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Principal Evaluation Protocol

Introduction

Missouri’s Educator Evaluation System was created, field-tested and piloted, and refined by hundreds of educators across the state. The system is founded on general beliefs about the purpose of the evaluation process. Central to these beliefs is a theory of action which maintains that improving student performance is predicated on the improvement of educator practice. These beliefs include that evaluation processes are formative in nature and lead to continuous improvement; are aligned to standards that reflect excellence; build a culture of informing practice and promoting learning; and use multiple, balanced measurements that are fair and ethical. Districts are encouraged to collectively establish basic beliefs that serve as the foundation of their local evaluation process. Based on the theory of action and beliefs that are the foundation to the state’s model Educator Evaluation System, the primary purpose of the Principal Evaluation Protocol is to promote growth in effective practice that ultimately increases student performance. This growth in practice occurs based on the following sequence:

Growth requires focus. The identification of indicators is essential to establishing a particular focus based on performances articulated in the indicators. The baseline data serves as a starting point by establishing a current level of performance. Strategies for improvement are identified
and practiced. Meaningful feedback is provided regarding the extent to which the new strategies are addressing the area of focus. A follow-up rating provides indication of the amount of growth in performance that occurred. Reflection on the process and amount of growth that occurred or didn’t occur informs whether this particular indicator remains an area of focus or whether there is a new area of focus. This sequence is an important component to the growth in educational practice that occurs in the principal evaluation process described in the following steps:

**Step 1: Identify the indicators to be assessed**

**Rationale**

Appropriate indicators are selected that most support increasing student learning by promoting growth in teacher practice through a focus on potential growth opportunities for the principal. The indicators identified create an alignment between district and school improvement plans and the efforts and primary responsibilities of the principal in the building.

**Description**

The selection of indicators is a very important step in the process. These determine the focus and rationale for improving effective practice and are based on what is needed most to improve student learning.

The identified indicators provide a focus area for ongoing learning and growth. Typically these are identified at the end of the year for returning principals. The determination of which and how many indicators to identify is determined with the following criteria in mind:

1. Driven by student learning needs
2. Derived from the Building and District Improvement Plans (BIP-building level / CSIP-district level)
3. A maximum of three indicators per principal per year are recommended which are:
   - Based on student needs
   - Represents priorities of the building/district leadership for that principal
   - Based on a potential growth opportunity for the principal and are determined in collaboration between the principal and district leadership
4. At a minimum two of the indicators must address impact on student learning
5. Other indicators may be identified at any time based on issues and needs that arise. In extreme instances where particular growth or change in practice must be addressed, an Educator Improvement Plan (see Step 3) may be instituted.
Example
Mr. Peters is a fifth year principal at an elementary school. A major district focus this year is the implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards. As such, the superintendent of the district is directing all principals to work on Quality Indicator 2.2 “Provide an Effective Instructional Program” and 3.2 “Lead Personnel” to facilitate this implementation. In addition, Mr. Peters, in consultation with his superintendent, has identified Quality Indicator 2.3 “Ensure Continuous Professional Learning” in order to better align the professional learning of his teachers to the priority areas of his building. For this year, Mr. Peters’ area of focus will be on performances articulated in the following three indicators:

1. Provide an Effective Instructional Program 2.2
2. Lead Personnel 3.2
3. Ensure Continuous Professional Learning 2.3

All three indicators include evidence on Mr. Peters’ performance in the professional frames of commitment, practice and impact.

Step 2: Determine a baseline score for each identified indicator

Rationale
In order to determine growth on an indicator, it is necessary to establish a baseline score and compare it to a follow-up score. This represents a type of pre- and post-test format where growth in practice occurs between two points in time. A numerical rating provides an assessment of both pre- and post-status to determine accurately the growth that occurred in between.

Description
The 0 – 7 scale found on each growth guide provides a numerical rating for each indicator. This numerical rating establishes a baseline score. The baseline score for returning principals working on the same indicator as the previous year is the follow-up rating they received. This generates continuity of improvement of performance on a particular indicator.

The baseline rating is determined by considering the evidence at each level of the appropriate growth guide. Evidence falls into one of three different categories: commitment, practice and impact. Evidence in the commitment frame focuses on the quality of the leadership skills of the principal and includes data and information like licensing, credentialing, building improvement plans, building handbooks, and other building-level regulations and protocols. Evidence in the practice frames focuses on observable behaviors, or the quality of leadership that the principal demonstrates. Evidence in the impact frames focuses on outcomes or evidence of what teachers and students in the building are doing as a result of the principal’s leadership practices.
It is important to think about a principal’s rating of performance by taking these separate categories of evidence into consideration. After all, if a principal promotes what they think is a high level of instruction and monitors teacher performance and provides feedback in what they think is an effective manner and yet students are not understanding the content, then there is still something less than ideal occurring in learning experiences throughout the building. Identifying where that growth opportunity exists that limits the learning experience of all students from being ideal is the type of focus that leads to growth in practice.

It is first necessary to determine the appropriate descriptive rating for the principal’s performance. This descriptive rating of performance will be either Emerging, Developing, Proficient or Distinguished. To determine the descriptive rating, it is necessary to establish the highest level for which there is evidence of performance.

For example, in Growth Guide 2.2, a determination about the principal’s performance might be as illustrated below. There is Commitment evidence that the principal is knowledgeable of current instructional and assessment practices and that teachers collaboratively plan for their use. There is also observable Practice evidence that the principal facilitates a review of instructional practices and their effectiveness. Evidence at the Impact level reveals that student achievement has been linked to the practices and curricular materials that are currently being used. Although evidence can be gathered by observing student performance and various student products, an additional way to gather evidence at the impact level could be through the use of student surveys. Although this is perceptual in nature, research maintains that it does offer useful data.
In this illustration, the highlighted areas reflect the evidence of the principal’s performance. As noted by the highlighted text, there are examples of evidence in two different columns, Emerging and Developing. However, it is only in the Emerging column where there is an alignment, or evidence in all three professional frames. This alignment of evidence supports that the principal’s performance is fully rated at the Emerging level. In this particular example, facilitating a collaborative process among teachers on the consistent use of effective instruction and assessment
practices that positively impact student learning would represent the growth opportunity for this principal. Accomplishing this would establish an alignment of evidence at the Developing level.

It is next necessary to establish a baseline score within the Emerging level. This would be calculated and communicated as follows:

1. Using the appropriate growth guide and rating scale (see below), determine a baseline score. A score of 0 indicates there is no evidence present in at least one of the three frames. A score of 1 indicates there is evidence in all frames, but that it is inconsistently present or demonstrated. A score of 2 would indicate it is present and routinely demonstrated. Ideally, this score determination would occur as a collaborative, professional conversation between the principal and district superintendent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RATING SCALE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present but Inconsistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Once a score has been determined, specific feedback including an explanation and rationale are provided for the given score. Again, this would ideally occur within a collaborative, professional conversation.

3. In the example illustrated above, a positive impact on student learning as a result of teacher collaboration on the consistent use of effective instruction and assessment is the specific area where growth is needed to move performance from the “Emerging” level to the “Developing” level.

**Example**

Mr. Peters received the following ratings on his baseline assessment:

- A score of “2 Emerging” on Quality Indicator 2.2: Provide an Effective Instructional Program
  - The evidence, as presented in the example in the Description section, indicates that Mr. Peters is knowledgeable about current instruction and assessment practices and that teachers collaboratively plan for their use. This occurs because Mr. Peters facilitates a review of instructional practices and their effectiveness with his staff, linking it to current levels of student
achievement. An appropriate growth opportunity for Mr. Peters might include a strategy for ensuring the consistent use of practices aligned to Missouri’s Learning Standards among all teachers in all content and at all levels.

- A score of “4 Developing” on Quality Indicator 3.2: Lead Personnel
  - The evidence indicates that Mr. Peters routinely and consistently conducts an effective evaluation process with appropriate supporting documentation. He also provides effective feedback to all personnel on performance. An appropriate growth for Mr. Peters might include linking change in teacher practice to feedback from the evaluation process.

- A score of “4 Developing” on Quality Indicator 2.3: Ensure Continuous Professional Learning
  - The evidence indicates that Mr. Peters has established a culture of ongoing, professional learning in his building supported by appropriate artifacts and documentation. There is evidence of teacher’s consistently engaging in and documenting professional learning related to their appropriate content and grade levels. An appropriate growth opportunity for Mr. Peters might include creating and establishing strategies for teachers to consistently apply new professional learning to improve the learning of students.

### Step 3: Develop an Educator Growth Plan (i.e. professional learning/development plan or improvement plan)

#### Rationale

The primary purpose of the Principal Evaluation Protocol is to promote growth. Therefore, the acquisition and application of new learning and skills is essential for turning opportunities for growth into outcomes and results.

#### Description

The description of performance in each indicator and the baseline rating identifies an opportunity for growth. It is important when addressing this opportunity for growth that a very clear plan be developed. The Educator Growth Plan is the document used to articulate the various necessary components of this plan. In instances where very specific growth is required in a very specific timeframe, the Educator Improvement Plan is used to ensure that this growth occurs to the extent necessary and in a timely fashion.

The Educator Growth Plan addresses specific sources of new learning, the practice of skills related to new learning and timelines for completion. The state model offers two different formats for the Educator Growth Plan. One option uses language from the Data Team Process while the other uses language from the Plan/Do/Study Act process. Regardless of which option is used, the Educator Growth Plan includes the following key general components:
1. It corresponds to the examples of evidence provided in the appropriate growth guide

2. It is a clear articulation of a plan or goal statement to address growth opportunities

3. It includes specific strategies and timelines for application of new learning and skills

4. It is focused on results and outcomes

FOCUS – an area that represents an opportunity for growth and is generated from evidence on the growth guide

GOAL – a statement that addresses the focus and is specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and timely

STRATEGY – description of the skill(s) to be demonstrated that will effectively address the focus and include clear action steps and timelines

RESULTS – data and evidence that supports that the outcome of the strategy has effectively addressed the focus

When considering different strategies to address growth opportunities, the state model offers several different sources of research. Research sources are included in the “Research and Proven Practices” section of this document. There is research provided specific to instructional practices. These include the work of Dr. Robert Marzano, Dr. John Hattie, and Mr. Doug Lemov. These bodies of research were included because of the effect size information provided and their proven record of having impact on student learning. Crosswalks are provided for each to align each body of research with teacher indicators. This research is located in the teacher evaluation section.
Another body of research included is the Balanced Leadership Research conducted by Tim Waters, Robert Marzano and Brian McNulty. This includes a crosswalk comparing twenty-one leadership responsibilities with Missouri’s Leader Standards and Quality Indicators.

Also provided is a document called the Possible Sources of Evidence. There is a single page document provided for each standard. This document provides a list of “possible” sources of evidence that a principal might consider including as a component of the Educator Growth Plan.

It is important to note that this is not a comprehensive list of all evidence sources nor is it a checklist of things to do and/or provide. It simply offers some possible examples that might be included.

The evidence provided is categorized by the three professional frames found on each of the principal’s growth guides. In this way, principals and superintendents can use this to clarify exactly what kind of evidence will indicate that growth in performance has occurred.

Example

Mr. Peters, in consultation with his superintendent and perhaps also peers and/or a mentor, reviews the Possible Sources of Evidence documents and the Research and Proven Practices section to determine which new skills and strategies would be most appropriate given the particular growth opportunities of his selected indicators. Mr. Peters considers the following information as he works to complete his Educator Growth Plan:
• Quality Indicator 2.2: Provide an Effective Instructional Program
  o To support district implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards, Mr. Peters directs all staff to work on Quality Indicator 3.3 as one of the selected areas of focus for the year. This indicator focuses on instructional strategies related to curriculum implementation. Using the Research and Proven Practices section of the Educator Evaluation webpage, Mr. Peter observes that one of the strategies taken from the research of John Hattie would be beneficial for ensuring that all teachers implement effective instructional practices aligned to Missouri’s Learning Standards. This strategy is called Micro Teaching and has an effect size of .88. This strategy would direct his teachers to conduct mini-lessons and then discuss the impact of the lessons. It is suggested that this include video-taping. Mr. Peters determines he will establish a process for this to occur with his teachers. He also notes that in the Professional Impact section of the Possible Sources of Evidence for Standard 2 document, that an appropriate source of evidence would be “examples of professional learning impacting student learning”. Mr. Peters concludes that these taped lessons would be appropriate evidence.
  o In the Educator Growth Plan, Mr. Peters documents the following:
    ▪ **FOCUS** – Mr. Peters describes the focus for ensuring the use of effective instructional practices
    ▪ **GOAL** – Mr. Peters determines how many Micro Teaching lessons he wants each teacher to do and by when
    ▪ **STRATEGY** – Mr. Peters describes how the Micro Teaching lessons are to occur based on the research presented by John Hattie
    ▪ **RESULTS** – (to be completed later in Step 5)

• Quality Indicator 3.2: Lead Personnel
  o Mr. Peter notes that one of the strategies taken from the Balanced Leadership Research is called Intellectual Stimulation. This leadership responsibility directs the principal to “systematically engage staff in discussions about current research and theory”. As this has been established as a district priority, Mr. Peters decides he will provide feedback to teachers specific to practices designed to further the implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards. Mr. Peters notes that in the Professional Practice section of the Possible Sources of Evidence for Standard 3 document, that an appropriate source of evidence would be documentation of “visits to classrooms and targeted, constructive feedback”.
  o In the Educator Growth Plan, Mr. Peters documents the following:
    ▪ **FOCUS** – Mr. Peters describes the focus for providing effective feedback to his teachers
    ▪ **GOAL** – Mr. Peters determines how often he will provide feedback to each of his teachers.
    ▪ **STRATEGY** – Mr. Peters describes how he will introduce the district priority of implementing the Missouri Learning Standards and how he will provide feedback to each of his teachers on their implementation of these standards
• **RESULTS** – (to be completed later in Step 5)

- **Quality Indicator 2.3: Ensure Continuous Professional Learning**
  - Mr. Peters considers how to create and establish opportunities for teachers to apply new professional learning they have encountered. He observes, his first selected indicator, Micro Teaching, can serve a multiple purpose if teachers were to demonstrate a mini lesson aligned to Missouri’s Learning Standards and based on new professional learning and then discuss the impact of that lesson. Mr. Peters would then provide feedback as well. In this way, Mr. Peters is connecting all three of his selected indicators to one overall strategy. He again notes that the taped lessons and the feedback would be appropriate evidence for providing “examples of professional learning impacting student learning”.
  - In the Educator Growth Plan, Mr. Peters documents the following:
    - **FOCUS** – Mr. Peters describes the focus for applying new professional learning to improve student learning
    - **GOAL** – Mr. Peters determines how new professional learning will be included in the Micro Teaching lessons each teacher is going to do
    - **STRATEGY** – Mr. Peters describes how the Micro Teaching lessons are to occur based on the research presented by John Hattie and will include new professional learning. Teachers will receive feedback on the impact of the lesson.
    - **RESULTS** – (to be completed later in Step 5)

Mr. Peters can further support these opportunities for growth with appropriate articles and research. His building-level Professional Development Committee (PDC), district coaches, the regional professional development center and professional associations can be of assistance as well as other effective teachers in his building and district in assisting teachers with practicing teaching strategies that result in the implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards. Mr. Peters can also receive assistance on how to effectively deliver meaningful feedback.

**Step 4: Regularly assess progress and provide feedback**

**Rationale**

In keeping with the research on formative development, the essential role of practice and feedback will ensure that the acquisition and application of new learning, skills and strategies will lead to the improvement of effective practice resulting in improved learning for students.
Description

Determine progress made on new skill acquisition and application using a variety of formal and informal strategies. In addition to building and district administrators, the use of peers, mentors, coaches, regional centers, associations and other building and district resources assist with this part of the process.

Feedback on the extent of progress made on the growth opportunities from the identified indicator is critical. It ensures that new learning takes place. More importantly, it ensures that new skills and strategies are applied and practiced and the growth documented. The following guidelines assist in this process of regular assessment of progress and feedback:

1. A minimum of three to five opportunities for formal and informal feedback should occur on each identified indicator
2. Informal feedback may be provided by mentors, coaches, peers, external consultants, etc.
3. A formal follow-up assessment and discussion should occur between the principal and superintendent
4. Numerical scoring on the appropriate growth guide for each indicator included as a part of the feedback is optional, but can be helpful to accurately determine progress

The use of feedback forms included as a part of the state model allows for documentation of feedback and progress. There are two different forms available for use in providing and documenting discussions and feedback between the superintendent and principal.
The Principal General Feedback Form (shown on left) provides documentation that articulates the alignment of selected indicators to the district and/or building improvement plans. This single page form can be used to show how all three selected indicators support the district priorities. In the example of Mr. Peters, this form might be used to document implementation of Missouri’s Learning Standards in his building.

The Principal Indicator Feedback Form (shown on right) provides documentation offered on each particular indicator. This one page document summarizes the information from the Educator Growth Plan for all three selected indicators. It might easily serve as a document the principal and superintendent review frequently as a part of regular leadership meetings. In the example of Mr. Peters, this form might be used to show the relationship between his three selected indicators.
Example

As a part of the planning phase, Mr. Peters uses the Principal Evaluation Form to document his strategies for ensuring that his building, in keeping with the one of the district’s priorities for the year, is working towards implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards through the indicators he is focusing on. This form articulates his role in ensuring this implementation process is underway.

Mr. Peters also uses the Principal Evaluation Summary Form when he meets regularly with his superintendent. He uses the form to note the progress he is making on providing effective feedback. The form also assists in providing a summary to the superintendent on how well his teachers are doing in their collective work on Quality Indicator 3.3. This indicator focuses on instructional strategies related to curriculum implementation. In his discussions with his superintendent, he emphasizes the interconnectedness of his selected indicators to the selected indicators of his teachers and how these all contribute to the implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards.

Step 5: Determine a follow-up score for each identified indicator

Rationale

To determine growth on an indicator, it is necessary to compare the follow-up score to the baseline score. The comparison provides a measure of growth that has occurred on the performance articulated in each quality indicator.

Description

Using the same process to determine the baseline rating, the follow-up rating is determined by considering the evidence at the appropriate level of the growth guide. When making a determination about the follow-up rating, it is necessary to consider the particular professional frame of the principal’s opportunity for growth.

As a reminder, evidence falls into one of three different categories: commitment, practice and impact. Evidence in the commitment frame focuses on the quality of the leadership skills of the principal and includes data and information like licensing, credentialing, building improvement plans, building handbooks, and other building-level regulations and protocols. Evidence in the practice frames focuses on observable behaviors, or the quality of leadership that the principal demonstrates. Evidence in the impact frames focuses on outcomes or evidence of what teachers and students in the building are doing as a result of the principal’s leadership practices.
The follow-up score is determined as follows:

1. Using the appropriate growth guide and rating scale (see below), determine a follow-up score. A score of 0 indicates there is no evidence present in at least one of the three frames. Ideally, this follow-up score is collaboratively determined through a professional conversation between the principal and his/her superintendent.

**RATING SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Present</th>
<th>Present but Inconsistent</th>
<th>Present Consistent Routine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Once the follow-up score has been determined, specific feedback is provided that includes an explanation and rationale for the score that was given.

The purpose of a follow-up rating is to determine the extent to which the plan articulated on the Educator Growth Plan was addressed. In particular, it is used to determine the extent to which the strategies outlined in the plan addressed the goal. If the strategies did address the goal, then the opportunity for growth will have been addressed and satisfied. This is documented in the RESULTS box of the Educator Growth Plan. In addition, the follow-up score and growth score are captured on the Educator Growth Plan as well. Keep in mind, the Theory of Action for Missouri’s Model Educator Evaluation System is that growth in practice creates growth in student learning. The RESULTS box of the Educator Growth Plan provides documentation that a change in adult practice has occurred. It follows then that some aspect of student learning has likely improved as well.

**Example**

Mr. Peters’ follow-up ratings included:

- A follow-up score of “4 Developing” on Quality Indicator 2.2: Provide an Effective Instructional Program
o Mr. Peters staff consistently makes use of the Micro Teaching strategy from the research of John Hattie. Using this strategy, Mr. Peters has evidence that teachers are more consistently using effective instruction and assessment practices. The use of these practices enhances implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards.

o In the Educator Growth Plan, Mr. Peters documents the following:
  - **FOCUS** – Mr. Peters describes the focus for ensuring the use of effective instructional practices
  - **GOAL** – Mr. Peters determines how many Micro Teaching lessons he wants each teacher to do and by when
  - **STRATEGY** – Mr. Peters describes how the Micro Teaching lessons are to occur based on the research presented by John Hattie
  - **RESULTS** – Mr. Peters describes the specific improvements that resulted in teacher practice by using the Micro Teaching strategy. In particular, he provides evidence from the taped lessons of teachers of improved implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards
    - Baseline Score – 2
    - Follow-up Score – 4
    - Growth Score – 2

  A follow-up score of “5 Proficient” on Quality Indicator 3.2: Lead Personnel

  o Based on feedback received from both the superintendent and his teachers on his ability to provide meaningful feedback, Mr. Peters now has evidence that he has improved this leadership skill. Mr. Peters has evidence of his visits to classrooms and the feedback he provided. He can demonstrate how this led to changes and improvements in teachers’ instructional practices. Specifically, teachers improved in practices aligned to the implementation of the Missouri Learning Standards.

  o In the Educator Growth Plan, Mr. Peters documents the following:
    - **FOCUS** – Mr. Peters describes the focus for providing effective feedback to his teachers
    - **GOAL** – Mr. Peters determines how often he will provide feedback to each of his teachers.
    - **STRATEGY** – Mr. Peters describes how he will introduce the district priority of implementing the Missouri Learning Standards and how he will provide feedback to each of his teachers on their implementation of these standards
    - **RESULTS** – Mr. Peters describes what, when and how he provided feedback to teachers and the changes in practice that resulted because of that feedback.
      - Baseline Score – 4
      - Follow-up Score – 5
      - Growth Score – 1
A follow-up score of “6 Proficient” on Quality Indicator 2.3: Ensure Continuous Professional Learning
  o The teachers in Mr. Peters’ building have consistently engaged in the Micro Teaching strategy. Video tapes of lessons provide evidence that teachers have gained new professional learning and have applied it in their teaching strategies. They have received feedback from Mr. Peters as well as colleagues on their application of new learning and its impact on student learning.
  o In the Educator Growth Plan, Mr. Peters documents the following:
    ▪ **FOCUS** – Mr. Peters describes the focus for applying new professional learning to improve student learning
    ▪ **GOAL** – Mr. Peters determines how new professional learning will be included in the Micro Teaching lessons each teacher is going to do
    ▪ **STRATEGY** – Mr. Peters describes how the Micro Teaching lessons are to occur based on the research presented by John Hattie and will include new professional learning. Teachers will receive feedback on the impact of the lesson.
    ▪ **RESULTS** – Mr. Peters notes the changes in practice that were captured on video using the Micro Teaching strategy. He specifically notes the impact these changes had on student learning.
      ▪ Baseline Score – 4
      ▪ Follow-up Score – 6
      ▪ Growth Score – 2

**Step 6: Complete the final summative evaluation**

**Rationale**
The evaluation process exists for the improvement of teacher and principal practice as a necessary catalyst for improving student performance. The summative evaluation pulls together the data that has been collected and provides a final overall statement of the educator’s effectiveness.

**Description**
An overall determination on performance uses baseline and follow-up scores, feedback generated throughout the year on selected indicators, general feedback generated periodically through classroom observations and any other data or information relevant to the principal’s performance observed or gathered throughout the year. This information is captured on feedback forms and the Educator Growth Plan or, if applicable, the Educator Improvement Plan. This information and data is used to complete the Summative Evaluation Form.
The first page of the summative evaluation form provides an overview of the effectiveness of the principal looking across all six of the leader standards. The 2nd page provides an overview of the specific indicators the principal has worked on throughout the year.

- Assessing the principal’s performance across all 6 leader standards
  - Each standard is listed with summary statements. The statements represent a very broad description drawn from the categories of commitment, practice and impact. They are listed as a type of checklist supporting each of the 6 standards. For each standard, three options are provided:
    - **Area of Concern** – checking this box for a standard will likely result in an improvement plan for this standard meaning that growth in this area is both necessary and required and could impact future employment
    - **Growth Opportunity** – checking this box for a standard might possibly result in an indicator from this standard being selected in the following year as an opportunity for growth and documented in the next year’s Educator Growth Plan
    - **Meets Expectation** – checking this box for this standard indicates that performance in this area meets the expectation of the superintendent/district at the present time
Note: the comment box provided below each standard provides the opportunity to offer the rationale for the rating as well as to note exemplary performance in this particular area.

- Assessing the principal’s performance on selected indicators
  
  - This section of the summative evaluation form focuses on the growth opportunities presented through the selected indicators. Summative information is provided in the following areas:
    - Indicator and Rationale – document the specific indicator(s) that were selected and the reason this was a growth opportunity for the principal
    - Baseline Assessment – indicate the initial rating achieved for each selected indicator
    - Goal – summarize the goal that was created to address the growth opportunity
    - Results – describe the outcomes of implementing the strategy and determine whether the focus was adequately addressed
    - Follow-Up Assessment – indicate the follow-up rating achieved for each selected indicator
  
  - Note: This information matches the information that is documented on the Educator Growth Plan
The final page of the Summative Evaluation Form provides an overall rating for the principal. This section is completed as follows:

1. Years in Position – determine the number of years the principal has been in the current evaluated position (Note: the purpose for “in position” is to allow for reassignment to other grade levels/positions without adversely affecting performance ratings)

2. Select one of the effectiveness ratings based on the following criteria:

- **Ineffective Rating**
  - i. Multiple areas of concern across the 6 standards, OR
  - ii. An average of the follow-up assessment scores on the selected indicators falls into the indicated range

- **Minimally Effective Rating**
  - i. 1 area of concern across the 6 standards, OR
  - ii. An average of the follow-up assessment scores on the selected indicators falls into the indicated range

- **Effective Rating**
  - i. No areas of concern across the 6 standards, AND
  - ii. An average of the follow-up assessment scores on the selected indicators falls into the indicated range

- **Highly Effective Rating**
  - i. No areas of concern across the 6 standards, AND
  - ii. An average of the follow-up assessment scores on the selected indicators falls into the indicated range

- **Complete the comments section and the recommendation for employment**
Example

Mr. Peters’ superintendent completed his summative evaluation form with the following information:

Assessing Mr. Peters’ performance across all 6 teaching standards

- Standard 1: Vision, Mission and Goals       Meets Expectation
- Standard 2: Teaching and Learning       Growth Opportunity
- Standard 3: Management of the Organizational Systems       Meets Expectation
- Standard 4: Collaboration with Families and Stakeholder       Meets Expectation
- Standard 5: Ethics and Integrity       Meets Expectation
- Standard 6: Professional Development       Growth Opportunity

Mr. Peters had no areas of concern. He had two areas, Teaching and Learning and Professional Development, that were marked by his superintendent as growth opportunities. His selected indicators next year could possibly come from these two standards. In the comments section under Standard 3 Management of the Organizational Systems, his superintendent particularly noted that he felt Mr. Peters was particularly strong in his management skills and ability to work well with his teachers and staff.

Assessing Mr. Peters’ performance on selected indicators

Mr. Peters’ follow-up ratings on his identified indicators show evidence of his efforts to implement the Missouri Learning Standards and, in particular, showed he had assisted his teachers in improving their professional practice. His growth on each selected indicator is as follows:

- Emerging (2) to Developing (4) on Quality Indicator 2.2: Provide an Effective Instructional Program
- Developing (4) to Proficient (5) on Quality Indicator 3.2: Lead Personnel
- Developing (4) to Proficient (6) on Quality Indicator 2.3: Ensure Continuous Professional Learning.

His average rating based on his follow-up assessments is a 5 (15 total / 3 indicators = 5). This average follow-up assessment score provides a general summary on the growth Mr. Peters achieved in his three growth opportunities.

Mr. Peters is in his fifth year of leading an elementary school. Since he has been in his current evaluated position for five years, the second row of the Overall Principal Rating chart is used. Mr. Peters had no areas of concern AND his average rating fell in the 4-5 range.
Based on the information collected throughout the year and compiled on the Summative Evaluation Form, Mr. Peters would receive the following overall rating:

Mr. Peters is rated as Effective for the 2012 - 2013 school year.

- **Recommend for Re-Employment**
  - Develop a new or revised growth plan based on new indicators or a continuation of the same indicators.
  - Develop an improvement plan linked to indicators. This must included specific target dates and timelines that must be met in order for re-employment to continue.

- **Do Not Recommend for Re-Employment**
**Step 7: Reflect and Plan**

**Rationale**
The evaluation process exists primarily for the improvement of effective practice in order to improve student performance. Ongoing reflection and planning are used to ensure that student learning needs are continually met.

**Description**
The improvement of effective practice is a means to an end. The ongoing and continual process of improving professional practice is essential for ensuring that student learning needs remain the focus of the evaluation process. The ultimate result is the improvement of student learning. Monitoring student learning growth caused by a principal’s improved practice satisfies the primary purpose of the evaluation process.

Reflection on personal growth is an important part of feedback. It provides personal insight to areas of strength and potential growth opportunities for future focus. As a part of this reflection, consider the following:

1. Assess whether the particular areas of improvement of effective practice impacted teacher practice and student learning
2. Reflect on personal growth and possible future opportunities for continued growth
3. Plan ahead for future opportunities for growth. In collaboration with the superintendent and perhaps teachers and staff and/or colleagues, select indicators for next year (applies to returning principals).
4. Continue to acquire new knowledge and practice new strategies and skills

**Example**
Through the end of the year, Mr. Peters continues to monitor the learning of the students in his building. He particularly reflects on how effective instruction and assessment, developed and practiced through the Micro Teaching strategy and the focus of his feedback have contributed to students’ improved performance. In consultation with his superintendent, he begins to plan which particular indicators would be most appropriate for him to focus on next year. In particular, based on his Summative Evaluation Form, they consider and discuss selecting indicators from Standard 2: Teaching and Learning and Standard 6: Professional Development. Their professional conversation includes consideration of working on some of the same indicators next year. Mr. Peters will use his summer months to continue his learning in ways that will improve his performance on the indicators he will work on next year.
# Timeline for completion of the Principal Evaluation Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Step 5</th>
<th>Step 6</th>
<th>Step 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title and Description of Step</td>
<td>Identify the indicators to be assessed</td>
<td>Determine a baseline score for each identified indicator</td>
<td>Develop an Educator Growth Plan</td>
<td>Regularly assess progress and provide feedback</td>
<td>Determine a follow-up score for each identified indicator</td>
<td>Complete the final summative evaluation</td>
<td>Reflect and Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select indicators to be assessed based on student data and aligned to building &amp; district improvement plans.</td>
<td>Conduct an initial assessment of identified indicators and set a baseline score for each identified indicator.</td>
<td>Based on the opportunities for growth and the baseline scores, complete the Educator Growth Plan that includes the practice and application of new knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>Conduct observations on performances in the identified indicators. Provide targeted feedback on areas of strength and opportunities for growth. Note: observations may be conducted by coaches, peers, teacher team members as well as superintendents and assistant superintendents.</td>
<td>Conduct a follow-up assessment of identified indicators. Determine overall progress on the Educator Growth Plan.</td>
<td>Complete the Summative Evaluation Form to determine the overall rating on performance by the 15th of March.</td>
<td>Continue to monitor student growth and reflect on the impact of improved effective practice. Reflect on progress of growth opportunities. Indicators for next year may be selected based on local student data and the results of the evaluation process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Timeline for Returning Principal
- **Summer – Aug**: Summer – Aug
- **August – October**: August – October
- **November – February**: November – February
- **Early Spring**: Early Spring
- **April – May – Summer**: April – May – Summer

## Timeline for 1st Year Principal
- **Summer – Aug**: Summer – Aug
- **September – October**: September – October
- **November – February**: November – February
- **Early Spring**: Early Spring
- **April – May - Summer**: April – May - Summer