

SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION TOOL

DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL MODEL

DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL MODEL

The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluations is the result of Collins & Blaha, P.C.'s range of experience in the field of education law, input from various districts in Michigan, and the careful selection of elements from multiple state-approved evaluation tools. Educators and experts in several southeastern Michigan school districts provided input for the tool as well. Specific contributors are listed below.

After Public Act 173 of 2015 passed, our office focused research on the Superintendent evaluation tools used in other states. In particular, we examined those tools which were adopted statewide by a state's Department of Education, School Board Association, or a similar entity. We found that nearly all widely-recognized and accepted Superintendent evaluations are based on the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders or the predecessor Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium ("ISLLC") Standards. The 2015 Professional Standards are:

1. Mission, Vision, and Core values;
2. Ethics and Professional Norms;
3. Equity and Cultural Responsiveness;
4. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment;
5. Community of Care and Support for Students;
6. Professional Capacity of School Personnel;
7. Professional Community for Teachers and Staff;
8. Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community;
9. Operations and Management; and
10. School Improvement.

All of these topics are addressed in the components used in the Local Model. However, this tool consolidates the standards into six primary components and an optional seventh component:

1. Visionary Leadership;
2. Policy and Governance;
3. Instructional Leadership;
4. Communication and Community Relations;
5. Organizational Management;
6. Professionalism and Ethics; and
7. Statutory Factors (Optional).

Each of the Local Model's performance indicators and subcomponents in the evaluation tool are derived from an evaluation tool used on a statewide basis in another state. The Local Model derives content from tools developed by the (1) Oregon School Boards Association; (2) Arizona Department of Education; (3) New York State Council of School Superintendents;

(4) Massachusetts Association of School Committees; and (5) Connecticut Association of Boards of Education and Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents.

THE LOCAL MODEL FOR SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATIONS

Both the standard and expanded forms of the evaluation system require the board of education to reach a consensus with respect to the seven components on the performance evaluation tool, as well as the student growth and assessment rating. The board must then reach a consensus with respect to the Superintendent's final evaluation rating of ineffective, minimally effective, effective, or highly effective. This method reflects a true governance model, encouraging board members to provide input and discuss the Superintendent's performance. We believe this consensus-based approach is preferable to a numerical approach which can reduce the Superintendent's evaluation to a tallying or averaging of the board members' scores. In such a case, the extreme scores of one or two board members can significantly impact the Superintendent's average evaluation score. Rather, the tool we have developed requires board members to reach a consensus.

Should boards prefer to use subcomponents to focus their discussion, the expanded form of the evaluation tool provides two to three subcomponents for each main component, for a total of 16 subcomponents in the tool. We believe 16 is an appropriate number of subcomponents in the evaluation. In addition, the use of excessive subcomponents dilutes the more important aspects of the Superintendent's duties.

EVIDENCE OF RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND EFFICACY

[Section 1249b(2)(c)]

Reliability: The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation has the following plan for developing evidence of reliability, as permitted by MCL 380.1249b(2)(c).

Test-retest reliability will be used to develop evidence of the tool's **reliability**, or the degree to which the assessment tool produces stable and consistent results. The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation will use test-retest reliability to measure the degree to which the tool produces stable and consistent results. A sample of school districts will administer the evaluation at two different points in time. The ratings given by a Board of Education to its Superintendent will be compared to evaluate the assessment for reliability.

Validity: The foundation of the Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation is the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, formally known as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. The Professional Standards "communicate expectations . . . about the work, qualities and values of effective educational leaders." The National Policy Board for Educational Administration, which publishes the Professional Standards, stated in 2015:

The 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape. It involved a thorough review of empirical research . . . and sought the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups to identify gaps among the 2008 Standards, the day-to-day work of education leaders, and leadership demands of the future. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and American Association of School Administrators (AASA) were instrumental to this work.

The Professional Standards were reviewed by the authors of the Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation and used to develop a local superintendent evaluation tool specific to the needs of Michigan.

Efficacy: The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation was developed to address the needs of local school districts and intermediate school districts while complying with the requirements of Michigan law. The Local Model reflects a true governance model, encouraging Board members to provide input, discuss the Superintendent's performance, and reach a consensus. While a numerical approach reduces the Superintendent's evaluation to a tallying or averaging of the Board members' scores, a consensus-based approach, like the Local Model, results in a rating that reflects a unified Board decision.

RESEARCH BASE FOR THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, INSTRUMENT, AND PROCESS

The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation is derived from the following research bases:

- DiPaola, M.F. (2010). *Evaluating the Superintendent* (White Paper). American Association of School Administrators.
- Leo, S.F. & Lachlan-Haché, L. (2012). *Creating Summative Educator Effectiveness Scores: Approaches to Combining Measures*. American Institutes for Research.
- *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders*. (2015) National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- Sanders, N.M. & Kearney, K.M. (Eds.) (2008). *Performance Expectations and Indicators for Education Leaders, an ISLLC-Based Guide to Implementing Leader Standards and a Companion Guide to the Educational Leadership Policy Standards*. (2008). Council of Chief State School Officers; State Consortium on Education Leadership.
- Collins, Gary J. & Blaha, William J. (2016). *Michigan Teacher and Administrator Evaluations*. Collins & Blaha, P.C.

The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation is also the result of reviewing administrator evaluation systems in all 50 states, with particular focus on the following evaluation tools:

- Model Superintendents Evaluation, New York State Council of School Superintendents (November 2014);
- Principal Evaluation Process, An Arizona Model for Measuring Educator Effectiveness, Arizona Department of Education in collaboration with the Arizona School Administrators Association (2014-2015);
- Superintendent Evaluation, Connecticut Association of Boards of Education and Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (June 2016);
- Superintendent Evaluation, Massachusetts Association of School Committees (September 2012); and
- Superintendent Evaluation, Oregon School Boards Association (June 2014).

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND RUBRIC

[Section 1249b(2)(d)]

The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation Standard Form and Expanded Form are available at the following links.

Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation Standard Form. (Insert Link)

Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation Expanded Form. (Insert Link)

DESCRIPTION OF PROCESS FOR CONDUCTING CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS, COLLECTING EVIDENCE, CONDUCTING EVALUATION CONFERENCES, DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE RATINGS, AND DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLANS

[Section 1249b(2)(e)]

The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation provides this information.

Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation Standard Form. (Insert Link)

Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation Expanded Form. (Insert Link)

DESCRIPTION OF PLAN FOR PROVIDING EVALUATORS AND OBSERVERS WITH TRAINING

The introduction to the Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation provides step-by-step instructions for a Board of Education using the tool to evaluate its superintendent. The tool instructs the Board to reach a consensus with respect to each component. The Local Model then provides a process to reach a final evaluation rating.

The Local Model for Superintendent Evaluation authors are available to conduct live training. This training will include the purpose of the tool and how it should be used to conduct an evaluation of a superintendent. Formal training will include:

- The evaluation process;
- Evidence gathering;
- Review of the six components of the tool;
- Determination of the Superintendent's Student Growth and Assessment Rating; and
- Calculation of the Final Score.

Authors

- Gary J. Collins, Esq. (Primary Author), in collaboration with the attorneys of Collins & Blaha, P.C.

Construct Validity Consultants

- Dr. Christine Johns, Superintendent, Utica Community Schools
- Karl D. Paulson, Superintendent, Lakeview Public Schools
- Barbara VanSweden, Superintendent, Fitzgerald Public Schools