and growth on a few very specific aspects of educational leadership. The DP Score contributes 20% of the Leadership Practice Score.

Summary of Scoring Processes

1. Score Core Practices	Based on rubrics in this guide
2. Score Deliberate Practice Metric	Based on directions in this guide
3. Calculate Leadership Practice Score	Combine Core Practices Score and Deliberate Practice Scores Based on formula in this guide
4. Calculate Student Growth Measure Score	Use district cut points for SGM
5. Assign Proficiency Level rating label	Combine Leadership and SGM scores

What this Scoring Guide Covers:

How to “score” the Core Practices

How to “score” Deliberate Practice

Leadership Practice Score

Annual Performance Rating

How to Score the Core Practices

About the Scoring Process

The scoring model has these features:

- The performance labels used in Section 1012.34, F.S. for summative performance levels are also used to summarize feedback on the core practices:
 - Highly Effective (HE)
 - Effective (E)
 - Needs Improvement (NI)
 - Unsatisfactory (U)
- Direct Weighting: The Core Practice score is based on ratings for each of the nine practices, but the system specifically gives added weight to certain practices. The weights are:
 - Core Practice 1: 10%
 - Core Practice 2: 10%
 - Core Practice 3: 10%
 - Core Practice 4: 10%
 - Core Practice 5: 5%
 - Core Practice 6: 5%
 - Core Practice 7: 10%
 - Core Practice 8: 10%
 - Core Practice 9: 10%

How to Determine an Core Practice Score

Step One: Rate each Core Practice.

Start with judgments based on the rubrics for the practices. Practices are rated as HE, E, NI, or U based on accumulated evidence. To guide the rating decision, illustrative examples of leadership actions and illustrative examples of impacts of leadership actions are provided.

Rating Labels: What do they mean?

The district administrator should complete a self-assessment by scoring each of the practices. The evaluator also will score each of the practices. In an end-of-year conference, their respective ratings are shared and discussed. The evaluator then determines a final rating for each practice and, using the procedures in this scoring guide, calculates a Core Practice score.

Distinguishing between proficiency ratings:

The “Effective” level describes leadership performance that has local impact (i.e., within the district) and meets organizational needs. It is adequate, necessary, and clearly makes a significant contribution to the district. The majority of the leadership workforce will be in the effective area once they have a clear understanding of what the Core Practices require and have made the adjustments and growth necessary to upgrade performance. The previous rating system of “satisfactory “ and “unsatisfactory” does not provide any guidance as to where those who repeat past performance levels will fall in the shift to research and standards-based assessments.

The “Highly Effective” level is reserved for truly outstanding leadership as described by very demanding criteria. Performance at this level is dramatically superior to “Effective” in its impact on students, staff members, parents, and the school district. Highly effective leadership results from recurring engagement with “deliberate practice.” In brief, the “Highly Effective” leader helps every other element within the organization become as good as they are. In normal distributions, some leaders will be rated highly effective on some practices, but very few leaders will be rated highly effective as a summative performance level.

The “Needs Improvement” level describes district administrators who understand what is required for success, are willing to work toward that goal, and, with coaching and support, can become proficient. Needs improvement rating will occur where expectations have been raised and standards made more focused and specific. Professional behavior and focused professional learning will guide district administrators toward increasingly effective performance.

Performance at the “Unsatisfactory” level describe district administrators who do not understand what is required for proficiency or who have demonstrated through their actions and/or inactions that they choose not to become proficient on the strategies, knowledge bases, and skills sets needed for student learning to improve and faculties to develop.

Step Two: Calculate the Core Practice Score.

At the individual Core Practice scoring stage the model shifts to a weighted point system. Points are assigned to the practices, direct weights are employed, and scores are converted to a numerical scale. The following point model is used:

Table 1

CORE PRACTICE RATING	POINTS ASSIGNED
A Practice rating of Highly Effective	3 points
A Practice rating of Effective	2 points
A Practice rating of Needs Improvement	1 point
A Practice rating of Unsatisfactory	0 points

The Practice points are multiplied by the Practice’s direct weight: The rating is entered in column 2 (“Rating”), the points in column 3 (“Points”), and a weighted score calculated in column 5.

After a Weighted Score is calculated, the scores are converted to a 100 point scale in column 7.

Table 2

	Rating	Points	Weight	Weighted Score	Convert to 100 point scale	Core Practice Score
Core Practice #1			.10		x 100	
Core Practice #2			.10		x 100	
Core Practice #3			.10		x 100	
Core Practice #4			.10		x 100	
Core Practice #5			.05		x 100	
Core Practice #6			.05		x 100	
Core Practice #7			.10		x 100	
Core Practice #8			.10		x 100	
Core Practice #9			.10		x 100	
Total Core Practice Score						

Example

This table illustrates the conversion of a Domain Weighted value to a 100 point scale.

Table 3

Domain	Rating	Points	Weight	Weighted Score	Convert to 100 point scale	Core Practice Score
Core Practice #1	HE	3	.10	.3	x 100	30
Core Practice #2	E	2	.10	.2	x 100	20
Core Practice #3	HE	3	.10	.3	x 100	30
Core Practice #4	NI	1	.10	.1	x 100	10
Core Practice #5	E	2	.05	.1	x 100	10
Core Practice #6	E	2	.05	.1	x 100	10
Core Practice #7	E	2	.10	.2	x 100	20
Core Practice #8	HE	3	.10	.3	x 100	30
Core Practice #9	NI	1	.10	.1	x 100	10
Total Core Practice Score						170

The individual practice scores are added up and a Core Practice score determined. The Core Practice Score is converted to a rating of HE, E, NI, or U based on this scale:

Table 4

CORE PRACTICE SCORE	Proficiency Rating
240 to 300	Highly Effective
151 to 239	Effective
75 to 150	Needs Improvement
0 to 74	Unsatisfactory

The Core Practice Score is combined with a Deliberate Practice Score to generate a Leadership Practice Score. The next section provides scoring processes for Deliberate Practice.

How to Score Deliberate Practice

Deliberate Practice Score

- The DP score is 20% of the Leadership Practice Score.
- The DP metric will have 1 to 4 specific growth targets.
- Each target will have progress points (much like a learning goal for students).
- The targets will have equal weight and the leader's growth on each will be assessed as HE, E, NI, or U.

Table 5

Scoring a DP Growth Target	Rating Rubrics
Highly Effective	Target met, all progress points achieved, and verifiable improvement in leaders performance
Effective	Target met, progress points achieves....impact not yet evident
Needs Improvement	Target not met, but some progress points met
Unsatisfactory	Target not met, nothing beyond 1 progress point

A DP Score has an upper limit of 300 points. Each target is assigned an equal proportion of the total points. Therefore the points for each target will vary based on the number of targets.

Table 6

Number of growth targets	Maximum points per target	Maximum Point Range
One Target	300	300
Two Targets	150 (300/2)	300 (150 x 2)
Three Targets	100 (300/3)	300 (100 x 3)
Four Targets	75 (300/4)	300 (75 x 4)

Target values based on Rating (HE, E, NI, or U) and Number of Targets.

This chart shows the points earned by a growth target based on a rating Level (HE, E, NI, or U) **and** the total number of targets in the DP plan.

Table 7

Rating	Point values	If 1 target	If 2 targets	If 3 targets	If 4 targets
HE	max points	300	150	100	75
E	.80 of max	240	120	80	60
NI	.5 of max	150	75	50	37.5
U	.25 if some progress	75	37.5	25	18.75
U	.0 if 1 progress stage	0	0	0	0

A DP score is based on ratings of the targets and the points earned for each rating.

Examples

If Three Growth Targets:

Table 8

DP Target	Rating	Points (based on table 17 – column 5) *
DP TARGET 1	HE	100
DP TARGET 2	E	80
DP TARGET 3	NI	50
DP Score (target score added together)		230

*** Points available vary based on total number of growth targets. Use Table 7 to select point values.**

Deliberate Practice rating

Table 9

DP Score Range	DP Rating
241 to 300	Highly Effective
151 to 240	Effective
75 to 150	Needs Improvement
0 to 74	Unsatisfactory

Summary

80% of the Leadership Practice Score is based on the Core Practices Score.

20% of the Leadership Practice Score is based on the Deliberate Practice Growth Score.

How to Calculate a Leadership Practice Score

A. Core Practices Score:

$$\underline{\hspace{2cm}} \times .80 = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$$

B. Deliberate Practice Score:

$$\underline{\hspace{2cm}} \times .20 = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$$

C. Add scores from calculations A and B above to obtain Leadership Practice Score

$$(A) \underline{\hspace{2cm}} + (B) \underline{\hspace{2cm}} = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$$

Example:

Core Practice score of 220 x .80 = 176

DP score of 230 x .20 = 46

Leadership Practice Score is 222.

Leadership Score Range	Leadership Practice Rating
240 to 300	Highly Effective
151 to 239	Effective
75 to 150	Needs Improvement
0 to 74	Unsatisfactory

How to Calculate an Annual Performance Level

1: Enter Cut scores for Student Growth Measures using a 300 point scale:

Above 239 = Highly effective

151 to 239 = Effective

75 to 150 = Needs Improvement

Below 75 = Unsatisfactory

Step 2: Enter Leadership Practice Score: _____

Step 3: SGM score and Leadership Practice Score

Example: SGM score of 212 + Leadership Practice score of 222 = 432 performance score

Performance score of 432 = rating of effective

Performance Score ranges	Performance Level Rating
480 to 600	Highly Effective
301 to 479	Effective
150 to 300	Needs Improvement
0 to 149	Unsatisfactory

Step 4: Enter rating on Annual Evaluation form

District Administrator Assessment Data Collection and Feedback Forms

These forms provide guidance to school district administrators and evaluators on what is expected regarding each core practice.

The forms provide:

- **Rubrics to distinguish among proficiency levels**
- **Narratives to assist in understanding the focus and priorities embedded in the core practices**
- **Illustrative examples of Leadership Actions and Impacts on Others of Leadership Action that assist in understanding how the issue(s) in an indicator are observed “on the job”.**
- **Reflection questions to guide personal growth**

DISTRICT OFFICE CORE PRACTICES RUBRICS

Core Practice #1: Getting Results

Narrative: This proficiency area focuses on actual results in improving desired student learning growth and achievement. Priority attention is on the district administrators' leadership behaviors that influence the school site instructional leadership, faculty development, and school operations that impact the quality of the learning environment; it also addresses supporting processes that result in improving the percentage of effective and highly effective principals and teachers in the supervised school's by focusing on whether the accumulated impact of the district leader's actions result in positive trend lines on principal and teacher effectiveness on behaviors that impact student results.

Rating Rubric

Highly Effective: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice exceed effective levels and constitute models of proficiency for other leaders. Evaluation Focus: Student results for which the leader is responsible consistently exceed expectations. Attributes of the highly effective district administrator on this core practice include:	Effective: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are sufficient and appropriate reflections of quality work with only normal variations. Evaluation Focus: Student results for which the leader is responsible consistently meet expectations. Attributes of the effective district administrator on this core practice include:	Needs Improvement: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are evident but are inconsistent or of insufficient scope or proficiency. Evaluation Focus: Student results for which the leader is responsible are inconsistent in meeting expectations. Attributes of the district administrator needing improvement on this core practice include:	Unsatisfactory: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are minimal or are not occurring, or are having an adverse impact. Evaluation Focus: Student results for which the leader is responsible are consistently below expectations. Attributes of the district administrator unsatisfactory on this core practice include:
<p>Priority Attributes Every principal meeting and staff development forum is focused on student achievement on Florida's academic standards, including periodic reviews of educator and student work that illustrate progress on standards-based instruction.</p> <p>The district administrator can specifically document examples of decisions impacting teaching, assignment, curriculum alignment with standards, assessment alignment with standards, professional development supports aligned to personnel evaluation results, and interventions that have been made on the basis of problem solving using data analysis.</p> <p>MTSS is operational in all classes in all schools supervised.</p> <p>A consistent record of improved student achievement exists on multiple indicators of student success.</p> <p>Student success occurs not only on the overall averages, but in each group of historically disadvantaged students.</p>	<p>The link between standards and student performance is in evidence from the alignment in lesson plans of learning goals, activities and assignments to course standards.</p> <p>MTSS is operational in most classes in all schools supervised.</p> <p>The district administrator is able to recognize whether or not learning goals and student activities are related to standards in the course descriptions.</p> <p>The district administrator uses multiple data sources, including state, district, school, and classroom assessments, and systematically examines data at the subscale level to find strengths and challenges.</p> <p>The district administrator empowers teaching and administrative staff to determine priorities using data on student and adult performance. Data insights are regularly the subject of meetings and professional development sessions.</p> <p>There is minimal use of school or district staff intended to provide support to the instructional</p>	<p>Florida's College and Career Ready Standards are accessible to principals, faculty and students. Required training on standards-based instruction has been conducted, but the link between standards and student performance is not readily evident to many principals.</p> <p>The district administrator is aware of state and district results and has discussed those results with staff, but has not linked specific decisions to the data.</p> <p>Data about adult performance (e.g. evaluation feedback data, professional learning needs assessments) are seldom used to inform instructional leadership decisions.</p> <p>Specific and measurable goals related to student achievement are established, but these efforts have yet to result in improved student achievement or planning for methods of monitoring improvements.</p> <p>Priorities for student growth are established in some areas, understood by some principals, and plans to achieve those</p>	<p>The district administrator is hesitant to intrude or is indifferent to decisions in the school/classroom that are at variance from the requirements of academic standards in the course descriptions.</p> <p>School/classroom learning goals and curriculum are not monitored for alignment to standards or are considered a matter of individual discretion regardless of course description requirements.</p> <p>The district administrator is unaware of or indifferent to the data about student and adult performance, or fails to use such data as a basis for making decisions.</p> <p>Planning for improvement in student achievement is not evident and goals are neither measurable nor specific.</p> <p>The district administrator focuses more on student characteristics as an explanation for student results than on the actions of the teachers and leaders in the system.</p> <p>Evidence of student improvement is not routinely gathered and used to promote</p>

<p>The district administrator creates systems and approaches to monitor the level of academic expectations.</p> <p>Significant Supporting Attributes</p> <p>The district administrator has coached district administrators in other departments to improve their problem solving and data analysis skills and to inform instructional decision making.</p> <p>The district administrator routinely shares examples of specific leadership, teaching, and curriculum strategies that are associated with improved student achievement.</p> <p>Other leaders credit this district administrator with sharing ideas, coaching, and providing technical assistance to implement successful new initiatives supported by quality planning and goal setting.</p> <p>The district administrator benchmarks expectations to the performance of the state's, nation's, and world's highest performing schools.</p> <p>The district administrator shares productive monitoring methods with other school leaders to support district wide improvements.</p> <p>The focus and specificity of feedback creates a clear vision of what the priority instructional goals are for the school and the cause and effective relationship between practice and student achievement on those priority goals.</p> <p>All initiatives are implemented across the schools, grades and subjects as appropriate with full fidelity to the components of each initiative.</p> <p>The district administrator monitors the school's implementation of the initiative, tracks the impact of the initiative on student growth, and shares effective practices and impacts with other district and school leaders.</p> <p>The percentage of principals rated effective or highly effective increases while the percentage rated needs improvement for two</p>	<p>program for administrative or organizational tasks unrelated to improving teaching and learning.</p> <p>Priorities for student growth are established, understood by staff, and plans to achieve those priorities are aligned with the actual actions of the staff.</p> <p>The average of the student population improves, as does the achievement of each group of students who have previously been identified as needing improvement.</p> <p>The district administrator systematically (e.g., has a plan, with goals, measurable strategies, and a frequent monitoring schedule) creates and supports high academic expectations by empowering principals and staff to set high and demanding academic expectations for every student.</p> <p>The district administrator's effectiveness monitoring process provides the leader and district team with a realistic overview of the current reality of a school's effectiveness on the FEAPs, the indicators in the teacher evaluation system, and research-based instructional strategies.</p> <p>The district administrator's monitoring practices are consistently implemented in a supportive and constructive manner.</p> <p>Corrective and positive feedback is linked to organizational goals and both the district administrator and school employees can cite examples of where feedback is used to improve individual and organizational performance.</p> <p>Most of the district and state initiatives are implemented across the schools, grades and subjects as appropriate with full fidelity to the components of each initiative.</p> <p>The district administrator is conversant with the impact the initiative is expected to have and monitors the school's implementation of the elements of the initiative.</p> <p>The percentage of principals and teachers rated effective or highly effective increases or remains stable within five percentage</p>	<p>priorities are aligned with the actual actions of some of the principals.</p> <p>Some evidence of improvement exists, but there is insufficient evidence of using such improvements to initiate changes in leadership, teaching, and curriculum that will create the improvements necessary to achieve student performance goals.</p> <p>The district administrator has taken some decisive actions to make some changes in time, principal and teacher assignment, curriculum, leadership practices, or other variables in order to improve student achievement, but additional actions are needed to generate improvements for all students.</p> <p>The district administrator sets expectations, but fails to empower principals and teachers to set high expectations for student academic performance.</p> <p>The district's evaluation system is being implemented but the process is focused on procedural compliance rather than improving proficiency on leadership and instructional strategies that impact student achievement.</p> <p>The manner in which monitoring is conducted is not generally perceived by principals as supportive of their professional improvement.</p> <p>The district administrator tends to view feedback as a linear process; something they provide principals and teachers rather than a collegial exchange of perspectives on proficiency.</p> <p>Some initiatives are implemented across the some of the schools, grades and subjects as appropriate with work in progress to implement the components of each initiative.</p> <p>The district administrator relies on principals to implement the initiatives and is seldom involved in monitoring or providing feedback on the impact of the initiative's implementation on</p>	<p>further growth.</p> <p>The district administrator has not taken decisive action to change time, principal and teacher assignment, curriculum, leadership practices, or other variables in order to improve student achievement.</p> <p>The district administrator does not create or support high academic expectations by accepting poor academic performance.</p> <p>The district administrator fails to set high expectations or sets unrealistic or unattainable goals.</p> <p>Monitoring does not comply with the minimum requirements of the district's evaluation system.</p> <p>Monitoring is not focused on principal proficiency in research-based instructional and leadership strategies.</p> <p>Informal feedback is rare, nonspecific, and not constructive.</p> <p>There is no or only minimal monitoring that results in feedback on proficiency.</p> <p>District and state supported initiatives are not supported by the district administrator with any specific plans, actions, feedback or monitoring.</p> <p>The district administrator is unaware of what state and district initiatives are expected to be implemented at the district and/or school levels.</p> <p>The percentage of principals and teachers rated effective or highly effective declines and cannot be explained by changes in staff membership.</p> <p>There is no evidence of improvement in student growth measures for the majority of the principals and teachers rated as needs improvement or unsatisfactory.</p> <p>No actions other than use of slogans and exhortations to succeed are taken by the district administrator to address practices and process that actually enable success.</p> <p>MTSS is not operational in the</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>consecutive years' declines.</p> <p>Through all grades and subjects a multi-tiered system of supports is operational providing core universal supports (research-based, high-quality, general education instruction and support; screening and benchmark assessments for all students, and continuous data collection continues to inform instruction).</p> <p>Where students are not successful on core instruction, problem solving is employed to identify and implement targeted supplemental supports (data based interventions and progress monitoring.)</p> <p>The district administrator demonstrates skillful problem solving to ensure staff have adequate time and support, and effectively monitors effective use of research-based instructional and leadership practices.</p> <p>The leader has created a self-regulating system based on data that guarantees regular and predictable success of all sub-groups, even if conditions change from one year to another.</p> <p>Achievement gaps have been eliminated or substantially minimized with trend lines consistently moving toward elimination of such gaps.</p>	<p>points of the prior year, but there is evidence of specific improvements in student growth measures or proficiency in high effect size strategies.</p> <p>Problem solves skillfully (e.g., conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information) to provide adequate time, resources, and support to schools to deliver the district's curriculum to all students.</p> <p>The district administrator consistently applies the process of inquiry and/or has enabled the development of processes that generate greater understanding of the district's current systems and their impact on sub-group academic achievement.</p>	<p>student growth.</p> <p>There is no evidence of improvement in student growth measures for the majority of the principals and teachers rated as effective, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.</p> <p>There is significant variation between teachers' student growth measures and principals' assessment of instructional practices.</p> <p>Problem solving efforts are unskillfully used to provide adequate time, resources, and support to principals and teachers to deliver the district's curriculum and state's standards to students.</p> <p>MTSS is operational in some schools but is not a consistent practice in all school supervised</p> <p>Sub-groups within the district and associated with achievement gaps have been identified and some processes are underway to understand root causes.</p> <p>Some actions to minimize the gaps have been implemented but either do not reach all sub-group students or have inconsistent or minimal results.</p> <p>The district administrator inconsistently applies the process of inquiry and/or has enabled only limited efforts to the development of processes that generate greater understanding of the district's current systems and their impact on sub-group academic achievement.</p>	<p>majority of the classes in the schools. supervised</p> <p>The district administrator does not identify nor implement strategies to understand the causes of sub-group achievement gaps.</p> <p>No changes in practices or processes have been implemented under the district administrator's direction that are designed to address achievement gaps.</p> <p>The district administrator does not apply the process of inquiry and/or develop processes that generate greater understanding of the district's current systems and their impact on sub-group academic achievement.</p>
<p>Leadership Evidence of proficiency on this core practice may be seen in the leader's behaviors or actions. <u>Illustrative examples</u> of such evidence may include, but are not limited to the following:</p>		<p>Impact Evidence of leadership proficiency may be seen in the behaviors or actions of the faculty, staff, students and/or community. <u>Illustrative examples</u> of such evidence may include, but are not limited to the following:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agendas, memoranda, etc. reflect leader's communications to principals on the role of state standards in curriculum, lesson planning, and tracking student progress. Data files and analyses on a wide range of student performance assessments are in routine use by the leader. Analyses of trends and patterns in student performance over time are reflected in presentations to principals and teachers on instructional improvement needs. Analyses of trends and patterns in evaluation feedback on school/principals proficiencies and professional learning needs are reflected in presentations to principals on instructional 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principals' meeting records verify recurring review of progress on state standards. Principals use performance data to make instructional decisions. School meetings reflect recurring attention to student performance data. Principals identify changes in practice within their teams or departments based on performance data analyses. Principals and teachers make presentations to colleagues on uses of performance data to modify instructional practices. Principals are able to describe their participation in planning and goal setting processes. 	

<p>improvement needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agendas, memoranda, etc. reflect recurring attention to performance data and data analyses. • Presentations to principals provide recurring updates on the status of plan implementation and progress toward goals. • Schedules for classroom observation document monitoring of instruction in schools. • Records or notes indicate the frequency of formal and informal observations. • Data from classroom walkthroughs is focused on high-effect size strategies. • Notes and memorandum from follow-up conferences regarding feedback on formal or informal observations reflect attention to research-based practices and leadership actions. • Rubrics that distinguish among proficiency levels on evaluation indicators are used by the district administrator to focus feedback on needed improvements in instructional practice. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples of written feedback provided to principals/staff regarding prioritized instructional practices. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The schedule results in frequent walkthroughs and observations of teaching and learning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence the district administrator has a system for securing feedback from principals specific to prioritized instructional practices. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The calendar reflects at least 2 work days a week spent on monitoring instructional issues (i.e. "watching the game") and providing specific and actionable feedback on instructional practices to principals and teachers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback describes ways to enhance performance and reach the next level of proficiency. • Feedback reflects judgment on proficiency, not just a "yes-no" checklist approach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initiatives being pursued are explicitly identified and access to supporting resources is provided. • Agendas, memoranda, etc. reflect presentations to principals on the targeted initiatives. • A Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and Response to Intervention (RtI) is fully implemented and the district administrator monitors regularly to sustain implementation. • The district administrator monitors practices in areas where subject specific strategies are expected and provides feedback on the effective issue of such strategies (e.g. ESOL strategies). • The district administrator can identify all of the initiatives in use in the schools and can describe how progress is monitored for each. • The district administrator tracks student growth data and school assessment data aligned to learning goals to track actual improvement in school performance, and maintains records of the percentage of schools showing growth over time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agendas, memorandum, and other documents provide direction on implementation of MTSS. • Agendas, memorandum, and other documents reflect recurring discussion with principals on continuous progress monitoring practice. • Statistical analyses identifying academic needs of sub-group members are used effectively. • Written goals are developed and provided to principals that focus on reducing or eliminating achievement gaps for students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals relevant to principals' and teachers' actions are evident and accessible. • Principals and teachers are able to articulate the goals for their achievement which emerged from planning. • Principals and teachers track their progress toward accomplishment of the stated goals. • Principal and department meetings' minutes reflect attention to evidence of student improvements. • Learning goals routinely identify performance levels above the targeted implementation level. • Principal meeting agendas or memoranda reflect follow-up actions based on feedback from the district administrator's monitoring on FEAPs, teacher evaluation indicators, or research-based strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson study, PLC, or teacher team work is initiated to address issues arising from monitoring process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data and feedback from the district administrator's walkthroughs and observations are used by principals and teachers to revise instructional practices. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principals and teachers describe feedback from the district administrator in terms of recognizing strengths and suggestions to take their performance to a new level. • Feedback to principals, over the course of the year, is based on multiple sources of information (e.g. observations, walkthroughs, videos, self-reflections, lesson studies, PLCs, assessment data,) and from more than one person. • Principals and teachers describe how they implement and support the various initiatives. • Video exemplars that support implementing the initiatives are routinely used by principals and teachers. • Online resources and technology supports that deepened understanding of the initiatives are used by staff/principals. • State or district web-based resources aligned with the initiatives are regularly accessed by principals and teachers. • Principals and teachers have participated in professional development associated with the initiative and ensured implementation of the strategies learned. • The percentage of effective and highly effective teachers and principals increases. • The percentage of teachers ranking at or above the district average on student growth measures increases. • Principals' records reveal data-based interventions and progress monitoring. • Principal-directed celebrations of student success identify causes of success. • Supplemental supports are provided in schools. • Principals and staff describe the district administrator as one who is genuinely committed to student success in school and life. • Principals, faculty teams, departments, grade levels or collegial learning teams who have worked together on student success are recognized. • Principals and teachers can describe the school-wide achievement goals focused on narrowing achievement gaps and relate how they implement those goals to impact individual students. • Principals can describe specific policies, practices, and procedures that help them use culture and developmental issues to improve student learning. • Principals and teachers can explain how goals eliminate differences in achievement for students at different
---	--

<p>teachers in sharing a vision of high quality teaching with their colleagues so that there is no plateau of "good enough"?</p> <p>How frequently do principals recognize that your feedback is directly linked to improving both their personal performance and that of the school?</p> <p>How do you engage principals in communities of practice where practices related to the initiatives are shared with principals in other schools or districts?</p> <p>In what ways are you assisting the better performing principals to improve as much as you are assisting the lower performers?</p> <p>What supports do you need to provide to deepen principals' capacity to provide intensive individual supports?</p> <p>What strategies might you employ to increase your ability to help your district level colleagues understand how the elements of culture are impacted by the current systems (e.g., curriculum, instruction, assessment, etc.) in order to improve student achievement?</p>	<p>staff/principals is both specific enough to be helpful and perceived as support rather than negative criticism?</p> <p>What are some examples of focused, constructive, and meaningful feedback that you provide to principals? How does this support their learning?</p> <p>How do you use monitoring of initiatives to identify professional development needs that, if addressed, would improve the quality of implementation?</p> <p>In what ways are you providing feedback on instructional/leadership practices that result in improved student learning for those principals most in need of growth?</p> <p>How do you enable principals proficient at MTSS to share the process with other principals?</p> <p>What continuous progress practices should be shared with the entire district?</p> <p>What are one or two critical steps you could take that would shift your examination of culture to a point that they become a self-regulating system based on data that guarantees regular and predictable success even if conditions change?</p>	<p>then communicate that in useful ways?</p> <p>What information are you collecting to help you know what is or is not happening in the schools where principals/teachers need improvement?</p> <p>How do you monitor instructional practice to assess the quality of implementation of MTSS?</p> <p>How do you monitor the impact of targeted supplemental supports?</p> <p>What barriers to student success are not being addressed in schools?</p> <p>How might you systematically apply the process of inquiry to develop methods of generating greater understanding of the cultures of individuals within the district and how the elements of culture are impacted by the current systems (e.g., curriculum, instruction, assessment) to improve student achievement?</p>	<p>instructional proficiency?</p> <p>Why do sub-groups of students like those in your district not perform as well as similar groups in other regions or districts?</p> <p>In what ways might you demonstrate greater understanding of cultures and their impact on the current systems in your district to improve student learning?</p>
---	---	--	---

DISTRICT OFFICE CORE PRACTICES RUBRICS

Core Practice #2: Continuous Improvement of Teaching and Learning

Narrative: Core Practice #2 is focused on continuous improvement of teaching and learning or what the district office leader does to engage school administrators and faculty in meaningful professional learning (which includes being involved in what the school level educators are learning). Professional learning on-the-job is an essential aspect of effective schools. District administrators who manage the school system in ways that support both individual and collegial professional learning get better outcomes than those who do not. The leader's personal participation in professional learning plays a major role in making professional learning efforts pay off. This core practice addresses the district administrator's role as a leader of learners.

Rating Rubric

<p>Highly Effective: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice exceed effective levels and constitute models of proficiency for other leaders.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's actions that result in professional learning cultures in the school supervised where 90%+ of all faculties are routinely engaged in collegial team learning processes and deliberate focused on the FEAPs or FPLS. Attributes of the highly effective district administrators on this core practice include:</p>	<p>Effective: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are sufficient and appropriate reflections of quality work with only normal variations.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's actions that result in professional learning cultures in the school supervised where at least 75% of all faculties are routinely engaged in collegial team learning processes and deliberate focused on the FEAPs or FPLS. Attributes of the effective district administrators on this core practice include:</p>	<p>Needs Improvement: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are evident but are inconsistent or of insufficient scope or proficiency.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's quality and frequency of engagement where professional learning cultures in the schools supervised have under 75% of all faculties routinely engaged in collegial team learning processes and deliberate focused on the FEAPs or FPLS. Attributes of the district administrator needing improvement on this core practice include:</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are minimal or are not occurring, or are having an adverse impact.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's quality and frequency of engagement where professional learning cultures in the schools supervised have under 50% of all faculties routinely engaged in collegial team learning processes and deliberate focused on the FEAPs or FPLS. Attributes of the district administrator unsatisfactory on this core practice include:</p>
<p>Priority Attributes</p> <p><i>In addition to meeting the requirements for effective performance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district administrator contributes time and attention to focusing district provided professional development capacities on high quality professional development practices. The district administrator participates either as a learner or provider in professional growth processes for school leaders and/or teachers focused on district priorities. The district administrator supports school level professional learning cultures by maximizing the time and resources employed at the school level that engage educators in deliverable practice. The leader has developed a system of job-embedded professional learning that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leader is crystal clear and repetitive when communicating the district's agenda for student learning. Effective leaders are visible and articulate, but they also work with others in the district office so that all conveys the message. Provide increased opportunities for administrators to collaborate on common work. Provide a wide range of intensive, unique, in-school opportunities for teachers and school-level leaders to develop the capacities they need to accomplish the district's student-learning agenda. Support principals, particularly those new to the district or school, in providing aligned forms of leadership distribution that build on existing strengths. Provide assistance for teachers and school-level leaders (especially secondary school staff) in accessing, interpreting, and making use of evidence for their decisions about teaching and learning. Visits schools several times throughout the year. Use school visits as well as district meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leader is clear when communicating the district's agenda for student learning. Periodically provides opportunities for administrators to collaborate on common work. Provide a range of professional development opportunities for teachers and school-level leaders to develop their capacity to accomplish the district's student-learning agenda. Support principals in providing aligned forms of leadership distribution that build on existing strengths. Provide assistance for teachers and school-level leaders in accessing, interpreting, and making use of evidence for their decisions about teaching and learning. Rarely visits schools and the principals they evaluate. Most of the interaction between this leader and principals occurs at district meetings. Gather data about how well district policies are working at the school level but has yet to use the results to improve practice. Understands the need to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leader rarely talks about the district's agenda for student learning. Talks about the importance of collaborating but have yet to provide time to do so. Provides professional development opportunities for teachers and school-level leaders but they are loosely aligned to the district's learning agenda. Unaware of the support principals need in providing aligned forms of leadership distribution that build on existing strengths. The leader expects teachers and school-level leaders to provide their own support in accessing, interpreting, and making use of evidence for their decisions about teaching and learning. The leader is conspicuously absent from schools. All of the interaction between this leader and principals occurs at district meetings. Does not gather data about how well district policies are working at the school level. Does not understand the need to

<p>differentiates training and implementation with mechanisms for monitoring of instructional priorities based on teacher and principal needs, which help retain effective and highly effective staff.</p> <p>Significant Supporting Attributes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district administrator routinely shares professional learning success stories as well as missteps to avoid with other schools, departments, districts, and organizations to help them achieve similar levels of leadership impact. Time-management at the schools supervised provides maximum time for professional learning Conflicts over competing priorities for use of school personnel time and resources are consistently resolved in favor of priorities that impact capacity to support student learning. 	<p>to help build principals' sense of efficacy or confidence in their abilities to accomplish the priorities for student learning agreed on in the district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gather data about how well district policies are working at the school level. Work continually to increase synergy among district policies, procedures, and practices aimed at guiding and supporting the district's agenda for student learning. Ensure coordination and coherence in support for schools across different organizational units at the district level. Time-management at the schools supervised provides sufficient time for professional learning Conflicts over competing priorities for use of school personnel time and resources are generally resolved in favor of priorities that impact capacity to support student learning. 	<p>coordinate support for schools across different organizational units at the district level but has yet to act on this need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time-management at the schools supervised provides inconsistent scheduling of adequate time for professional learning Conflicts over competing priorities for use of school personnel time and resources are often unresolved or often not resolved in favor of priorities that impact capacity to support student learning. 	<p>coordinate support for schools across different organizational units at the district level but has yet to act on this need.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time-management at the schools supervised provides inadequate time for professional learning Conflicts over competing priorities for use of school personnel time and resources are frequently resolved in ways that negatively impact capacity to support student learning.
<p>Leadership Evidence of proficiency on this core practice may be seen in the leader's behaviors or actions. <u>Illustrative examples</u> of such evidence may include, but are not limited to the following:</p>		<p>Impact Evidence of leadership proficiency may be seen in the behaviors or actions of the faculty, staff, students and/or community. <u>Illustrative examples</u> of such evidence may include, but are not limited to the following:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district administrator is able to produce samples of multiple forms of communication (i.e., meeting agendas, e-mails, professional development documents, etc.) sent out to school principals communicating the district's agenda for student learning The district administrator is able to provide reprints of their daily calendars spanning at least six months that support being visible within the schools for which they have oversight The district administrator can produce numerous (4-5) examples (i.e., professional development offerings, agendas containing learning intentions and success criteria, etc.) of opportunities for administrators to collaborate on common work The district administrator can produce several forms of documentation (i.e., teacher and school/leader self-assessment data, observational data, etc.) depicting the degree to which teachers and school-level leaders are implementing the professional development provided to develop the capacities they need to accomplish the district's student-learning agenda The district administrator is able to provide multiple forms of evidence of their data gathering efforts indicating how well district policies are working at the school level and how they used that data to inform district leadership practice 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey data from school leaders reflect a majority agreeing with the statement that district administrators clearly communicate the district's agenda for student learning Survey data from school leaders reflect a majority agreeing with the statement that district administrators are active and effective in supporting excellent instruction Teachers and school leaders track their progress toward "Effective" and higher implementation of prioritized professional development offerings Survey data from school leaders reflect a majority agreeing with the statement that district administrators communicate effectively about best practice in high priority areas of instruction Survey data from school leaders reflect a majority agreeing with the statement that district administrators have a detailed plan for improving instruction across the district Survey data from school leaders reflect a majority agreeing with the statement that district administrators clarify the steps that school administrators and teacher need to take to improve the quality of instruction Survey data from school leaders reflect a majority agreeing with the statement that district administrators provide increased opportunities for administrators to collaborate on common work 	

Scale Levels: *(choose one) Where there is sufficient evidence to rate current proficiency on this core practice, assign a proficiency level by checking one of the four proficiency levels below. If not being rated at this time, leave blank:*

Highly Effective **Effective** **Needs Improvement** **Unsatisfactory**

Evidence Log (Specifically, what has been observed that reflects current proficiency on this core practice? The examples above are illustrative and do not reflect an exclusive list of what is expected):

--

Reflection Questions for Core Practice #2

Highly Effective:	Effective:	Needs Improvement:	Unsatisfactory:
<p>How are you helping leaders outside of your area of influence develop a system of job-embedded professional learning that differentiates training and implementation with mechanisms for monitoring of instructional priorities based on teacher and principal needs, which help retain effective and highly effective staff?</p>	<p>How have you shared professional learning success stories as well as missteps with other schools, departments, districts, and organizations to help them achieve similar levels of leadership impact results?</p>	<p>What are one or two key strategies you have effectively utilized to support principals, particularly those new to the district or school, in providing aligned forms of leadership distribution that build on existing strengths?</p>	<p>How are you providing a range of professional development opportunities for teachers and school-level leaders to develop their capacity to accomplish the district's student-learning agenda?</p>

DISTRICT OFFICE CORE PRACTICES RUBRICS

Core Practice #3: Building School Leaders' Sense of Efficacy for School Improvement

Narrative: Core Practice #3 is focused on the district administrators impact on building principals' and assistant principals' sense of efficacy for school improvement. Efficacy is the belief about one's own ability (self-efficacy), or the ability of one's colleagues collectively (collective efficacy), to perform a task or achieve a goal. One of the most powerful ways in which districts influence teaching and learning is through the contribution they make to feelings of professional efficacy on the part of school principals and emerging school leaders. Principals possessed of strong efficacy beliefs will be more likely than others to undertake and persist in school-improvement projects. Principal efficacy provides a crucial link between district initiatives, school conditions, and student learning.

Rating Rubric

<p>Highly Effective: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice exceed effective levels and constitute models of proficiency for other leaders.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's influence on all school site leaders supervised results in high energy positive attention by those leaders to school improvement priorities focused on district initiatives, school conditions, and student learning. Attributes of the highly effective district administrator on this core practice include:</p>	<p>Effective: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are sufficient and appropriate reflections of quality work with only normal variations.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's influence on the majority of school site leaders supervised results in high energy positive attention by those leaders to school improvement priorities focused on district initiatives, school conditions, and student learning. Attributes of the effective district administrator on this core practice include:</p>	<p>Needs Improvement: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are evident but are inconsistent or of insufficient scope or proficiency.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's influence on the school site leaders supervised generates inconsistent results in achieving high energy positive attention by a majority of those leaders to school improvement priorities focused on district initiatives, school conditions, and student learning. Attributes of the district administrator needing improvement on this core practice include:</p>	<p>Unsatisfactory: Leader's actions or impact of leader's actions relevant to this core practice are minimal or are not occurring, or are having an adverse impact.</p> <p>Evaluation Focus: The district administrator's influence on the school site leaders supervised generates inconsistent results in achieving high energy positive attention by a majority of those leaders to school improvement priorities focused on district initiatives, school conditions, and student learning and corrective action plans to change those conditions are not evident.. Attributes of the district administrator unsatisfactory on this core practice include:</p>
<p>Priority Attributes</p> <p><i>In addition to meeting the requirements for proficient performance, central office and building leaders...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leader has developed an effective system of monitoring, which holds principals accountable for implementing and following up on what is learned during district sponsored professional development. The leader models deliberate practice consistently engaging in deliberate practice to develop personal mastery of job related competencies. <p>Significant Supporting Priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leader provides individualized support for principals, depending 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district administrator establishes and maintains a district-wide focus on student achievement and instruction. Efficacy is enhanced when the district provides human and financial resources to assist schools in achieving those high expectations. The leader encourages teamwork and professional community by including both principals and teachers in district-wide decisions that directly impact their work. The leader strives to provide stable district leadership as a contribution to principal efficacy. The leader gives principals a significant role in selecting teachers they believe to be outstanding choices for their own school contexts. The leader provides targeted and phased focuses for principal's continuous improvement. The leader requires the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district administrator is attempting to establish a district-wide focus on student achievement and instruction but these two issues compete with other initiatives for precious human and financial resources. The leader occasionally includes principals and teachers in district-wide decisions that directly impact their work when it is convenient to do so. The leader appears to be unwilling or unable to provide stable district leadership. The leader supports principals who want to be involved in the selection of teachers. The leader provides professional development for principal's continuous improvement however it lacks focus. The leader encourages principals to develop improvement plans in all schools that are aligned with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The district administrator is unaware of the need to establish a district-wide focus on student achievement and instruction. The leader never includes principals in district-wide decisions that directly impact their work. The leader makes little or no effort to provide stable district leadership. The leader makes little or no effort to involve principals in the selection of teachers. The leader provides either an excessive amount of or too little professional development for principals. For this leader it is either feast or famine. The leader expects principals to develop improvement plans that are aligned with state and district standards, but with no discretion left to the school to

Reflection Questions for Core Practice #3

Highly Effective:	Effective:	Needs Improvement:	Unsatisfactory:
<p>What are some strategies you could pursue which would provide guidance to other leaders outside your system so that they too can deliver a wide range of professional development opportunities to help build the instructional leadership capacities of principals?</p>	<p>What strategies might you pursue that would allow you to routinely share professional learning success stories as well as missteps to avoid with other schools, departments, districts, and organizations to help them achieve similar levels of leadership impact?</p>	<p>What one or two strategies might you consider that would help you encourage teamwork and professional community by including both principals and teachers in district-wide decisions that directly impact their work?</p>	<p>In what strategies might you engage that would encourage principals to develop improvement plans in all schools that are aligned with state and district standards, but with little discretion left to the school to determine the paths to goal achievement?</p>

