ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROCESS
(APEP)

Lapeer Community Schools

Administrative Guideline #1420

Updated December 2019

Building Administrator Performance Evaluation System

Lapeer Community Schools is committed to ensuring that all students reach their potential as self-directed learners and responsible citizens. To that end, we believe that an effective evaluation process is intended to assist in both the growth of each individual (the formative process) and the evaluation of each individual (the summative process). Effective building level leadership is an essential to student and teacher growth and school improvement.

The following evaluation process for building administrators utilizes the School ADvance Administer Evaluation System. As used herein, the term "administrator" refers to principals and assistant/associate principals and, unless specific reference to "assistant/associate principal" is made, the term "principal" refers to both principals and assistant/associate principals.

Building Administrator Evaluation System
Principals are evaluated by the superintendent, or designee, with input from central office administrators and, assistant/associate principals are evaluated by the superintendent, or designee, with input from the building principal.

As part of the formative process, each of the individual standards will be assessed as **Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, or Highly Effective** using the School Advance Administrator Evaluation System.

The annual year-end evaluation of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective will be derived by the evaluator considering his/her rating of each of the Domain Areas and evidence of student growth.

Pursuant to 380.1249 of The Revised School Code, the annual year-end evaluation process will also include assessment of the following:

A. The administrator's training and proficiency in using the evaluation tool for teachers including a random sampling of his or her teacher performance evaluations to assess the quality of the school administrator's input in the teacher performance evaluation system.

B. The progress made by the school in meeting the goals set forth in the school's improvement plan.

C. Pupil attendance in the school.

D. Student, parent, and teacher feedback and other information considered pertinent by the superintendent or his/her designee. This will include but not be limited to consideration of the results of surveys which will be shared with principals prior to use.

E. Student growth and assessment data pertaining to the school in which the administrator works. Student growth is measured by Student Growth Calculation.

I. Administrator Performance Standards

Administrator performance will be assessed in accordance to MDE Approved School Advance building Administrator Evaluation System. The Building Administrator Framework contains five (5) Domain areas and twenty-nine (29) standards listed below. A detailed set of rubrics describing performance expectations for each standard can be found in Outlook, Share drive, Team Sites, Human Resources, Evaluation, LSDAA.

School ADvance Building Administrator Evaluation System

Domain 1 – Results
A. **Student Achievement** (Based on student growth on academic measures)
B. **Teacher Performance** (Based on student growth targets)
C. **Achievement Gap Reduction/Elimination** (Based on targets for achievement gap reduction)
D. **Overall Progress on Building School Improvement Plan** (Based on SIP Targets)

Domain 2 - Leadership
A. **Vision for Learning and Achievement Factors**
   1. Personal (2A)
   2. Shared (2B)

B. **Leadership Behavior Factors**
   1. Informed (2C)
   2. Strategic and Systemic (2D)
   3. Fair, Legal, Honest, Ethical, and Professional (2E)
   4. Resilient (2F)

Domain 3 - Programs
A. **High Fidelity and Reliability Instructional Program Factors**
   1. Curriculum (3A)
   2. Instruction (3B)
   3. Assessment (3C)

B. **Safe, Effective, and Efficient School Operations Factors**
   1. Policies, Laws, and Procedures (3D)
   2. Systems, Processes, and Procedures (3E)
   3. Resource Allocation and Management (3F)

Domain 4 - Processes
A. **Community Building Factors**
   1. Relationships (4A)
   2. Inclusion (4B)
   3. Communications (4C)

B. **Evidenced Based and Data Informed Decision Making Factors**
   1. Collaborative Inquiry Process (4D)
   2. Systematic Use of Multiple Data Sources (4E)
   3. Data Systems (4F)

Domain 5 - Systems
A. **Technology Integration and Competence Factors**
   1. Personal Use of Technology (5A)
   2. Learning and Teaching with Technology (5B)
   3. Leadership for Technology (5C)

B. **Human Capacity Factors**
   1. Professional Development (5D)
   2. Leadership Development (5E)
   3. Performance Evaluation (5F)
   4. Productivity (5G)

II.   **Administrator Evaluation Process**
The annual evaluation process for building administrators begins no later than September 30 of each school year and concludes no later than June 30. A summary of the major activities and timelines related to building administrator evaluation can be found in **Appendix C**.

The district utilizes an online evaluation tool, *Frontline Professional Growth*, to complete all forms referenced in this document. **Appendix B** provides details regarding the forms contained in ***Frontline Professional Growth*** as well as information on how to log in to your account.

Each building administrator will be placed on one of the following three (3) evaluation tracks:

a. **Probationary Administrator Track –** All administrators in their first two (2) years of employment with the district as an administrator, shall be considered probationary and are placed on the probationary administrator evaluation track. The purpose of this track is to provide the following: a foundation for the professional standards related to administrator performance; ongoing and regular feedback regarding performance progress; and support for transition to professional growth.

b. **Professional Growth Administrator Track** – The Professional Growth track facilitates administrator growth through a process of collaboration, development of knowledge, expansion of effective practice and on-going professional self-reflection.

c. **Administrator Assistance Track –** Any administrator previously determined to not be performing at least an "effective" level based on their most recent performance evaluation, will be placed on the Administrator Assistance Track. The goal of this track is to provide increased levels of feedback and support to assist the administrator in performing at an "effective" level and, thereby, move to the Professional Growth Track.

The evaluation process for building administrators contains the components described below.

A.   **Pre-Evaluation Meeting** -- Prior to October 30 of each school year, administrators generally shall attend an initital evaluation meeting to review the following:

1. **Self-Evaluation (Form B)** Every administrator will electronically complete a self-evaluation and submit it prior to the meeting.
2. **Goal Planning and Authorization (Form A)** – Student growth goals are submitted and invdividual growth goals are reviewed and discussed during this meeting and recorded on "Administrator Goal Worksheet" during the initial meeting.
3. **Personal Growth Plan** (if applicable) – All probationary administators and

administrators on the Administrator Assistance Track will have a personal growth plan developed by the evaluator in conjucntion with the administrator. Administrtors on the Professional Growth Track, may have a personal growth plan developed as needed. Plans will be reviewed during the pre-evaluation meeting.

B. **Personal Growth Plan**

All probationary administrators and administrators on the assistance track will have a personal growth plan developed. Additionally, administrators on the professional growth track determined to not be meeting performance expectations in any domain category, may also have a personal growth plan developed.

Personal growth plans will identify performance areas of focus for the administrator. For administrators who were previously identified as less than "effective", Personal Growth plans will specify the performance areas determined to be less than effective and recommend professional development opportunities and other measures designed to improve the rating of the administrator on his/her next annual summative evaluation. Plans will include a timeline for improvement and/or of meeting identified goals. Goals contained on the personal growth plan will be developed by the evaluator in consultation with the administrator and will directly link to the Administrator Performance Standards. In addition to goals, the plan will specify administrator actions and support to be provided by the evaluator or other identified staff.

C. **Evidence Collection**

Throughout the evaluation cycle, each administrator will maintain documentation which will include evidence of progress implementing best practice strategies to support building and individual goals and evidence of progress in achieving goals to be reviewed during the summative evaluation conference. Sample evidence for the focus goal areas can be found in Outlook, Share drive, Team Sites, Human Resources, Evaluation, LSDAA.

D. **Observations and Feedback**

The evaluator and other central office administrators will monitor the educational environment on a regular and ongoing basis through observations and feedback. The evaluator or other central office adminstartors will provide at least two (2) documentented forms of feedback annually for administrators on the professional growth track and at least four (4) documentented forms of feedback annually for administrators on the probationary or assistance track. Feedback may be provided in a variety of forms including email, direct conversation, or may be provided on **(Form C).**

E. **Midyear Progress Review**

A midyear progress review conference will be held for every first-year administrator, any administrator who received a less than effective rating on his or her most recent annual year-end performance evaluation, or for any other such administrator as may be determined by an evaluator or central administration. The evaluator will use the Mid-Year Progress Report **(Form F)** to report progress on each of the 29 standards and previously developed IDP goals if applicable. The

administrator-maintained documentation referenced above in "C" is reviewed at this time and the evaluator provides written feedback on the progress toward goals.

F. <u>Summative Performance Evaluation Conference</u>

A performance evaluation conference takes place no later than June 25 of each year. The evaluator will use the "Administrator Summative Evaluation" instrument **(Form H)** to report his/her assessment of the administrator's performance. In advance of the meeting, administrators will submit a written self-reflection **(Form G)** to be included with the final Summative Evaluation**.** During the evaluation conference, administrators will review documentation which includes evidence of progress in implementing best practice strategies and evidence of progress in achieving goal areas.

An evaluation is defined as the final, written summary of the evaluator's judgments regarding the effectiveness of an administrator's job performance. Effectiveness shall be measured by the performance evaluation system under 380.1249 of the Revised School Code. Beginning in the 2019-2020 school year, the final summative evaluation score shall consist of 40% of the overall calculated student growth goal for the building. Student Growth will be calculated for building administrators as described in **Appendix A**.

A final effectiveness rating and labels on the summative evaluation will be determined by calculating a weighted rating based on 40% student growth (Domain 1) and 60% of an overall framework rating (Domains 2-5).

Overall framework ratings will be determined as follows:

Ineffective: An ineffective rating in any of the 4 domain areas will result in an overall framework rating of ineffective.
Minimally Effective: An overall minimally effective rating will result if two or more domain areas are rated minimally effective and no areas are rated ineffective.
Effective: An overall effective rating will result if at least 3 domain areas are rated effective/highly effective, and no areas are rated ineffective.
Highly Effective: An overall highly effective rating will result if all domain areas receive a highly effective rating.

The following calculation will determine the final summative rating:

Growth (Domain 1) 40%	Framework Rating (Domain 2-5) 60%			
Rating Level	Ineffective (1)	Minimally Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)
1	1.0	1.6	2.2	2.8
2	1.4	2.0	2.6	3.2
3	1.8	2.4	3.0	3.6
4	2.2	2.8	3.4	4.0

Based on the total weighted rating, each administrator is given a final rating of Highly Effective (HE), Effective (E), Minimally Effective (ME), or Ineffective (I) using the following scale.

Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
1.0-1.9	2.0-2.5	2.6-3.5	3.6-4.0

APPENDIX A

Calculating Student Growth Scores for Building Administrators

The calculated student growth score is 40% of the overall Summative Evaluation rating. The student Growth Calculation is determined from a combination of two growth assessment scores with one-half of the overall calculated score coming from a state assessment. The chart below identifies the specific assessments used for calculating student growth for each level.

Assessments Used to Calculate Student Growth for Administrators

	20% State Assessment		20% Other Student Growth Measure	
K – 5 & 6 - 7 Grade	Spring 2016 to Spring 2019 MSTEP building *(SGP) score based on students assigned to building in reading and math		Fall 2019 to Spring 2020 NWEA results in Reading and math for all students assigned to the building.	
8-9 Grade	10%	Spring 2016 to Spring 2019 MSTEP building *(SGP) score based on all students assigned to building in reading and math	10%	Fall 2019 to Spring 2020 NWEA results in Reading and math for all students assigned to the building.
	10%	2018 Spring to 2019 Spring PSAT/SAT ELA and Math scores for all students assigned to building	10%	2019-2020 Pre to Post Common Assessment results in all content areas for all students assigned to the building
10-12 Grade	2018 Spring to 2019 Spring PSAT/SAT ELA and Math scores for all students assigned to building		2019-2020 Pre to Post Common Assessment results in all content areas for all students assigned to the building	
District Level Assignment	Most recent 3-year District *(SGP) score based on a weighted average of MSTEP and PSAT/SAT for all students assigned to the district in reading and math		Average the most recent calculated "Other Student Growth Measure" score from all buildings in the district.	

Calculating Growth Scores for State Assessments
In grades and subjects in which state assessments are administered, one-half of the final student growth calculation must be measured using state assessment results.

A. Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

SGP's will be used to determine growth calculations for State assessment results when available. SGP's describe a student's growth compared to other students with similar test score histories (their academic peers). In calculating SGP's, students are grouped with academic peers throughout the state who had comparable score patterns on past tests. Students in each academic peer group are then ordered based on their score on the current year test. SGP's for all students assigned to the building will utilize current and prior year data weighted according to the chart below to generate a state assessment growth score:

School Year	Weighting of Overall Score
Most Recent Year	50%
Year Pervious to Most Recent	30%
Two Years Previous to Most Recent	20%

Once the SGP is calculated for each of the years assessed, a growth rating score for the State assessment portion of the overall growth score will be determined as follows:

State Assessment Student Growth Score	Description of Rating	Average SGP Required for Rating
4 Highly Effective	Average SGP Required for State Assessment Growth Rating of Exceeds	60 +
3 Effective	Average SGP Required for State Assessment Growth Rating of Met	40 – 59
2 Minimally Effective	Average SGP Required for State Assessment Growth Rating of Nearly Met	20 - 39
1 Ineffective	Average SGP Required for State Assessment Growth Rating of Not Met	19 or less

When there are not 3 years' worth of data available, most recent year will be weighted 65% and prior year will be weighted 35%. When only one-year worth of data is available, it will 100% of the State Assessment score.

When no state assessment data is available for an administrator, common assessment results as calculated below will be used to determine the State Assessment portion of the overall growth score. When common assessments are the ONLY student defined student growth measure available, an average of all unit assessment scores will be used for the "other assessment growth score" and measured in the same manner as common assessment proficiency scores defined below.

B.   NWEA & PSAT/SAT Results

For grade levels where SGPs cannot be determined from MSTEP results, student growth for the state assessment portion of the overall growth score will be calculated using NWEA or PSAT/SAT results as follows.

For most grade levels, baseline assessment data (Fall or prior spring) is used to determine a projected growth score for each individual student in the building in the content areas of ELA and Math. Summative assessments (given in the spring) will be given to compare how the individual student performed compared to their projected growth.

Early 5 – A projected growth score is not calculated for Early 5 students and therefore, the following RIT growth from fall to spring NWEA assessments will be used in calculating teacher growth:

NO Growth	0
1-10	1
11-20	2
21+	3

Grades 9-12 – A projected growth score is not calculated for PSAT and therefore the following Projected Growth Vertical Scale for PSAT scores will be used is as follows:

9th Grade	PSAT to PSAT	120-720
10th Grade	PSAT to PSAT	160-760
11th Grade	PSAT to SAT	200-800

Values are assigned for each student in ELA and math as follows:

- 0 – Student did not improve or regressed
- 1 – Student improved, but did not meet the projected growth goal
- 2 – Student met projected growth goal
- 3 – Drastic Growth, student exceed growth goal

The state assessment growth score is calculated by averaging all of the individual student values (0, 1, 2, 3) for both math and ELA for students assigned to a building.

An overall average score is determined and rated as follows:

State Assessment Student Growth Score	Calculated Average of all Values assigned
4 Highly Effective	2.5 +
3 Effective	1.50 – 2.49
2 Minimally Effective	1.00 – 1.49
1 Ineffective	0.0 - 0.99

Calculating Growth Scores for Other Student Growth Measure
The remaining 20% of the overall growth calculation will be determined through another identified assessment as listed below.

A.   NWEA Results
Baseline assessment data (given in the fall) is used to determine a projected growth score for each individual student in the building in the identified content areas. Summative assessments (given in the spring) will be given to compare how the individual student performed compared to their projected growth. For all administrators, NWEA scores from ELA and math assessments will be used to determine the score. Values are assigned for each student in ELA or math as follows:

- 0 – Student did not improve or regressed
- 1 – Student improved, but did not meet the projected growth goal
- 2 – Student met projected growth goal
- 3 – Drastic Growth, student exceed growth goal

The other identified assessment growth score is calculated by averaging all of the individual student values (0, 1, 2, 3) for all students assigned to a building.

An overall average score is determined and rated as follows:

Other Student Growth Measure	Calculated Average of all Values assigned
4 Highly Effective	2.5 +
3 Effective	1.50 – 2.49
2 Minimally Effective	1.00 – 1.49
1 Ineffective	0.0 - 0.99

B.   Common Assessments
To determine progress towards the other identified assessment results for administrators using common assessments, district-approved pre and post common assessment will be used. These assessments are living documents that continue to be revised for appropriate alignment with Common Core Standards and the essential learnings developed for the identified content areas. Student Growth is measured using Common Assessments in one of two ways.

a. **Progress in Meeting Proficiency Targets** – Effectiveness in the area of student growth is based on the total percentage of students who achieve proficiency using the district common assessment.

Proficiency on common assessments is defined as follows:

K-3 Writing	*An average of 28 points or higher as measured on both informational and narrative writing prompts
K-5 Specials	80% or higher
Grades 6 -12	78% or higher

*In limited cases, Appendix F may be used to adjust the proficiency target for specified students.

The following table will be used to calculate effectiveness.

1	2	3	4
Less than 70% of students proficient	70 – 79% of students proficient	80-89% of students proficient	90-100% students proficient

b. **Safe Harbor** - In the event that an administrator does not reach a rating of "4" based on student proficiency as referenced above, she/he applies a Safe Harbor formula.
Safe Harbor is based on the overall increase in the average of student scores from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment. The following table indicates the effectiveness ratings assigned to the increase in the average of student growth scores:

1	2	3	4
Less than 20% growth	20% to 29% growth	30% to 78% Growth	79% or more growth

Final Student Growth Rating Calculation

A final student growth rating determination is based on consideration of both the state assessment growth results and the other student growth measure. Scores are determined for each assessment and combined to determine the final student growth score based on the chart below.

		State Assessment Growth Determination			
		1 Ineffective	**2** Minimally Eff.	**3** Effective	**4** Highly Eff.
Other Student Growth Measure Determination	**1** Ineffective	1 *Ineffective*	2 *Minimally Effective*	2 *Minimally Effective*	3 *Effective*
	2 Minimally Eff.	2 *Minimally Effective*	2 *Minimally Effective*	3 *Effective*	3 *Effective*
	3 Effective	2 *Minimally Effective*	3 *Effective*	3 *Effective*	4 *Highly Effective*
	4 Highly Eff.	3 *Effective*	3 *Effective*	4 *Highly Effective*	4 *Highly Effective*

APPENDIX B

Directions for Accessing Online Evaluation Tool
Frontline Professional Growth

The following forms used for the educator evaluation process are found in the online tool used for Professional Educator Evaluations, *Frontline Professional Growth:*

FORM	TITLE
A	Goal Planning and Authorization
B	Self-Evaluation
C	Administrator Feedback Form
F	Mid-Year Progress Report
G	Summative Evaluation Self-Reflection
H	Building Admin Summative Evaluation

Educators can access their account by following the directions below.

1. Access the system:
   - At the website: **www.mylearningplan.com,** or
   - From the District webpage under the staff access tab.

2. Once you are at the My Learning Plan website, access your account using the following information:

   Username: **your own email address**
   Password: **changeme**

Additional online resources including a training webinar can be found on the Staff Access page of the LCS District website.

APPENDIX C

Annual Building Administrator Evaluation Timeline

Date	Activity
No Later than Oct 30	Complete and submit Goal Planning and Authorization (Form A)
September – October	Initial Evaluation meetings ○ Building Leaders complete and submit self-evaluation (Form B) prior to meeting ○ Review and discuss goal planning worksheets (Form A)
Sept – Dec	Building admin collect evidence on progress in goal areas Observation feedback provided
Jan	Mid-Year Progress Report and Conference *as needed*
Jan – April	Building admin collect evidence on progress in goal areas Observation feedback provided
No later than May 1	Administer and submit stakeholder (staff, student, parent) perception survey results to the Dept of Instruction
No later than the end of the first week of June	Building admin submit written self-reflection (Form G)
June	Year-End Evaluation Conference and Summative Evaluation Documents finalized and sent to HR by June 27