



2016-2017

Administrative Evaluation System



Rule 6A-5.030
Form AEST-
Effective Date: July 1, 2016

Lafayette County School District
Robert Edwards, Superintendent
2016-2017

Table of Contents

1. Performance of Students
2. Instructional Leadership
3. Other Indicators of Performance
4. Summative Evaluation Score
5. Additional Requirements
6. District Evaluation Procedures
7. District Self-Monitoring
8. Appendix A – Checklist for Approval

1. Performance of Students

Student Growth will count as 40% of an administrator's final summative evaluation score. The intent here is for reading and/or math student academic performance to be measured by statewide standardized assessment VAM results AND the other subject areas the administrator is responsible for to be assessed by a local assessment using a proficiency score. An administrator's student growth score will only come from the students the administrator is responsible for. For all administrators, the student performance data will include at least three years when possible, including the current year and the two years immediately preceding the current year, when available. If less than the three most recent years of data are available, the years for which data are available will be used. The performance of students' score will be determined by the school wide value added measure score as determined and issued by the Florida Department of Education.

Calculation of Student Performance Score:

The School wide student performance score will be multiplied by 4 (40%) and entered on the Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators, see attached.

2. Instructional Leadership

Instructional Leadership will count as 40% of an administrator's final evaluation score. The Instructional Leadership Score is obtained from observation and data documented on the Administrator Evaluation Proficiency Form. (see attachment) The proficiency areas with indicators are listed below and are based on the Florida state model:

Domain 1: The focus is on leadership practices that impact prioritization and results for student achievement on priority learning goals - knowing what's important, understanding what's needed, and taking actions that get results. This domain contributes 20%.

Proficiency Area 1 - Student Learning Results: Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's student learning goals and direct energy, influence, and resources toward data analysis for instructional improvement, development and implementation of quality standards-based curricula.

Indicator 1.1 – Academic Standards: The leader demonstrates understanding of student requirements and academic standards (Common Core and NGSSS).

Indicator 1.2 – Performance Data: The leader demonstrates the use of student and adult performance data to make instructional leadership decisions.

Indicator 1.3 – Planning and Goal Setting: The leader demonstrates planning and goal setting to improve student achievement.

Indicator 1.4 - Student Achievement Results: The leader demonstrates evidence of student improvement through student achievement results.

Proficiency Area 2 - Student Learning as a Priority: Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through effective leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success.

Indicator 2.1 - Learning Organization: The leader enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning, and engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.

Indicator 2.2 - School Climate: The leader maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning.

Indicator 2.3 - High Expectations: The leader generates high expectations for learning growth by all students.

Indicator 2.4 - Student Performance Focus: The leader demonstrates understanding of present levels of student performance based on routine assessment processes that reflect the current reality of student proficiency on academic standards.

Domain 2: The focus is on instructional leadership – what the leader does and enables others to do that supports teaching and learning. This domain contributes 40%.

Proficiency Area 3 - Instructional Plan Implementation: Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs, and assessments.

Indicator 3.1 – FEAPs: The leader aligns the school’s instructional programs and practices with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) (Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C.), and models use of Florida’s common language of instruction to guide faculty and staff’s implementation of the foundational principles and practices.

Indicator 3.2 - Standards-based Instruction: The leader delivers an instructional program that implements the state’s adopted academic standards (Common Core and NGSSS) in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students by aligning academic standards, effective instruction and leadership, and student performance practices with system objectives improvement planning, faculty proficiency needs, and appropriate instructional goals, and communicating to faculty the cause and effect relationship between effective instruction on academic standards and student performance.

Indicator 3.3 - Learning Goals Alignments: The leader implements recurring monitoring and feedback processes to insure that priority learning goals established for students are based on the state’s adopted student academic standards as defined in state course descriptions, presented in student accessible forms, and accompanied by scales or rubrics to guide tracking progress toward student mastery.

Indicator 3.4 - Curriculum Alignments: The leader implements systemic processes to insure alignment of curriculum resources with state standards for the courses taught.

Indicator 3.5 - Quality Assessments: The leader ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.

Indicator 3.6 - Faculty Effectiveness: The leader monitors the effectiveness of classroom teachers and uses contemporary research and the district’s instructional evaluation system criteria and procedures to improve student achievement and faculty proficiency on the FEAPs

Proficiency Area 4 - Faculty Development: Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff; focus on evidence, research, and classroom realities faced by teachers; link professional practice with student achievement

to demonstrate the cause and effect relationship; facilitate effective professional development; monitor implementation of critical initiatives; and secure and provide timely feedback to teachers so that feedback can be used to increase teacher professional practice.

Indicator 4.1 - Recruitment and Retention: The leader employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served.

Indicator 4.2 - Feedback Practices: The leader monitors, evaluates proficiency, and secures and provides timely and actionable feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction on priority instructional goals, and the cause and effect relationships between professional practice and student achievement on those goals.

Indicator 4.3 - High Effect Size Strategies: Instructional personnel receive recurring feedback on their proficiency on high effect size instructional strategies.

Indicator 4.4 -Instructional Initiatives: District-supported state initiatives focused on student growth are supported by the leader with specific and observable actions, including monitoring of implementation and measurement of progress toward initiative goals and professional learning to improve faculty capacity to implement the initiatives.

Indicator 4.5 - Facilitating and Leading Professional Learning: The leader manages the organization, operations, and facilities to provide the faculty with quality resources and time for professional learning and promotes, participates in, and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative learning on priority professional goals throughout the school year.

Indicator 4.6 - Faculty Development Alignments: The leader implements professional learning processes that enable faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction by generating a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide objectives and the school improvement plan; identifying faculty instructional proficiency needs (including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement); aligning faculty development practices with system objectives, improvement planning, faculty proficiency needs, and appropriate instructional goals; and using instructional technology as a learning tool for students and faculty.

Indicator 4.7 - Actual Improvement: The leader improves the percentage of effective and highly effective teachers on the faculty.

Proficiency Area 5 - Learning Environment: Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.

Indicator 5.1 – Student-Centered: The leader maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning, and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy by providing recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment and aligning learning environment practices with system objectives, improvement planning, faculty proficiency needs, and appropriate instructional goals.

Indicator 5.2 – Success-Oriented: The leader initiates and supports continuous improvement processes and a multi-tiered system of supports focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being.

Indicator 5.3 - Diversity: To align diversity practices with system objectives, improvement planning, faculty proficiency needs, and appropriate instructional goals, the leader recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and

practices that motivate all students and improve student learning, and promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students. Indicator 5.4 - Achievement Gaps: The leader engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps associated with student subgroups within the school.

Domain 3: The focus is on school operations and leadership practices that integrate operations into an effective system of education. This domain contributes 20%.

Proficiency Area 6 - Decision-Making: Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data; manage the decision-making process, but not all decisions, using the process to empower others and distribute leadership when appropriate; establish personal deadlines for themselves and the entire organization; and use a transparent process for making decisions and articulating who makes which decisions.

Indicator 6.1- Prioritization Practices: The leader gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency, gathering and analyzing facts and data, and assessing alignment of decisions with school vision, mission, and improvement priorities.

Indicator 6.2 – Problem-Solving: The leader uses critical thinking and problem-solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions.

Indicator 6.3 - Quality Control: The leader maintains recurring processes for evaluating decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome(s); implements follow-up actions revealed as appropriate by feedback and monitoring; and revises decisions or implements actions as needed.

Indicator 6.4 - Distributive Leadership: The leader empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate.

Indicator 6.5 - Technology Integration: The leader employs effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school. The leader processes changes and captures opportunities available through social networking tools, accesses and processes information through a variety of online resources, incorporates data-driven decision making with effective technology integration to analyze school results, and develops strategies for coaching staff as they integrate technology into teaching, learning, and assessment processes.

Proficiency Area 7 - Leadership Development: Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization, modeling trust, competency, and integrity in ways that positively impact and inspire growth in other potential leaders.

Indicator 7.1 - Leadership Team: The leader identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders, promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning, and aligns leadership development practices with system objectives, improvement planning, leadership proficiency needs, and appropriate instructional goals.

Indicator 7.2 – Delegation: The leader establishes delegated areas of responsibility for subordinate leaders and manages delegation and trust processes that enable such leaders to initiate projects or tasks, plan, implement, monitor, provide quality control, and bring projects and tasks to closure.

Indicator 7.3 - Succession Planning: The leader plans for and implements succession management in key positions.

Indicator 7.4 - Relationships: The leader develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education, and business leaders.

Proficiency Area 8 - School Management: Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment; effectively manage and delegate tasks and consistently demonstrate fiscal efficiency; and understand the benefits of going deeper with fewer initiatives as opposed to superficial coverage of everything.

Indicator 8.1 - Organizational Skills: The leader organizes time, tasks, and projects effectively with clear objectives, coherent plans, and establishes appropriate deadlines for self, faculty, and staff.

Indicator 8.2 - Strategic Instructional Resourcing: The leader maximizes the impact of school personnel, fiscal and facility resources to provide recurring systemic support for instructional priorities and a supportive learning environment.

Indicator 8.3 – Collegial Learning Resources: The leader manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to provide recurring systemic support for collegial learning processes focused on school improvement and faculty development.

Proficiency Area 9 - Communication: Effective school leaders use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by practicing two-way communications, seeking to listen and learn from and building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community; managing a process of regular communications to staff and community keeping all stakeholders engaged in the work of the school; recognizing individuals for good work; and maintaining high visibility at school and in the community.

Indicator 9.1 - Constructive Conversations: The leader actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders and creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important issues.

Indicator 9.2 - Clear Goals and Expectations: The leader communicates goals and expectations clearly and concisely using Florida’s common language of instruction and appropriate written and oral skills, communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community, and ensures faculty receive timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local, state, and federal administrative requirements and decisions.

Indicator 9.3 - Accessibility: The leader maintains high visibility at school and in the community, regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school, and utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration.

Indicator 9.4 - Recognitions: The leader recognizes individuals, collegial work groups, and supporting organizations for effective performance.

Domain 4: The focus is on the leader’s professional conduct and leadership practices that represent quality leadership. This domain contributes 20%.

Proficiency Area 10 - Professional and Ethical Behaviors: Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in

education and as a community leader by staying informed on current research in education and demonstrating their understanding of the research, engage in professional development opportunities that improve personal professional practice and align with the needs of the school system, and generate a professional development focus in their school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives.

Indicator 10.1 – Resiliency: The leader demonstrates resiliency in pursuit of student learning and faculty development by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to adversity and barriers to success, acknowledging and learning from errors, constructively managing disagreement and dissent with leadership, and bringing together people and resources with the common belief that the organization can grow stronger when it applies knowledge, skills, and productive attitudes in the face of adversity.

Indicator 10.2 - Professional Learning: The leader engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school and system and demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.

Indicator 10.3 – Commitment: The leader demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well being of the school, families, and local community.

Indicator 10.4 - Professional Conduct: The leader adheres to the Code of Ethics of the Education Profession in Florida (Rule 6B-1.001, F.A.C.) and to the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession (Rule 6B-1.006, F.A.C.).

Calculation of the Instructional Leadership Score:

The Instructional Leadership Score is obtained from observation and data documented on the Administrator Evaluation Proficiency Form. (see attachment) Observed indicators in each domain are rated and checked on the Administrator Evaluation Proficiency Form. The total for each domain is then calculated using the four step process in Section 4 Summative Evaluation Score to arrive at the FSLA rating score. The FSLA rating score/ Instructional Leadership score is then multiplied by 4 (40%) and documented on the Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators.

3. Other Indicators of Performance

Other indicators of performance will be in the form of the Deliberate Practice score. This will contribute 20% of evaluation. The purpose of Lafayette School District’s Instructional Evaluation System is to work in perfect concert with an overall system of continuous improvement flowing up from growth in teacher quality to growth in school and district leadership quality to overall improvement as measured by common metrics reflective of student academic performance. Simply stated, district and school improvement plans use data to establish learning goal outcomes for students. These same data are used to measure administrator and teacher effectiveness and inform decisions about classroom practice, staffing, and professional development needs. Instructional evaluation results will be used to identify both challenge areas and possible solutions to be addressed in school and district improvement plans.

Each administrator will complete an Individual Professional Learning Plan annually. The plan will focus on three indicator areas of improvement: District Indicator, School-wide Indicator and an Individual Indicator. Each indicator will specify a targeted area, an objective and measureable goal for the targeted area and the professional development planned focused on the targeted area. At the end of the school year, results will be documented in order to evaluate the success of the plan. Each administrator will preview their plan at the beginning of the year with the superintendent and again at the end of the year. A Deliberate Practice Score has an upper limit of 300 points. Each target is assigned an equal proportion of the total points (example, 100 points each). Three Growth Targets equals a maximum of 300 points, 100 per target.

Deliberate Practice Score and Rating chart.

Deliberate Practice Score Range	Deliberate Practice Rating
241 to 300	Highly Effective (4)
151 to 240	Effective (3)
75-150	Needs Improvement (2)
0-74	Unsatisfactory (1)

Calculation of the Deliberate Practice Score:

At the end of the school year, results will be documented in order to evaluate the success of the plan. Each administrator will preview their plan at the beginning of the year with the superintendent and again at the end of the year. A Deliberate Practice Score has an upper limit of 300 points. Each target is assigned an equal proportion of the total points (example, 100 points each). Three Growth Targets equals a maximum of 300 points, 100 per target. Once the Deliberate Practice points are determined and rated, the rating score (1, 2, 3, or 4) is multiplied by 2 (20%) and documented on the Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators. (see attachment)

4. Summative Evaluation Score

Scoring Process

Calculation of Student Performance Score:

The School wide student performance score will be multiplied by 4 (40%) and entered on the Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators, see attached.

Calculation of the Instructional Leadership Score:

The Instructional Leadership Score is obtained from observation and data documented on the Administrator Evaluation Proficiency Form. (see attachment) Observed indicators in each domain are rated and checked on the Administrator Evaluation Proficiency Form. The total for each domain is then calculated using the four step process in Section 4 Summative Evaluation Score to arrive at the FSLA rating score. The FSLA rating score/ Instructional Leadership score is then multiplied by 4 (40%) and documented on the Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators.

How to determine Instructional Leadership Score using Proficiency form attached based on the Florida School Leaders Assessment (FSLA).

Step One: Rate each Indicator. Start with judgments on the indicators. Indicators in each Proficiency Area are rated as HE, E, NI, or U based on accumulated evidence.

*The FSLA supports this indicator proficiency rating process with rubrics for distinguishing between the levels (HE, E, NI, or U) that are specific to the indicator.

*To guide the rating decision, illustrative examples of leadership actions and illustrative examples of impacts of leadership actions are provided.

*The rubrics for indicators and the illustrative examples are found in the “long forms” – the Data Collection and Feedback Protocols” posted on www.floridaschoolleaders.org (in the Learning Library, Resources Menu: Evaluation Resources – School Leaders).

Step Two: Rate each Proficiency Area. Ratings on the indicators in a Proficiency Area are combined to assign a proficiency level (HE, E, NI, or U) to a Proficiency Area: The distribution of indicator ratings within a Proficiency Area result in a Proficiency Area Rating. Since the number of indicators in a Proficiency Area varies, the following formulas are applied to assign Proficiency Area ratings. For each Proficiency Area, use the appropriate table.

Table 1 For Proficiency Areas 1,2,5,7,9 and 10 with four Indicators, each Proficiency Area is rated:

Highly Effective (HE) if: three or more indicators are HE and none are less than E.

Effective (E) if: at least three are E or higher and no more than one are NI. None are U.

Needs Improvement (NI) if: Criteria for E not met and no more than one is U.

Unsatisfactory (U) if: two or more are U.

Table 2 For proficiency Area 3 with six Indicators, each Proficiency Area is rated

Highly Effective (HE) if: four or more indicators are HE and none are less than E.

Effective (E) if: at least four are E or higher and no more than two are NI. None are U.

Needs Improvement (NI) if: Criteria for E not met and no more than two are U.

Unsatisfactory (U) if: two or more are U.

Table 3 For Proficiency Area 4 with seven Indicators, each Proficiency Area is rated:

Highly Effective (HE) if: five or more indicators are HE and none are less than E.

Effective (E) if: at least five are E or higher and no more than two are NI. None are U.

Needs Improvement (NI) if: Criteria for E not met and no more than two are U.

Unsatisfactory (U) if: two or more are U.

Table 4 For Proficiency Area 6 with five Indicators, each Proficiency Area is rated:

Highly Effective (HE) if: four or more indicators are HE and none are less than E.

Effective (E) if: at least four are E or higher and no more than one are NI. None are U.

Needs Improvement (NI) if: Criteria for E not met and no more than one is U.

Unsatisfactory (U) if: two or more are U.

Table 5 For Proficiency Area 8 with three Indicators, each Proficiency Area is rated:

Highly Effective (HE) if: two or more indicators are HE and none are less than E.

Effective (E) if: two or more are E or higher and no more than one is NI. None are U.

Needs Improvement (NI) if: Criteria for E not met and no more than one is U.

Unsatisfactory (U) if: two or more are U.

Step Three: Rate Each Domain. Domains are rated as HE, E, NI, or U based on the distribution of ratings on Proficiency Areas within the Domain.

Domain 1: Student Achievement (Two Proficiency Areas)

- Highly Effective if both Proficiency Areas rated HE
- Effective if one proficiency area rated HE and one Effective, OR both are rated Effective
- Needs Improvement if one proficiency area is rated HE or E and one is rated NI or U, OR both proficiency areas are rated NI
- Unsatisfactory if one proficiency area is rated NI and the other is rated U, OR both are rated U

Domain 2: Instructional Leadership (Three Proficiency Areas)

- Highly Effective if all three Proficiency Areas are rated **HE**, OR two proficiency areas are rated HE and one is E
- Effective if two proficiency areas are rated E and one is HE or NI, OR all three proficiency areas are rated E
- Needs Improvement if any two proficiency area is rated NI, OR one proficiency area is rated NI, one proficiency area is rated U and one proficiency area is rated E or HE
- Unsatisfactory if two or more proficiency areas are rated U

Domain 3: Organizational Leadership (Four Proficiency Areas)

- Highly Effective if all four Proficiency Areas are rated HE, OR three proficiency areas are rated HE and one is E
- Effective if two proficiency areas are rated E and two are rated HE, OR all four proficiency areas are rated E, or three proficiency rated E and one rated either NI or HE
- Needs Improvement if any two proficiency area are rated E and two are rated NI, OR any three proficiency area is rated NI, OR one proficiency

area is rated NI, one proficiency area is rated U and two proficiency area are rated E or HE

- Unsatisfactory if two or more proficiency areas are rated U

Domain 4: Professional Behaviors (One Proficiency Area)

- Highly Effective if proficiency area 10 is rated HE
- Effective if proficiency area 10 is rated Effective
- Needs Improvement if proficiency area 10 is rated NI
- Unsatisfactory if proficiency area 10 is rated U

When you have determined Domain ratings, you then combine those ratings to generate an FSLA score.

Step 4: Calculate the FSLA Score.

- In Step One, proficiency ratings for indicators were made based on an assessment of available evidence and the rating rubrics.
- In Step Two, the apportionment of Indicators ratings, using the tables provided, generated a rating for each Proficiency Area within a Domain.
- In Step Three, Domain ratings were generated. All of these steps were based on evidence on the indicators and scoring tables.

At the FSLA scoring stage the model shifts to a weighted point system. Points are assigned to Domain ratings, direct weights are employed, and scores are converted to a numerical scale. The following point model is used:

- A Domain rating of Highly Effective = 4 points
- A Domain rating of Effective = 3 points
- A Domain rating of Needs Improvement = 2 point
- A Domain rating of Unsatisfactory = 1 points

The Domain points are multiplied by the Domain’s direct weight: The rating is entered in column 2 (“Rating”), the points in column 3 (“Points”), and a weighted score calculated in column 5.

Table 6

Domain	Rating	Points	Weight	Domain Weighted Score
Domain 1: Student Achievement			.20	
Domain 2: Instructional Leadership			.40	
Domain 3: Organizational Leadership			.20	

Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior			.20	

After a Domain Weighted Score is calculated, the scores are converted to a 100 point scale. This process results in a FSLA Score range of 0 to 300 Points. The Domain scores are added up and an FSLA score determined. The FSLA Score is converted to an FSLA rating of HE, E, NI, or U based on this scale:

Table 7

FSLA Score	FSLA Proficiency Rating
240 to 300	Highly Effective
151 to 239	Effective
75 to 150	Needs Improvement
0 to 74	Unsatisfactory

How to Score Deliberate Practice

The Deliberate Practice Score will be documented on the Individual Professional Learning Plan. The Deliberate Practice score is 20% of the Leadership Practice Score. The Deliberate Practice metric will have 3 specific growth targets (District, Schoolwide & Individual). The targets will have equal weight and the leader’s growth on each will be assessed as HE, E, NI, or U.

Deliberate Practice Rating Rubrics:

- Highly Effective (4)– All three targets met, documented results complete.
- Effective (2) – Two out of three targets met, documented results complete.
- Needs Improvement – One out of three targets met, partial documentation.
- Unsatisfactory (1)– Targets not met, incomplete documentation.

How to Calculate an Annual Performance Level

1. Multiply Student Performance score X 4 (40%) and document on Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators.
2. Multiply Instructional Leadership score X 4 (40%) and document on Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators.
3. Multiply Deliberate Practice Score X 2 (20%) and document on Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators.

4. Add all three total scores (Student Performance, Instructional Leadership and Deliberate Practice), divide by 10. Determine rating rank based on score.

Performance Score ranges	Performance Level Rating
3.25-4.0	Highly Effective
2.25-3.24	Effective
1-.25-2.24	Needs Improvement
0-1.24	Unsatisfactory

5. Enter rating on Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators.

SEE Summative Evaluation Form for Administrators, Attachment #3.

5. Additional Requirements

LCSD implements the Florida School Leader Assessment processes. The seven steps employed are described below:

Step 1: Orientation: The orientation step can occur at the start of a new work year, at the start of a new school year, or at the start of assignment (or new assignment) as a principal. The depth and detail of orientation may vary based on prior training and whether changes in evaluation model have occurred, but an annual orientation or re-fresher orientation should occur. The orientation step should include:

- District provided orientation and training on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), Student Success Act, applicable State Board of Education rules, Race To The Top (RTTT) requirements, and district specific expectations that are subject to the evaluation system.
- All leaders and evaluators should have access to the content and processes that are subject to the evaluation system. All leaders and evaluators should have access to the same information and expectations. This may be provided by the leader’s review of district evaluation documents, online modules, mentor sessions, or face-to-face training where awareness of district processes and expectations are identified.
- At the orientation step, each school leader is expected to engage in personal reflection on the connection between his/her practice and the FPLS and the indicators in the district evaluation system. This is a “what do I know and what do I need to know” self-check aligned with the FPLS and the district evaluation system indicators.

Step 2: Pre-evaluation Planning: After orientation processes, the leader and evaluator prepare for a formal conference to address evaluation processes and expectations. Two things occur:

- Leader’s self-assessment from the orientation step moves to more specific identification of improvement priorities. These may be student achievement priorities or leadership practice priorities. The leader gathers any data or evidence that supports an issue as an

improvement priority. This may include School Improvement Plan (SIP), student achievement data, prior faculty evaluations, and evidence of systemic processes that need work.

- The evaluator articulates a perspective on strengths and growth needs for the leader and for student achievement issues at the school.

Step 3: Initial Meeting between evaluatee and evaluator: A meeting on “expectations” held between leader and supervisor to address the following:

- Evaluation processes are reviewed and questions answered.
- Perceptions (of both) from Pre-evaluation Planning are shared.
- Domain, Proficiency Areas, Indicators from evaluation system that will be focus issues are identified and discussed.
- Student growth measures that are of concern are discussed.
- Relationship of evaluation indicators to the SIP and district-supported initiatives are discussed.
- Such a meeting is typically face-to-face but may also be via tele-conference or phone. (Meeting issues can be clarified via texts and emails as appropriate.)
- Proposed targets for Deliberate Practice (additional metric) are discussed and determined, or a timeframe for selection of Deliberate Practice targets are set. While a separate meeting or exchange of information may be implemented to complete the Deliberate Practice targets, they should be discussed at the Step 3 Conference given their importance to the leader’s growth and the summative evaluation.

Step 4: Monitoring, Data Collection, and Application to Practice: Evidence is gathered that provides insights on the leader’s proficiency on the issues in the evaluation system by those with input into the leader’s evaluation.

- The leader shares with supervisor evidence on practice on which the leader seeks feedback or wants the evaluator to be informed.
- The evaluator accumulates data and evidence on leader’s actions or impact of leader’s actions during the routine conduct of work. Such data and evidence may come from site visits, be provided by the leader, from formal or informal observations, or from evidence, artifacts or input provided by others. The accumulated information is analyzed in the context of the evaluation system indicators.
- As evidence and observations are obtained that generate specific and actionable feedback, it is provided to the leader in a timely manner. Feedback may be provided face-to-face, via FSLA forms, via email or telephone, or via memoranda.
- Collegial groups, mentors, communities of practice (CoPs), professional learning communities (PLCs), and lesson study groups in which the leader participates may provide specific and actionable feedback for proficiency improvement.
- These monitoring actions occur before and continue after the mid-year Progress Check (step 5).

Step 5: Mid-year Progress Review between evaluatee and evaluator: At a mid-year point, a progress review is conducted.

- Actions and impacts of actions taken on priorities identified in Step 3 Initial Meeting are reviewed.

- Any indicators which the evaluator has identified for a specific status update are reviewed. (The leader is given notice of these indicators prior to the Progress Check, as the feedback expected is more specific than that for the general indicator overview.)
- The leader is prepared to provide a general overview of actions/processes that apply to all of the domains and proficiency areas and may include any of the indicators in the district system. Any indicator that the evaluator or the leader wishes to address should be included.
- Strengths and progress are recognized.
- Priority growth needs are reviewed.
- Where there is no evidence related to an indicator and no interim judgment of proficiency can be provided, a plan of action must be made:
 - If the evaluator decides that the absence of evidence indicates unsatisfactory proficiency because actions or impacts of action should be evident if leader was proficient, the leader is provided notice that the indicator(s) will be addressed in a follow-up meeting.
 - The absence of evidence is explained by lack of opportunity for the evaluator to note anything relevant, and leader is asked to provide follow-up data on the indicator prior to the year-end conference.
 - The lack of evidence on one indicator is balanced by substantial evidence on other indicators in the same proficiency area. No follow-up is required until evidence supporting a Needs Improvement (NI) or Unsatisfactory (U) rating emerges.
- Any actions or inactions which might result in an unsatisfactory rating on a domain or proficiency area if not improved are communicated.
- Any indicators for which there is insufficient evidence to rate proficiency at this stage, but which will be a priority for feedback in remainder of the year, are noted.
- *FSLA Feedback and Protocol Form* (or district equivalent) is used to provide feedback on all indicators for which there is sufficient evidence to rate proficiency. Notes or memorandums may be attached to the forms as appropriate to reflect what is communicated in the Progress Check.

Step 6: Prepare a consolidated performance assessment: The summative evaluation form is prepared by the evaluator and a performance rating assigned.

- Consider including relevant and appropriate evidence by any party entitled to provide input into the leader's evaluation.
- Review evidence on leader's proficiency on indicators.
- Use accumulated evidence and rating on indicators to rate each proficiency area.
- Consolidate the ratings on proficiency areas into domain ratings.
- Consolidate Domain ratings, using FSLA weights, to calculate a FSLA score.

Step 7: Year-end Meeting between evaluatee and evaluator: The year-end meeting addresses the FSLA score, the Deliberate Practice Score and Student Growth Measures.

- The FSLA score is explained.
- The leader's growth on the Deliberate Practice targets is reviewed and a Deliberate Practice Score assigned.
- The FSLA Score and Deliberate Practice Score are combined (as per weighting formula) to generate a Leadership Practice Score.

- If the Student Growth Measurement (SGM) score is known, inform the leader how the Leadership Practice Score and SGM Score combine to a summative performance level of Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory.
- If SGM score is not known, inform leader of possible performance levels based on known Leadership Practice Score and various SGM outcomes.
- If recognitions or employment consequences are possible based on performance level, inform leader of district process moving forward.
- Review priority growth issues that should be considered at next year's step 2 and step 3 processes.

Timely Feedback: The superintendent meets with individual administrators formally once a semester to go over proficiency ratings. Immediate feedback is given via phone call or email if necessary and on a case by case basis. The Individual Professional Learning Plan is completed for each year in a face to face meeting between the evaluator and the personnel being evaluated. The Individual Professional Learning Plan is reviewed at the end of the year or beginning of the next year (depending on data availability) in a face to face meeting between the evaluator and the personnel being evaluated.

Training Programs:

Evaluation System Training:

- Evaluatees have been trained formally in a district wide book study on Marzano's The Art and Science of Teaching. New evaluatees to the district have an informal one-on-one training on Marzano instructional practice techniques and best practices.
- At the beginning of every school year, a review of the instructional focus for the school and district based on student performance data is held with evaluatees and evaluators.
- Evaluators are trained on the iObservation system formally through the Marzano Institute. Every Evaluator attends a Marzano training at least every other year, sometimes yearly.
- All Evaluators have had Inter-reliability training.
- All Evaluatees have a log in and are trained in how to use the iObservation data base to view observations, schedule conferences and view instructional videos.

Training for less than effective Teachers:

- In the event an evaluatee scores less than effective, the district will require participation in specific professional learning activities for any and all areas of concern.

All district administrators and school leaders have Florida Certification in Educational Leadership and/or Principal Certification all grade levels. All school leaders go through a Principal Leadership Academy through North Florida Educational Consortium. The purpose of Lafayette School District's Instructional Evaluation System is to work in perfect concert with an overall system of continuous improvement flowing up from growth in teacher quality to school and district improvement as measured by common metrics reflective of student academic performance. Simply stated, district and school improvement plans use data to establish learning

goal outcomes for students. These same data as well as the teacher evaluation data are used to measure school leader effectiveness and inform decisions about professional development needs.

Annual Evaluations: All administrators are evaluated annually and reported to FLDOE's reporting system.

Peer Review Option: Will not be implemented at this time.

Other Input - In Lafayette County, there are two principals and two assistant principals. The Superintendent of Schools will be performing evaluations annually. The Directors of Teaching & Learning Services, Support Services and Finance will have input toward the evaluation of school leaders during formal and informal meetings.

Parents and instructional personnel will have the opportunity to complete a survey either written or electronic to provide input into the administrator's performance.

6. District Evaluation Procedures

Reporting Process

The following reporting processes will be employed to comply with 1012.34 reporting requirements:

*The Superintendent of School will annually report the evaluation results to the Department of Education.

*All evaluation systems approved will be posted online with 30 days of approval at <http://lafayette.schooldesk.net>.

*The Department of Education will be provided with the URL to EdQualityEvalSystems at fldoe.org to be included on the Department's website.

*The District's annual report on the status of the evaluation system implementation shall address the monitoring results. We will use the LIIS system data elements as data to include in the annual report.

*The district school superintendent shall annually notify the department of any school administrators who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

*The district school superintendent shall notify the department of any school administrators who are given written notice by the district of intent to terminate or not renew their employment.

Special Procedures

*The evaluator may amend an evaluation based upon assessment data from the current school year if the data becomes available within 90 days after the close of the school year.

7. District Self-Monitoring

Evaluators' understanding of the proper use of evaluation criteria and procedures, including evaluator accuracy and inter-rater reliability; [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)1., F.A.C.]

The only evaluator of an administrator in Lafayette county will be the superintendent of schools. The superintendent will be trained each summer regarding the rubrics, indicators and evidence collected to improve the quality of future actions and depth of knowledge of the performance expectations.

Evaluators provide necessary and timely feedback to employees being evaluated; [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)2., F.A.C.]

Once an observation is completed by the superintendent, a meeting is set up with the administrator to review the observation data together. This meeting occurs within a week of the observation.

Evaluators follow district policies and procedures in the implementation of evaluation system(s); [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)3., F.A.C.]

District policies and procedures are reviewed annually. The Director of Teaching and Learning Services reviews all policies and procedures with the superintendent and administrative staff at a district staff meeting to ensure policy and procedures are being implemented properly.

Use of evaluation data to identify individual professional development; and [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)4., F.A.C.]

Results from the evaluation data will be analyzed annually in order to provide focus for individual and school level professional development. A report of the data analysis will be generated and presented to the School Board each year. Within the report will be the identification of specific improvement needs of the workforce and the activities planned to impact the evaluation results. It is the intent that subsequent annual reports will reflect improvements made in practice and student achievement that can be causally linked to specific professional development activity as provided by the analysis of student data.

Use of evaluation data to inform school and district improvement plans [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)5., F.A.C.].

Results from the evaluation data will be analyzed annually in order to provide focus for individual, school and district improvement goals. A report of the data analysis will be generated and presented to the School Board each year.

District training for those who function as evaluators and those who are being evaluated will include the following:

1. The research framework(s) on which the evaluation is based. Evaluatees can have a deeper understanding of how to implement strategies correctly and in appropriate circumstances.

Evaluators can provide better feedback when they understand the research framework.

2. Inter-rater reliability. Evaluators should be able to provide similar feedback and ratings so that there is consistent use of the evaluation system across the district. Training will be provided to both on the “Look Fors”, the rubrics and the rater reliability checks.

3. Specific, actionable and timely feedback processes. There will be training on how and when to provide feedback to evaluatees.

4. Conference protocols and use of forms. Evaluators and evaluatees will be provided with the forms, the frequency of meetings, the conference procedures and other required documentation.

5. Processes and procedures for implementing the evaluation system. Evaluators and evaluatees will be informed of the sources of evidence, scoring rules and use of forms.

6. Student growth measures. This training will be based on the district’s requirements regarding use of student growth measures in the district’s evaluation system.

7. Sources of information. Evaluators and evaluatees will be trained on the resources, materials and documents regarding the evaluation process.

Initial training will begin in July of every school year and will continue as needed throughout the year. This systemic process is to inform workforce and evaluators, using Florida’s common language of instruction, on what they are to know and be able to do is based on the elements in the evaluation system. After the initial training, the capacities of workforce and evaluators will continuously improve to understand and implement the performance expectations in the evaluation system indicators.

Continuous Improvement and Professional Development

The purpose of Lafayette School District's Instructional Evaluation System is to work in perfect concert with an overall system of continuous improvement flowing up from growth in teacher quality to school and district improvement as measured by common metrics reflective of student academic performance. Simply stated, district and school improvement plans use data to establish learning goal outcomes for students. These same data as well as the teacher evaluation data are used to measure administrator, school leader and teacher effectiveness and inform decisions about professional development needs.

Results from the evaluation data will be analyzed annually in order to provide focus for individual, school and district improvement goals and professional development. A report of the data analysis will be generated and presented to the School Board each year. Within the report will be the identification of specific improvement needs of the workforce and the activities planned to impact the evaluation results. It is the intent that subsequent annual reports will reflect improvements made in practice and student achievement that can be causally linked to specific professional development activity as provided by the analysis of student data. Specific attention to data related to performance indicators related to 1) monitoring of teaching practice on high effect size strategies; 2) timely and actionable feedback on practices observed; and 3) monitoring of the implementation of individual improvement plans will be reported.

Employees will be provided with feedback throughout the year at formal and informal meetings between the Superintendent and Principals. Principals will be trained each summer regarding the rubrics, indicators and evidence collected to improve the quality of future actions and depth of knowledge of the performance expectations.

Appendix A – Checklist for Approval

Performance of Students

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

For all school administrators:

- The percentage of the evaluation that is based on the performance of students criterion.
- An explanation of the scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined.
- At least one-third of the evaluation is based on performance of students.

For all school administrators confirmed the inclusion of student performance:

- Data for at least three years, including the current year and the two years immediately preceding the current year, when available.
- If less than the three most recent years of data are available, those years for which data are available must be used.
- If more than three years of student performance data are used, specified the years that will be used.

For all school administrators:

- The district-determined student performance measure(s) used for personnel evaluations.

Instructional Leadership

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

For all school administrators:

- The percentage of the evaluation system that is based on the instructional leadership criterion.
- At least one-third of the evaluation is based on instructional leadership.
- An explanation of the scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined.
- The district evaluation framework for school administrators is based on contemporary research in effective educational practices.

For all school administrators:

- A crosswalk from the district's evaluation framework to the Principal Leadership Standards demonstrating that the district's evaluation contains indicators based upon each of the Principal Leadership Standards.

For all school administrators:

- Procedures for conducting observations and collecting data and other evidence of instructional leadership.

Other Indicators of Performance

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- Described the additional performance indicators, if any.
- The percentage of the final evaluation that is based upon the additional indicators.
- The scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined.

Summative Evaluation Score

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- Summative evaluation form(s).
- Scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined.
- The performance standards used to determine the summative evaluation rating (the four performance levels: highly effective, effective, needs improvement/developing, unsatisfactory).

Additional Requirements

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- Documented that the evaluator is the individual who is responsible for supervising the employee.
- Identified additional positions or persons who provide input toward the evaluation, if any.

Description of training programs:

- Processes to ensure that all employees subject to an evaluation system are informed on evaluation criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation before the evaluation takes place.
- Processes to ensure that all individuals with evaluation responsibilities and those who provide input toward evaluation understand the proper use of the evaluation criteria and procedures.

Documented:

- Processes for providing timely feedback to the individual being evaluated.
- Description of how results from the evaluation system will be used for professional development.
- Requirement for participation in specific professional development programs by those who have been evaluated as less than effective.
- All school administrators must be evaluated at least once a year.

For school administrators:

- Inclusion of opportunities for parents to provide input into performance evaluations when the district determines such input is appropriate.
- Description of the district's criteria for inclusion of parental input.
- Description of manner of inclusion of parental input.
- Description of the district's peer assistance process, if any.

- Description of an opportunity for instructional personnel to provide input into a school administrator's evaluation, if any.

District Evaluation Procedures

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- That its evaluation procedures comply with s. 1012.34(3)(c), F.S., including:
 - That the evaluator must submit a written report of the evaluation to the district school superintendent for the purpose of reviewing the employee's contract.
 - That the evaluator must submit the written report to the employee no later than 10 days after the evaluation takes place.
 - That the evaluator must discuss the written evaluation report with the employee.
 - That the employee shall have the right to initiate a written response to the evaluation and the response shall become a permanent attachment to his or her personnel file.
- That district evaluation procedures require the district school superintendent to annually notify the Department of any school administrators who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations and to notify the Department of any school administrators who are given written notice by the district of intent to terminate or not renew their employment, as outlined in s. 1012.34, F.S.

District Self-Monitoring

The district self-monitoring includes processes to determine the following:

- Evaluators' understanding of the proper use of evaluation criteria and procedures, including evaluator accuracy and inter-rater reliability.
- Evaluators provide necessary and timely feedback to employees being evaluated.
- Evaluators follow district policies and procedures in evaluation system(s).
- The use of evaluation data to identify individual professional development.
- The use of evaluation data to inform school and district improvement plans.