

The Minnesota State Model Principal Evaluation

Introduction:

The Minnesota state model for Leadership Evaluation and Development for principals was designed by a committee of educators, primarily administrators, along with parents, school board members and other public members. It was designed in response to and in compliance with requirements in legislation.

Minnesota has a wide range in size and design of administrative structures. Several districts have numerous buildings each under the supervision of a principal. Most districts, however, will have fewer than ten principals and assistant principals. In addition in several districts the superintendent is also the principal. This evaluation model is designed to provide enough flexibility to address these differences.

Effective evaluation systems are designed to provide objective information about shared understandings and expectations that will support meaningful decisions for quality leadership. These expectations should be reflective of a district's vision mission and goals and integrated in its strategic planning. The system should clearly communicate the standards, purposes, procedures and acceptable levels of performance. The collection and use of evaluation information must be clearly defined in local policies and consistent with statute. Data on individual principals generated under this subdivision are personnel data under Minnesota Statute, section 13.43, and treated in the same manner as data generated for the teacher evaluation under sections 124A.40 and 124A.41.

Evaluation criteria should be fairly and uniformly applied. The focus of the evaluation is to improve a principal's 1) instructional leadership and 2) organizational management.

Quality, purposeful and targeted professional development enhanced by supportive mentoring and coaching should be the focus of growth plans that are built from the evaluation.

The Model

Who does the evaluation?

The evaluation should be done by one of or a combination of the following as determined by superintendent in consultation with the school board:

1. The superintendent,
2. A superintendent designee, or
3. A trained evaluator.

It is the superintendent's responsibility to assure that the evaluator fully understands the evaluation process and instruments and has demonstrated the ability to make fair, accurate and consistent judgments. This should be verified on a regular basis. The ultimate responsibility for selecting the summative performance rating rests with the superintendent.

Districts must comply with the provisions of Minnesota Statutes, sections 123B.143, subdivision 1, clause (3), and 123B.147, subdivision 3, paragraph (b) in implementing its evaluation process. This model incorporates these statutory provisions.

Requirements:

Legislation outlines nine components and several sub-components for principal evaluation.

Local District Requirements:

Some of components and sub-components are appropriately the responsibility of the local district or are dependent on the outcomes of the evaluation itself. For example it would be difficult to write a district's goals into the state model.

Also prescribing developmental activities for a growth plan that are tied to insights gained as an outgrowth of the evaluation itself is appropriately a decision between the principal and the evaluator. As a result these are not part of the model but will be included as direction for the district. These areas as specified in statute include the following:

As part of the evaluation process the following items are to be developed and implemented at the local district level:

- 1) Support to improve a principal's instructional leadership, organizational management and professional development, and strengthen the principal's capacity in the areas of instruction, supervision, evaluation, and teacher development;
- 2) The principal's job description,

- 3) A district's long-term plans and goals,
- 4) The principal's own professional multiyear growth plans and goals, all of which must support the principal's leadership behaviors and practices, rigorous curriculum, school performance, and high-quality instruction;
- 5) Professional development that emphasizes improved teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, student learning, and a collaborative professional culture;
- 6) A plan to improve the principal's performance and specify the procedure and consequence if the principal's performance is not improved.

Although the model does specify the procedures to be followed for item 6 above, the specific plan is to be developed locally consistent with contracts and statute.

Components of the State Model:

The state model is composed of three main components:

- Component One:** Evaluation by the Supervisor
- Component Two:** School Performance Data
- Component Three:** Other measures that include feedback from stakeholders

These three components above are outlined in statute and require the use of:

- 1) Formative and summative evaluations
- 2) On-the-job observations and review of previous evaluations
- 3) Allow surveys to help identify a principal's effectiveness
- 4) Longitudinal data on student academic growth as an evaluation component and incorporation of district achievement goals and targets

Performance Measures:

To establish a shared vision and common expectations for quality leadership in Minnesota schools, Performance Measures were developed as part of the evaluation model. These measures form the foundation for all components of the evaluation model. Performance Measures for the model are:

A Principal shall...

1. Establish a vision and mission focused on shared goals and high expectations
2. Provide instructional leadership for high student academic performance
3. Manage human resources for quality instruction and professional growth
4. Build professional and ethical relationships through collaboration and effective communication
5. Strategically manage resources for systemic performance accountability

Performance Measures with Indicators:

Indicators supported by rubrics and evidences are to be used to determine whether a principal meets the core competency. Indicators further define the expectations within each competency. Indicators have been aligned to each core competency as follows:

Performance Measure #1: *Establish a vision and mission focused on shared goals and high expectations*

INDICATORS:

- A. Engages all stakeholders in the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission and high, measureable goals that prepares every student to succeed in post-secondary learning and to become responsible and contributing citizens.
- B. Articulates a vision and develops strategies, for change that results in measurable achievement gains for all students including closing achievement gaps.
- C. Fosters a shared commitment to high expectations for student achievement and high standards of teaching and learning in a culturally competent environment where diversity is valued.
- D. Establishes rigorous, measureable goals for instructional program decisions and staff learning experiences that are consistent with school's mission, vision, and core beliefs.
- E. Builds a strong and positive sense of community in the school by honoring the important role of race and culture, its traditions, artifacts, symbols, values and norms, as a contributor to student and school success.
- F. Other as determined locally.

Performance Measure #2: *Provides Instructional Leadership for High Student Academic Performance*

INDICATORS:

- A. Facilitates the development and communication of a shared vision and school culture for effective teaching and instructional practices that reflect high expectations, engage all students, and accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness.
- B. Provides the structure and opportunity for the development, alignment, implementation, and evaluation of relevant and rigorous curricula tied to state academic and college and career readiness standards.
- C. Collaborates with teachers to examine student and school data to measure student learning and growth, identify achievement gaps, and develop strategic interventions that improves learning and closes identified gaps.
- D. Facilitates reflective practice, inquiry and action research to identify and monitor the impact of interventions and determine high yield instructional strategies that improve student learning.
- E. Supports the need for quality, collaborative staff learning experiences that are guided by data and research, planned by staff, are job- embedded, and are based on the school's learning needs.
- F. Other as determined locally.

Performance Measure #3: *Manages Human Resources for Quality Instruction and Professional Growth*

INDICATORS:

- A. Develops a strategic action plan with staff that includes targets to improve student achievement school wide and close achievement gaps with low performing student groups.
- B. Provides timely, appropriate and quality professional development and facilitates learning teams that gather information, analyze data, examine issues and develop new approaches to improve teaching and learning.
- C. Implements a cohesive approach to recruitment, placement, induction and retention that promotes highly qualified and effective staff.
- D. Routinely observes instruction and provides ongoing feedback and coaching to teachers and other staff in a fair and equitable manner in order to support professional growth.

E. Provides effective and timely supervision and evaluation aligned with local district goals, state regulations and contract provisions and uses these processes to facilitate development, remediation or removal of under-performing staff members.

F. Other as determined locally.

Performance Measure #4: *Builds Professional and Ethical Relationships through Collaboration and Effective Communication*

INDICATORS:

A. Demonstrates and communicates values, beliefs, and attitudes that make the well-being and academic success of all students the basis for all decision making.

B. Models appropriate personal, professional, and ethical behavior that is respectful, fair, enhances the image of the school and the profession and inspires others to higher levels of leadership and performance.

C. Employs conflict resolution and proactive problem-solving strategies in a wide variety of situations and circumstances.

D. Demonstrates strong interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills and facilitates groups effectively.

E. Welcomes and honors families and stakeholders by engaging them in a meaningful dialogue regarding student learning, the work of the school and its needs and accomplishments.

F. Ensures that the school is in compliance with local, state, and federal laws, standards, and regulations as well as local district and school policies.

G. Other as determined locally.

Performance Measure #5: *Strategically Manages Resources for Systemic Performance Accountability*

INDICATORS:

A. Distributes leadership responsibilities, shares decision-making and daily supervises ongoing management structures and practices to enhance teaching and learning.

B. Improves organizational performance by making appropriate and sound use of time, technology, management strategies and accountability measures, including assessments, to achieve the district and school's vision, mission, and goals.

C. Maintains a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students and staff that interfere with teaching and learning.

D. Manages the organization, operations and resources to promote student success and maintain a safe, efficient and effective learning environment.

E. Develops and implements a budget process that manages fiscal expenditures consistent with district and school goals, policies and available resources that are focused on and result in improved student achievement.

F. Other as determined locally.

Implementation

Component I: Evaluation by the Supervisor

The supervisor assessment is based on the core competencies and indicators and is to be conducted in accordance with the process outlined below. A rubrics template for each indicator has been developed and included as part of the model.

The rubrics template is designed to provide detailed guidance for making fair, accurate and consistent judgments about performance. Using the rubric to establish a common understanding of expectations contributes to quality assurance in the process for both the evaluator and the principal.

The template can also serve as the basis for an ongoing dialogue about results, as a tool for systemic feedback and as guidance for developing growth plans.

See Attachment E for copies of rubrics for all indicators for each core competency.

Component II: School Performance Data

The process of setting learning goals, monitoring progress, and assessing the results, is central to a quality evaluation process. School level performance data tied to established goals related to student outcomes are part of this evaluation model. This component is designed to implement the requirement in statute specifying the use of longitudinal data on student academic growth as an evaluation component incorporating district achievement goals and targets.

Student achievement and school outcome goals are to be developed by the principal in collaboration with school and grade-level teams and/or content specific teachers and aligned to district goals. Goals in this area may be subject and subgroup specific.

Decisions of effectiveness in this component should not be determined based on a single assessment or source of evidence but should rely on multiple measures.

Using State-Level Measures

In collaboration with the evaluator, a principal will set student achievement goals based on NCLB waiver areas – proficiency, growth, graduation rates (if applicable), and achievement gap reduction.

Results would be based on Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) scores provided by the Minnesota Department of Education. When MCA scores are released, the principal and evaluator assess the attainment of goals against a rubric (see Chart 1).

Chart 1. STATE LEVEL MEASURES - MCA GOALS RUBRIC

LEVEL FOUR	LEVEL THREE	LEVEL TWO	LEVEL ONE
Exceeded proficiency goals for math and reading proficiency.	Met proficiency goals for math and reading proficiency.	Met proficiency goal for either math or reading proficiency.	Did not meet proficiency goal for either math or reading proficiency.
Exceeded academic growth goals for math and reading proficiency.	Met academic growth goals for math and reading proficiency.	Met academic growth goal for either math or reading proficiency.	Did not meet academic growth goal for either math or reading proficiency.
Exceeded achievement gap reduction goals for math and reading proficiency.	Met achievement gap reduction goals for math and reading proficiency.	Met achievement gap reduction goal for either math or reading proficiency.	Did not meet achievement gap reduction goal for either math or reading proficiency.
If applicable, exceeded graduation rates goal.	If applicable, met graduation rates goal.	If applicable, did not meet graduation rates goal, and school graduation rates did not decrease.	If applicable, did not meet graduation rates goal, and school graduation rates decreased.

Note: Evaluators will have a +/-1 percentage point window. For example, the proficiency goal for math was to increase the percentage of students who are proficient or exceeding from 53 to 58 percent. Results at the end of the year indicate that 57 percent of students are proficient or exceeding. The evaluator can still grant credit for achieving the goal based on the principal's implementation of strategies supporting the goal.

Other School Performance Goals:

In collaboration with the evaluator, a principal will select two additional goal areas to reflect the unique circumstances of a school or district and to reinforce accountability and focus on school and district initiatives.

Examples of goals:

- Areas specific to one grade level or one sub-group of students
- Enrollment in rigorous courses
- Referrals for SPED services
- Student suspensions or disciplinary referrals
- Attendance
- Grade promotion
- MAP scores
- Student participation in activities

Individual goals will be attached to a data point that connects directly to students and student learning. When goal attainment can be assessed based on the principal's goals and action plan, the principal and evaluator assess the attainment of goals against a rubric (see Chart 2).

Chart 2. Individual School Performance Goals Rubric			
Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Exceeded both individual goals.	Met both individual goals.	Met one of the individual goals.	Did not meet either of the individual goals

Based on assessment of goal attainment, the evaluator will assign the principal a score of 1-4 for both MCA goals and individual goals to be incorporated with scores from the leadership competencies rubric and from survey data. Scores from all elements would be weighted in order to provide an overall evaluation of performance.

Component III: Other Measures That Include Feedback from Stakeholders

Multiple measures that seek information from students, parents, colleagues, and supervisors should be used to inform a principal's evaluation. A variety of methodologies that incorporate different types of evidence from these stakeholders should be used to address the range of expectations outlined in the performance measures and indicators to provide a thorough assessment of the principal's performance.

One of the most commonly used methods is a survey. There are two approaches that have been used in doing this. One is to develop an in-house model and the second is to certify an external instrument or instruments that are to be used by all districts. Certification has usually been done by the state agency or other empowered entity.

An integral part of this model is the use of surveys to obtain feedback from those who interact with the principal on a regular basis. At a minimum this model requires feedback from teachers. This model leaves the decision as to how to do this to the local district. It also leaves the decisions as to which other stakeholders are surveyed to the districts but recommends the inclusion of other administrators, parents and students. A portion of the summative evaluation must include external feedback from stakeholders.

See Attachment A for examples of surveys that have been developed by states, local districts or universities to be used for this purpose and examples of commercially prepared surveys.

The Evaluation Process:

1. Orientation on Process:

The superintendent or designee (the supervisor) provides the principal with a complete set of materials outlining the evaluation process and (as appropriate) with his/her summary evaluation from the last performance review.

2. Pre-Planning by Principal:

The principal reviews student achievement data from the previous school year, the prior year's evaluation results, and other relevant data (e.g., artifacts, survey results, teacher retention data). The principal uses these data sources to:

- Reflect on his/her own leadership practice
- Self-assess current performance on the Performance Measures and Indicators
- Identify priorities for professional growth and performance goals

The principal submits his/her self-assessment to the supervisor, who reviews it along with school results, and other relevant data, then sets a meeting to review and finalize priorities for the school year.

(See Attachment B.)

3. Goal-setting Conference:

The supervisor and principal meet to discuss, as applicable, the last performance evaluation, self-assessment, priorities for professional growth, and preliminary performance goals. At the conclusion of the conference, the supervisor and principal will come to agreement on performance goals (in the absence of agreement, the supervisor will make the final determination about the goals).

The conference will also be an opportunity to review the evaluation process overall and the processes to be used by the supervisor and principal to collect evidence about the principal's performance. If the supervisor holds significant concerns regarding the principal's performance and intends to use a process that is targeted at remediation, this should be clearly communicated at the goal-setting conference.

4. Evidence Collection:

The principal will collect evidence agreed upon in the goal-setting conference. This may include data for each performance measure included in the review; feedback from parents, students, and the school community; documentation of the professional development achieved during the year; evidence of student growth and success measured over time; and other data to document achievement of performance goals.

The supervisor will directly observe principal practice, interact with teachers and other members of the school community, and gather additional evidence to support the review. The supervisor should provide timely feedback on their observations, as appropriate. (This step repeated in spring after step 5).

(See Attachment C.)

5. Mid-year Supervisor Review:

The supervisor and principal hold a mid-year formative conference, with explicit discussion of progress against growth goals, all performance measures, and interim student and teacher performance data.

6. End-of-Year Summative Review:

The principal submits any evidence agreed to in the initial conference. The supervisor reviews this evidence and all other evidence gathered by him/herself and assembles a preliminary summary rating of the principal.

The supervisor and principal hold an end-of-year conference to review and discuss accomplishment of growth goals, the preliminary summary rating, and interim student and teacher performance data.

7. Summative Performance:

Following the conference, the supervisor will finalize the summary rating and will generate a summary report of the evaluation, to be signed by both parties. A performance level shall be assigned using one of the following categories (see Attachment D):

- 4 - Distinguished:** Consistently exceeds standards of performance.
- 3 - Accomplished:** Consistently meets standards of performance.
- 2 - Satisfactory:** Demonstrates satisfactory competence on standards of performance.
- 1 - Unsatisfactory:** Does not meet acceptable standards of performance.

Developing: The designation of “developing” may be added to one of the above ratings where a limited number of performance items are targeted and where one of the following conditions exist:

1. Principal is a probationary principal
2. Principal assumed a new assignment
3. A significant change has occurred in district goals, curricula, leadership, or strategic vision during the year

8. Growth Plans

A professional growth plan will be developed from the summary report consistent with the performance rating assigned. Growth plans will be signed by both parties.

4 - Distinguished: A self-directed growth plan; eligible for additional leadership roles and responsibilities; encouraged to assume role of mentor or coach.

3 - Accomplished: A self-directed growth plan.

2 - Satisfactory: One-year jointly designed growth plan.

1 - Unsatisfactory: One-year directed improvement plan stemming from unsatisfactory or concerning performance items; generated by the supervisor and specifically identifies areas for improvement.

Developing: A limited number of items targeted for improvement may be added to the growth plan by the supervisor under the criteria listed for this designation. This should be viewed as a transition plan that is designed to address the new knowledge and skills required by the change in position or changes initiated at the district level.

Consequences: Failure to remedy or improve a performance designation of “Unsatisfactory” shall result in disciplinary action per Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.40 or 122A.41 or local district policy.

Summative Evaluation Performance Results

Supervisor Evaluation Evidence of professional practice gained through observations and other evidences.	School Performance Measures Multiple measures of school performance using available data, including measures of student learning and growth.	Other Measures Additional evidences related to competencies including surveys and stakeholder input.
--	--	--

Distinguished Consistently exceeds standards of performance.	Accomplished Consistently meets standards of performance for most indicators.	Satisfactory Demonstrates satisfactory competence on levels of performance	Unsatisfactory Does not meet acceptable standards of performance.
--	---	--	---

Developing: A limited number of performance items are targeted and the following exists:

- Principal is in probationary year;
- Principal has assumed a new assignment;
- A significant change has occurred in district goals, curricula, leadership, or strategic vision.

Self-directed growth plan. Eligible for additional roles; responsibilities; Mentor/Coach	Self-directed growth plan.	One-year jointly developed growth plan.	One-year improvement plan developed by evaluator.
--	-----------------------------------	--	--

Improves

Does Not Improve

Growth Items: A limited number of items targeted for improvement may be added to the growth plan by the supervisor under the criteria listed for this designation.

Discipline per Minnesota Statutes, section 122A.40 or 122A.41 or local district option.