

State Council for Educator Effectiveness
Measuring Professional Practice for Principal Evaluations

DRAFT March 16, 2011

These draft recommendations reflect the Council’s efforts to balance numerous and sometimes competing values:

- Ensuring that local districts can make decisions that best fit the specific context of their schools and communities;
- Ensuring enough consistency in approach statewide that ensures students in different districts are not subjected to widely disparate degrees of expectations in their educational experiences;
- Recognition that, unlike in the case of teachers, SB 191 does not fundamentally change the manner in which principals are hired or retained in their positions. There are no implications for a principal’s tenure in a particular school which are implicated by the Council’s recommendation. The Council’s work in this area has focused primarily on the need to align incentives for principal evaluation with those of teacher evaluations, to try and ensure that all adults in the system are operating with aligned motivations with the goal of improving student outcomes.

Framework recommendation language

1. All districts in the state shall evaluate the performance of principals using the State Framework for Principal Evaluation Systems (“the Framework”). [flow chart]
2. Districts shall evaluate the performance of principals against the Colorado Quality Standards for Principals (“Principal Quality Standards”) using multiple measures of performance, which are weighted in such a way that the measures of Standards I – VI determine no more than 50% of the principal’s performance; and the measures of Standard VII (student growth) determine at least 50% of the weight of the evaluation.

Definition recommendation language

3. All districts shall use the Colorado Definition of Principal Effectiveness.

Quality Standards recommendation language

4. All districts shall evaluate the performance of principals on the full set of Principal Quality Standards and the associated detailed descriptions of knowledge and skills (also known as “Elements”).
5. The examples of practices included as part of the Principal Quality Standards Booklet are intended to assist districts in understanding the intended performance outcomes of each Standard and Element, and to guide the selection and use by districts of appropriate tools to measure a principal’s performance of each Quality Standards.
6. Districts shall not create additional Principal Quality Standards or Elements of Principal Quality Standards. However, districts may measure performance of the Quality Standards using tools that are locally selected or developed, and meets CDE technical requirements.

Quality Standards I – VI: Measures recommendation language

7. Districts shall involve principals in the district, including members of the representative association if one exists, in developing or adopting tools to measure a principal’s performance of the Principal Quality Standards. **[language being developed re: DACs, SACs and 1338 councils, and the need for the work of these bodies to be aligned without creating redundancies or being falsely inclusive in a manner that does not improve the efficacy of the overall system]**
8. Districts shall clearly communicate to principals the tools that will be used to measure their performance of the Principal Quality Standards prior to their use, how the selected measurement tools will be used to determine his/her performance of each Quality Standard, and the part/parties responsible for making decisions about how these multiple measures will be aggregated.
9. Each district system shall ensure that every principal is provided with a “Professional Performance Plan,” **[Definitions section of recommendations or regulations should indicate that this is the “principal development plan” which is referenced at 22-9-105.5(3)(a.5)] which shall be developed in collaboration with individual principals.** This Professional Performance Plan shall outline annual goals for the principal with respect to his/her school’s performance, and will outline the supports which will be made available to support the principal in achieving his/her goals. The PPP shall reflect the resources and supports available to facilitate the Principals attainment of the outlined goals.
 - a. **Districts are strongly encouraged to use TELL survey data to inform the development of PPP goals with respect to school goals around school climate and working conditions.**

Note re: Recommendation 11: Section 22-9-106(7) requires that the “Quality Standards for Principals must include ... (b) the number and percentage of licensed personnel in the principal’s school who are rated as effective and highly effective; and (c) the number and percentage of licensed personnel in the principal’s school who are rated as ineffective but are improving in effectiveness.” **The Council recognized that the intent of this language was to hold principals accountable for influencing the percentage of effective teachers in the building within the context of an overall improvement strategy. Implementation of the evaluation system with fidelity may result in an increase in the percentage and number of ineffective teachers, and PPP plans should be able to reflect the possibility of such**

increases in a manner that does not unfairly penalize principals. After much deliberation, the Council determined that the best way to address this requirement was to integrate reference to the numbers and percentages of personnel into the Quality Standard related to Human Resources Leadership, and use the counts and percentages as a measurement tool against that standard. A principal's Professional Performance Plan should explicitly reference the way in which the principal intends to address the counts and percentages of personnel within the context of an overall improvement plan for the school.

10. The Professional Performance Plan shall include explicit reference to the ways in which the principal shall address the counts and percentages of effective teachers in the school, in a manner consistent with the goals for the school outlined in the PPP and the school's unified improvement plan.
11. Principals shall be held accountable for progress against the goals laid out in the PPP.
12. Districts shall continually monitor principal goals, provide feedback and adjust support for the principal as needed.
13. Districts shall use multiple measures to evaluate all principals against quality standards I – VI using multiple formats and occasions as defined in section 14 below.
14. All measures used to collect data about a principal's performance against Quality Standards I – VI shall comply with any technical requirements developed by CDE to ensure the technical rigor of the measurement tool.
15. Districts shall measure performance of the Principal Quality Standards using a combination of the measures identified in section 15(a) – (c) below. These measures are supported by currently available research that affirms their value as measurements of principal performance as against quality standards, and shall be amended as research provides better evidence about best practice around principal evaluation.
 - a. Districts shall measure principal performance against Quality Standards I – VI using tools that capture information about:
 - i. Teacher/staff perceptions and feedback about the school environment, working conditions, evaluation and professional supports;
 1. **CDE shall develop a consistent statewide measurement tool for collecting teacher/staff perceptions about the school against the Quality Standards; over the course of the pilot it will be used and evaluated. it would be flexible enough to allow for the addition of questions by districts.**
 2. **Districts shall use the results from this tool as part of their evaluation of principals; though the decision on exactly how it will be used will be left to individual districts.**
 - ii. The percentage of number of teachers in the school who are rated as:
 1. Effective;
 2. Highly effective;
 3. Ineffective but improving.
 - b. Where appropriate and feasible districts are strongly encouraged to use multiple measures that capture evidence about the following:
 - i. Student perception data;
 - ii. Parent/guardian perception data;

- iii. Peer perceptions about a principal's professional performance.
 - c. Districts may also consider using other sources of evidence such as
 - i. Direct observations;
 - ii. Examination of a portfolio of relevant documentation regarding the principal's performance against the Quality Standards which may include but need not be limited to:
 - 1. Evidence of team development;
 - 2. Notes of staff meetings;
 - 3. School update newsletters;
 - 4. Content of website pages;
 - 5. Awards structures developed by the school;
 - 6. Master school schedule;
 - 7. Evidence of community partnerships;
 - 8. PTA participation rates and programs.
 - iii. 360 degree survey tools;
 - iv. Examination of the school's unified improvement plan;
 - v. Teacher retention data;
 - vi. External reviews of budgets;
 - vii. Examination of communications plan.
16. A formal rating of principals as effective, [marginally effective], highly effective, and ineffective shall take place once a year, using a body of evidence collected systematically in the months prior.
- a. Districts shall collect evidence of principal performance with enough frequency to ensure that the complete body of evidence leads to a fair and reliable measure of each principal's performance against Principal Quality Standards I-VI.
 - b. Whenever there is evidence that an educator is in need of support, districts are strongly encouraged to collect data about principal performance through observations or other methods as soon as practicable. This data should be shared with the educator in a manner that facilitates improvement.
 - c. Districts are strongly encouraged to conduct an informal evaluation of a principal early enough to facilitate feedback to the principal prior to their conduct of teacher evaluations.
17. *Districts shall develop a process to identify and conduct further evaluation of principals whose measures of performance for Principal Quality Standards I – VI are inconsistent, or whose performance on Quality Standards I – VI are inconsistent with measures of performance on Principal Quality Standard VII.*

Quality Standard VII: Student Growth recommendation language

See separate document in student growth section.

Weighting policies recommendation language

- 1. Districts shall determine locally how multiple measures of principal performance against the Colorado Quality Standards will be aggregated for experienced principals to provide an overall effectiveness rating against Quality Standards I – VI. CDE shall provide exemplars of such policies.**
 - a. In developing their weighting policies, districts shall develop a process to ensure that all quality standards shall be accounted for, and the weightings in a given year are transparent and should be consistent with the PPP goals of the principal.**
 - b. In developing their weighting policies, districts shall ensure that Standards I-VI are aggregated in such a way that no single standard I-VI is weighted less than 10% of the overall total score. Local districts can choose to emphasize any single standard up to 50% of the total.**
- 2. Districts shall communicate their weighting policies in order to ensure that all principals understand the process whereby they are assigned an effectiveness rating against Quality Standards I – VI.**
- 3. Districts shall develop locally a policy for determining how the multiple measures of student growth required by Quality Standard VII will be used to determine a principal’s performance of such Quality Standard.**
 - a. In developing their weighting policies, districts shall ensure that weights assigned to student growth measures are consistent with the measures’ technical quality and rigor.**
- 4. Districts shall aggregate the multiple measures of principal performance about quality standards I-VI into a single score; and aggregate the multiple measures of principal performance against quality standard VII (student growth) into a single score.**
- 5. Districts shall be transparent and clear about how the body of evidence collected about a principal’s performance will be used to make a decision about a principal’s effectiveness.**
- 6. The Council recommends that all districts statewide use the same scoring framework, which should be developed by CDE in accordance with Council recommendations, to assign principals to performance categories on the basis of the measures of principal performance against the quality standards.**
- 7. CDE working in collaboration with stakeholders including a subset of this Council shall develop the state scoring framework for principals in conjunction with the pilot period of the state model evaluation system.**

Weighting policies recommendation language – judgments about how to use the data

- 8. Districts shall develop policies regarding the use of professional judgment in determining how the score developed through the aggregation of multiple measures will ultimately be used. Districts shall clearly articulate how instances of conflicting principal performance data**

shall be handled for the purpose of making final performance standard ratings. These policies shall align with CDE developed guidelines.

CDE support of district development of principal evaluation systems recommendation language

9. CDE shall develop a complete state model system that complies with all of the requirements laid out in these recommendations. CDE shall ensure that this state model system can be implemented in all districts wishing to use it whether individually, through collaborative efforts, or with the support of CDE-provided resources and technical assistance.
10. Districts shall implement a system that satisfies the requirements laid out above and in CDE-developed technical guidelines for Educator Evaluator Systems for Teachers and Principals.
11. Monitoring system needs to measure whether educators understand how they are being evaluated, what they need to do to improve and how to access resources they need to support their professional development.

Resource bank recommendation language (see separate document re: Resource Bank)

12. CDE must provide resources about how districts can develop this body of evidence. These resources should be part of the resource bank developed by CDE in accordance with the requirements of SB 191.

AB, SS, TD – in the pilot we need to be clear about what we are trying to do – clear process

2 types of districts in the pilot – 1 pilot just the shalls

Subset of districts like DougCo – that would pilot the whole system including all of the tools – teacher perception tool and teacher observation rubric

Compare the two sets of outcomes. And then be clear about what we mean in terms of what comes out of it.

MS – there is a value to using the statewide tool in order to ensure that the state can collect data and make comparisons

SCRUB: edit shalls and mays to ensure that State model system includes consistent statewide tools, rubrics, etc.