

HCS Administrative Evaluation Process

The administrative evaluation tool was developed prior to 2016-17 and used by the Superintendent and Supervising Administrators to complete summative evaluations. The indicator domains on the original evaluation were chosen to cover all identified state requirements and influenced by the Michigan Association of School Boards evaluation tool (https://www.masb.org/docs/default-source/tools-and-templates/superintendents/masbisdsuptevaluation.pdf?sfvrsn=15fa83df_2) and more. The Evaluation Tool was adjusted from 4 rankings to 3 per state statute in July of 2024. The Evaluation Tool focuses on:

Evidence of Evaluation Based On:

- 1) Progress toward Goals
- 2) Progress toward District Improvement Plan with emphasis on students
- 3) Superintendent/Board communication

The indicators on the Summative Administrator Evaluation tool include:

- Instructional Leadership
- School Climate
- Human Resource Leadership
- Organizational Management
- Communications and Community Relations
- Professionalism
- Student Achievement

Domain totals are captured for the rating process. Using guidance from the State of Michigan the instrument was divided into domain weights which also captured the requirement that 20% be based on student growth. This included an average for the first six domains multiplied by 80% and the average for the final domain multiplied by 20%. Added together, the final score was created, and a rating determined, as seen below.

Rating Chart:

Effective = 85% to 100% (2.55 – 3 on Summative Worksheet)

Developing = 61% to 84% (1.81 – 2.54 on Summative Worksheet)

Needs Support = 0% to 60% (0 – 1.8 on Summative Worksheet)

The **authors** of the original tools, locally developed evaluation tools, were Chuck Hughes (Assistant Supt of Curriculum & Instruction, 2012-2016), Janet Sifferman (Superintendent, 2004-2016), Thom Dumond (BOE President, 2013-2022), and the 2015-16 HCS administrative team which verified that the domains were consistent with established expectations and best practices. The use of these tools since implementation have produced reliable and valid feedback regarding effectiveness. Percentile calculations were checked by a high school math teacher to ensure accuracy. All these individuals have worked with evaluations and in most cases are credentialled by the Michigan Department of Education with valid administrative certifications supported by coursework in administrative leadership. Mr. Hughes was the lead researcher and author of the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) approved Teacher Evaluation Tool called the Framework for Highly Effective Teaching which led to being asked to lead the development of the district Administrative Evaluation process. In many cases, the summative evaluations have been used to promote administrators, including the superintendent, within the organization, creating a confidence in the validity of the evaluation tools. We are confident in the **efficacy** behind the evaluation tools, measuring what we desire and leading to the identification and promotion of effective administrators in HCS.

Much of the same **research** used to create the HCS Framework for Highly Effective Teaching, was used to support the administrative evaluation rubric because as school administrators we have experiential knowledge to know what effective leadership means:

HCS Instructional Framework Supporting Research

Blankstein, Alan (2004) Failure is Not an Option, Corwin Press

Chappuis, Jan, Stiggins, Rick, Chappuis, Steve, and Arter, Judith (2012), Classroom Assessment for Student Learning. Pearson Education Inc.

Danielson, Charlotte, and McGreal, Thomas (2000), Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice. ASCD

Danielson, Charlotte (2002), Enhancing Student Achievement. ASCD

Danielson, Charlotte (April 2015), Framing Discussions About Teaching, *Educational Leadership*

Danielson, Charlotte (May 2016), Creating Communities of Practice, *Educational Leadership*

Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth Through Age 8. National Association for the Education of Young Children (2009)

Dewitt, Peter (Aug. 26, 2014), Clarity First; Accountability Follows

Fisher, Douglass, Frey, Nancy, and Pumpian, Ian (2012), How to Create a Culture of Achievement. ASCD

Goodwin, Bryan (2011), Simply Better. ASCD

Hall, Pete, and Simeral, Alisa (2008), Building Teachers' Capacity for Success. ASCD

Hargreaves, Andy, and Fullan, Michael (2012), Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School. Teachers College Press

Hattie, John, (2009), Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. Routledge.

Indiana Summative Turnaround Principal Rubric

Lezotte, Lawrence, and Snyder, Kathleen (2011), What Effective Schools Do. Solution Tree

Marzano, Robert (2003), What Works In Schools. ASCD

Marzano, Robert, Pickering, Debra, and Pollock, Jane (2001), Classroom Instruction That Works. ASCD

Marzano, Robert, (2007), The Art and Science of Teaching. ASCD

Marzano, Robert, Frontier, Toney, and Livingston, David, (2011), Effective Supervision: Supporting The Art and Science of Teaching. ASCD

MASB, <https://www.masb.org/tools-and-templates/assessments-and-evaluations/superintendent-evaluation> (current, but used what they had back when developing the evaluation tools)

Reeves, Anne (2011), Where Great Teaching Begins. ASCD

Reeves, Douglas, (2006), The Learning Leader. ASCD

Robbins, Pam (2015), Peer Coaching to Enrich Professional Practice, School Culture, and Student Learning. ASCD

Rossenfield, Sylvia, and Grovois, Todd (1996), Instructional Consultation Teams. The Guilford Press

Schmoker, Mike (2006), Results Now. ASCD

Stronge, James (2002), Qualities of Effective Teachers. ASCD

Willis, Judy (2006), Research-Based Strategies to Ignite Student Learning. ASCD

Willis, Jud (2007) Brain-Friendly Strategies for the Inclusion Classroom. ASCD

As part of the **evaluation process**, the district developed a goal-based approach called GRASP (see below). This stands for Goal, Rationale, Accountability, Strategy, and Plan. All administrators develop goals and are responsible for presenting evidence of effort at the end of the year to support the evaluation determination. The Superintendent or Direct Supervisors meet with the administrator's mid-year and at the end of the year to provide feedback on established GRASP goals and to complete the summative evaluation and rating.

Hartland GRASP Goal Worksheet

Name of Teacher/Teacher Team:

Content Area:

Grade Level:

Academic Year:

Type of SLO:

☐ Class-level

☐ Targeted (Specific students in a class, i.e. ELL)

☐ Course-level

☐ Leveled (Specific students in a course, i.e. Special Ed.)

Interval of Instruction (Semester, Year, etc.):

**This process aligns with the Student Learning Objectives (SLO) research supported by MDE.*

Student Population

Identify the students included in the GRASP Goal and explain why the students were selected. Describe the characteristics of the student population, including how many students have special needs relevant to the GRASP Goal (e.g. I have 4 students with reading disabilities, 2 English learners...).

Learning Standards or Competencies

List the state-adopted standards or competencies that are connected to the learning content.

Goal

Describe the specific student growth that you have identified for impact.

Rationale

Explain your rationale for setting the targets for student growth; identify how the targets connect with the school improvement plan.

Baseline Data

Describe the data that was reviewed in the creation of the GRASP Goal. Explain how the data supports the GRASP Goal.

Assessment/Accountability

Name the instrument that will be used to measure the outcome of the GRASP Goal.

Growth Targets

Identify the quantitative targets that will demonstrate achievement of the GRASP Goal. Each student included in the GRASP Goal should have a growth target.

Instructional Strategies and Interventions

Describe the instructional strategies and interventions you will use to help students reach growth targets; share how you will monitor students' progress.

Plan of Action (Timeline)

Explain the timeline you will use to institute strategies and how you will monitor student growth.

Plan of Action for Professional Development

Describe your plan for learning to support this GRASP Goal.

GRASP Goal Administrator Approval: _____

Approved ☐ **Not Approved** ☐

Date: _____

Teacher Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

The **plan** was to ensure that all administrators were introduced to the evaluation tool and trained on its usage prior to implementation. The evaluation is annually reviewed at Administrative Staff meetings to ensure that all are aware of the GRASP Goal process and indicators used for evaluation. For the purpose of HCS, **validity** refers to how well an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure, performance. Validity was established using our administrative team (educational experts) who are familiar with the research base and work of effective school leaders. District experts examined the research, accepted the performance indicators for measure and refined the scale for measurement.

The administrative evaluation process has been in place since the 2015-16 school year (adjusted in 2024), with an understanding that modifications can be done if necessary. Prior to this, the evaluation consisted of a narrative summative evaluation without clearly established domains. The district has strived to create a comprehensive and meaningful evaluation process for the superintendent and administrative staff as education research clearly points to meaningful feedback as the key to successful learning.

Administrator Evaluation Report

Choose an item.

Name: Click here to enter text.

Position: Click here to enter text.

School Year: Click here to enter text.

Date: Click here to enter text.

The administrator evaluation is based on professional growth goals developed to support student learning and teacher effectiveness. Goals are developed in the form of GRASP Goals that will be reviewed at mid-year and at the summative evaluation at the end of the school year, along with the following areas in educational leadership:

1) Instructional Leadership:

Click here to enter text.

2) School Climate:

Click here to enter text.

3) Human Resources Leadership:

Click here to enter text.

4) Organizational Management:

Click here to enter text.

5) Communications and Community Relations:

Click here to enter text.

6) Professionalism:

Click here to enter text.

7) Student Achievement:

Click here to enter text.

Administrator Evaluation Rating (Summative Only)

This Evaluation is Considered Satisfactory _____

This Evaluation is Considered Unsatisfactory _____

Evaluator Signature: _____

Date: _____

Employee Signature: _____

Date: _____

HCS Administrator Summative Evaluation Report

Choose an item.

Name: Click here to enter text.

Position: Click here to enter text.

School Year: Click here to enter text.

Date: Click here to enter text.

The Administrator Evaluation is based on evidence of effort toward adopted goals. Goals are developed and reviewed on the summative evaluation at the end of the school year under the following areas, with #1-6 accounting for 80% of the summative and #7 accounting for 20% of the summative. Please review the domain definitions on page two prior to checking one of the boxes for each domain below. It is also important that you provide details to support your rating for each domain.

1) Instructional Leadership:

☐ Effective

☐ Developing

☐ Needing Support

Click here to enter text.

2) School Climate:

☐ Effective

☐ Developing

☐ Needing Support

Click here to enter text.

3) Human Resources Leadership:

☐ Effective

☐ Developing

☐ Needing Support

Click here to enter text.

4) Organizational Management:

☐ Effective

☐ Developing

☐ Needing Support

Click here to enter text.

5) Communications and Community Relations:

☐ Effective

☐ Developing

☐ Needing Support

Click here to enter text.

6) Professionalism:

☐ Effective

☐ Developing

☐ Needing Support

Click here to enter text.

7) Student Achievement:

☐ Effective

☐ Developing

☐ Needing Support

Click here to enter text.

Please check a box for each of the following:

For Number 1 – 6, this Summative Evaluation is rated: ☐ Effective ☐ Developing ☐ Needing Support

For Number 7, this Summative Evaluation is rated: ☐ Effective ☐ Developing ☐ Needing Support

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

Employee Signature: _____ Date: _____

Administrator Evaluation Domains Defined

1. **Instructional Leadership:** The administrator projects a positive image to those they meet while participating in activities within the community. They demonstrate an understanding of educational issues and serves as the educational leader within the community while seeking open communication with those they supervise. Participation in local, state, or federal educational activities are shared with the Superintendent.
2. **School Climate:** The administrator projects a positive image for the district while seeking input from a variety of groups. They maintain good media relations and supports the effort to market the district. A collaborative effort to develop relationships/partnerships with businesses and organizations within the community is evident. Staff are delegated work properly and effectively. The administrator demonstrates that the welfare of students and staff is important.
3. **Human Resources Leadership:** Staff evaluations are completed in a timely manner and impartiality is demonstrated in personnel matters, if needed. The administrator establishes sound relationships with employee groups. The administrator ensures that competent staff are selected to fill open positions.
4. **Organizational Management:** The administrator recommends appropriate budgets and amendments when needed. Appropriate expenditures are brought forward when necessary. The administrator shares plans for school programs, facility upgrades, and bond projects with the Superintendent and community. The administrator assists the Superintendent in policy updates and develops appropriate administrative procedures to implement and enforce those adopted. Job responsibilities are carried out and leadership demonstrated through staff teamwork, delegation, and strong leadership. The administrator understands the necessity of projecting a positive leadership image.
5. **Communications and Community Relations:** The administrator provides the community with information through multiple formats such as social media, newsletters, and local media. The administrator demonstrates respect for the community and listens to concerns. Poise and composure are maintained in the face of crisis/criticism with a professional appearance being demonstrated. The administrator maintains a healthy image and enthusiasm for the job.
6. **Professionalism:** The administrator maintains all necessary credentials. Central Office inquiries are answered in a timely manner and the Superintendent is notified of problems/concerns. The Superintendent is presented with meeting materials and background information to ensure sound decisions can be made.
7. **Student Achievement:** The district demonstrates positive student assessment/growth. Professional development is aligned with district improvement goals.

Overall Summative Evaluation Rating

Effective (3)
85% to 100%

Developing (2)
61% to 84%

Needing Support (1)
0% to 60%

The Final Evaluation is determined by combining the majority of ratings in each of the domains #1- #6 X .80 + the rating in #7 X .20 with the overall percentage determining the final rating.

Rating #1-6 Example = 4 Effective, 1 Developing and 1 Needing Support, the Evaluator would use Effective or 3 as the multiplier for this category. Effective is the majority.

Rating #1-6 Example = 2 Effective, 3 Developing and 1 Needing Support, the Evaluator would use Developing or 2 as the multiplier for this category. Developing is the majority.

Rating #1-6 Example = 2 Effective, 2 Developing, 3 Needing Support, the Evaluator would use Needing Support or 1 as the multiplier for this category. Needing Support is the majority.

The Evaluator has the authority to make the final decision in situations where there is a question regarding the rating such as a tie or an unknown circumstance.

Example Final Rating = 3 (Effective) is the average majority rating for # 1-6 X .80 = 2.4
 2 (Developing) is the majority rating for # 7 X .20 = 0.4
 Add the two numbers together 2.4 + 0.4 = 2.8
 Divide the final number 2.8/3 = 93% = Effective Rating

FINAL END OF YEAR SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RATING TO BE COMPLETED BY THE EVALUATOR

The Evaluator will complete a single Summative Evaluation to be presented to the administrator using the above defined criteria. The Evaluator and Administrator signatures shall be included on this document.

Final Rating (see example above)

_____ (3,2,1) is majority rating for # 1-6 X .80 = _____ (a)

_____ (3,2,1) is the rating for # 7 X .20 = _____ (b)

a _____ + b _____ = _____ /3 = _____ % or a _____ Rating.

Summative Evaluation Rating (Circle One):

Effective

Developing

Needing Support

Evaluator Signature: _____

Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____

Date: _____

HCS Administrator Professional Development

Recent Years

Liberating Structures (PD Engagement Activities) Training

Secondary Principals County Networking

Assistant Principals County Networking

Elementary Principal County Networking

Reading Recovery Training / Conference

Cognitive Coaching Training

Horacio Sanchez: Brain Research Training

Jessica Minahan: Understanding and Teaching Difficult Students Training

Principal Instructional Learning Rounds Training

Leadership Training by District Leadership Team

Teachers College Workshops on Literacy Best Practice

ALICE Training

Title IX Training

Seclusion and Restraint Training

Administrative Book Studies

KLAA Principal Meetings: Educational Hot Topic Guest Speakers

HCS Evaluation Framework Supporting Research

Blankstein, Alan (2004) Failure is Not an Option, Corwin Press

Chappuis, Jan, Stiggins, Rick, Chappuis, Steve, and Arter, Judith (2012), Classroom Assessment for Student Learning. Pearson Education Inc.

Danielson, Charlotte, and McGreal, Thomas (2000), Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice. ASCD

Danielson, Charlotte (2002), Enhancing Student Achievement. ASCD

Danielson, Charlotte (April 2015), Framing Discussions About Teaching, *Educational Leadership*

Danielson, Charlotte (May 2016), Creating Communities of Practice, *Educational Leadership*

Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth Through Age 8. National Association for the Education of Young Children (2009)

Dewitt, Peter (Aug. 26, 2014), Clarity First; Accountability Follows

Fisher, Douglass, Frey, Nancy, and Pumpian, Ian (2012), How to Create a Culture of Achievement. ASCD

Goodwin, Bryan (2011), Simply Better. ASCD

Hall, Pete, and Simeral, Alisa (2008), Building Teachers' Capacity for Success. ASCD

Hargreaves, Andy, and Fullan, Michael (2012), Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School. Teachers College Press

Hattie, John, (2009), Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. Routledge.

Indiana Summative Turnaround Principal Rubric

Lezotte, Lawrence, and Snyder, Kathleen (2011), What Effective Schools Do. Solution Tree

Marzano, Robert (2003), What Works In Schools. ASCD

Marzano, Robert, Pickering, Debra, and Pollock, Jane (2001), Classroom Instruction That Works. ASCD

Marzano, Robert, (2007), The Art and Science of Teaching. ASCD

Marzano, Robert, Frontier, Toney, and Livingston, David, (2011), Effective Supervision: Supporting The Art and Science of Teaching. ASCD

MASB, <https://www.masb.org/tools-and-templates/assessments-and-evaluations/superintendent-evaluation> (current, but used what they had back when developing the evaluation tools)

Reeves, Anne (2011), Where Great Teaching Begins. ASCD

Reeves, Douglas, (2006), The Learning Leader. ASCD

Robbins, Pam (2015), Peer Coaching to Enrich Professional Practice, School Culture, and Student Learning. ASCD

Rossenfield, Sylvia, and Grovois, Todd (1996), Instructional Consultation Teams. *The Guilford Press*

Schmoker, Mike (2006), Results Now. ASCD

Stronge, James (2002), Qualities of Effective Teachers. ASCD

Willis, Judy (2006), Research-Based Strategies to Ignite Student Learning. ASCD

Willis, Jud (2007) Brain-Friendly Strategies for the Inclusion Classroom. ASCD

Additional Administrative Book Study or Discussion Resources Since 2015-16

City, Elizabeth, Richard Elmore, Sarah Fiarman, and Lee Teitel. **Instructional Rounds in Education**, Harvard Education Press 2011

Clark, Ron. **Move Your Bus**, Touchstone 2015

Clifton, Don. **Now, Discover Your Strengths**, Gallup Press 2021

Donohoo, Jenni. **Collective Efficacy**, Corwin 2017

Fisher, Douglas and Nancy Frey. **The Purposeful Classroom**, ASCD 2011

Gruenert, Steve and Todd Whitaker. **School Culture Rewired**, ASCD 2015

Hansen, Morten T. **Collaboration**, Harvard Business Press, 2009

Hargreaves, Andy and Dennis Shirley. **Well-Being in Schools**, ASCD 2022

Hoerr, Thomas R. **Taking Social Emotional Learning Schoolwide**. ASCD 2020

Kaser, Linda and Judy Halbert. **Leadership Mindsets**, Routledge 2009

Kohm, Barbara and Beverly Nance. **Principals Who Learn**, ASCD 2007

Kubicek, Jeremie and Steve Cockram. **The 100X Leader**, Wiley 2019

Maister, David H. **True Professionalism**, Simon & Schuster 1997

Patterson, Kerry and Joseph Grenny, David Maxfield, Ron McMillan and Al Switzler. **Influencer**, McGraw-Hill 2008

Reeves, Douglas. **The Daily Disciplines of Leadership**. Jossey-Bass 2002

Rutter, Michael and Barbara Maughan, Peter Mortimore, and Janet Ouston. **Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children**, Harvard University Press 1979

Sanchez, Horacio. **The Poverty Problem**, Corwin 2021

Scott, Susan. **Fierce Conversation**, Berkley Books 2004

Wolk, Ronald A. **Wasting Minds**, ASCD 2011