

An Overview of Commercially Available Principal Evaluation Resources

INTEGRATED LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

The Integrated Leadership Development Initiative (ILDI) is a cross-agency partnership that focuses on collaboratively guiding and supporting leader development and improving conditions of leadership so that there are highly accomplished leaders in every district and school in California. ILDI members include the California Department of Education, the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association, the Association of California School Administrators, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration, the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, the California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, and the Regional Educational Laboratory West at WestEd.

This work is supported by the California Comprehensive Center, a partnership of WestEd, American Institutes for Research, and School Services of California, through funding from the U.S. Department of Education, Pr/Award Number S283B050032. The work does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education, and endorsement by the federal government should not be assumed.

Suggested Citation: Kearney, K., Lara-Brady, L., Mattson Almanzán, H., & Vince, S. (2012). *An overview of commercially available principal evaluation resources*. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Karen Kearney, MA, is the Director of the Leadership Initiative (formerly the California School Leadership Academy) at WestEd. Kearney directs all aspects of the initiative, which focuses on the roles of principals, superintendents, and teacher leaders in comprehensive school restructuring.

Laura Lara-Brady, PhD, is a Research Associate with WestEd's Comprehensive School Assistance Program. Lara-Brady specializes in research relevant to education and academic achievement.

Heather Mattson Almanzán, EdM, is a Senior Research Associate with WestEd's Comprehensive School Assistance Program, specializing in research, content development, and information dissemination on elements critical to school and district reform.

Scott Vince, MPPA, is a Research Associate with WestEd's Comprehensive School Assistance Program. Vince specializes in research relevant to school turnaround, educator evaluation, and labor-management collaboration.

Project Director: Karen Kearney, Leadership Initiative at WestEd.

Editing and Design: WestEd.

Copyright © 2012 WestEd.

This resource can be downloaded for free at <http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/effectiveprincipals/>

Permission to reproduce with the WestEd copyright notice is hereby granted.

WestEd, 730 Harrison Street, San Francisco, CA 94107-1242

An Overview of Commercially Available Principal Evaluation Resources

Contents

Introduction	1
360° Leadership Assessment	5
Comprehensive Assessment of Leadership for Learning (CALL)	8
Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System	11
Leadership Development Program (LDP)	16
McREL Principal Evaluation System	19
Multidimensional Leadership Assessment System/Leadership Performance Matrix	23
MyLearningPlan Observation & Appraisal System (OASYS)	28
Principal Leadership Competencies/Principal Evaluation Rubric.....	32
School Leadership Evaluation Model	35
Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)	38
References	43

Introduction

Findings from existing research indicate that significant resources are required to carry out high-quality principal evaluation that will support changing education leadership practices. Sanders and Kearney (2012) suggest a range of considerations for states and districts that are selecting evaluation models and resources.

At one end of the continuum ... it appears that state or local development of evaluation instruments and systems contributes to positive attitudes, fidelity of implementation, and local capacity to align resources that improve leadership practice. When evaluation is developed and conducted as part of systemic changes in schools, the costs in time and resources may be substantial but somewhat masked as they are integrated within other general district activities and budgets.

On the other end of the continuum, commercially available products are also expensive but may be a viable option for timeliness, developing and documenting evidence of technical quality, the ability to contract for training and assistance, and comparability across states and districts. Product alignment with state and

district goals is indirect, through broad conceptual models and professional standards, but may be customized with additional investment. In addition to providing known content and processes, commercial products may provide cost estimates that are more concrete than those of developmental models. (p.3)

The purpose of this overview is to assist state and district leaders in making decisions about commercially available resources that may be useful in improving their principal evaluation systems. Information in this overview can support states and districts in identifying *some* of the resources to be considered in taking appropriate next steps to evaluate school leaders, design an evaluation method, and/or buy a program or service. These resources were recommended by district practitioners using them or were noted in topic-related reports by experts in the field

as being used by districts. Therefore, this selection of resources may not be exhaustive.

In order for this overview to be useful to states and districts, the search included resources that (a) may be used as components in an evaluation system, (b) are being used currently by school districts, and (c) are readily accessible throughout the country. Information about these shelf-ready resources was collected by reviewing online, publicly available principal evaluation materials and printed materials. The online review was supplemented by follow-up email or phone communications with authors, developers, or publishers to check on missing details and/or overall accuracy of the pre-publication information. During these communications, the authors, developers, or publishers reported that the resources were intended to evaluate principal effectiveness, performance, and/or impact on student achievement. No further

research was conducted to assess the accuracy of the reported information. Resources are included with permission.

This overview includes different types of resources: principal evaluation frameworks, principal evaluation assessments, and principal evaluation supports. Principal evaluation frameworks describe fundamental structures or dimensions of information that are relevant to the tasks of evaluating principals. Principal evaluation assessments include measurements that identify, gather, and interpret information about effective principal practice. Principal evaluation supports include management systems, training, and/or services focused on improving leadership and increasing professional learning.

Resources appear in alphabetical order. Information collected on each resource is organized according to considerations that might be of interest to those charged with improving principal evaluation. Each resource summary organizes information by the following categories, as appropriate:

Summary

Provides a broad overview of the resource. These summaries may help orient readers to resources that best fit their own interest areas.

Purpose(s)

Describes the key purpose(s) for using the resource.

Structure

Design/Origin: Describes how the resource was developed and by whom.

Features: Explains the resource's characteristics, approaches, and/or strategies.

Standards: Describes the leadership and/or professional standards that frame the resource.

Connection to Student Achievement: Describes whether and how student achievement is considered as part of the resource.

Components: Explains the parts that comprise the structure of the resource.

Process/Timeline: Describes the requirements and options for scheduling and/or using the resource.

Evaluators (Facilitators): Focuses on the criteria used for selecting evaluators and/or facilitators, as well as how they are prepared/trained.

Differentiation: Describes how the resource is modified or adapted for specific categories of administrators (e.g., new principals, assistant principals, struggling principals).

Information and Measures

Sources: Describes the data sources and artifacts (e.g., growth, performance levels) that are used to determine outcomes.

Reported Information: Describes the categories and/or format(s) in which results are presented.

Ratings: Explains the performance levels described by the resource (e.g. A–F grades, rubric scores).

Validity: Describes the psychometric validity of the resource (e.g., does it measure what it intends to measure?).

Reliability: Explains whether and how the resource is psychometrically reliable (e.g., are responses consistent and stable over time?).

Additional Information

Current Users: Describes where and by whom this resource is being used at the school, district, and/or state levels.

Sample Tools, Instruments, Forms: Describes the resources that are accessible online to download or view.

Cost: Provides information about the pricing model and what it includes.

Contact Information: Provides contact information that can be used to obtain updated and detailed information

specific to the needs of individual states and districts.

The format of the summaries enables leaders to review information about available resources using comparable descriptions. The frameworks, measures, and supports that are included have varying degrees of psychometric properties. Clearly, this overview provides

initial, quick references for those who will pursue additional information for decision-making. It is *not* intended as an evaluation of the resources. Other publications present findings from reviews of principal evaluation resources (e.g., Condon & Clifford, 2010).

Information included in this document was current as of June 2012.

360° Leadership Assessment

Summary

The online 360° Leadership Assessment from Educational Impact allows school principals to rate themselves in areas critical to their success. Users also solicit input and feedback from their staff and superiors. Assessment results provide the user with a picture of her/his strengths and weaknesses, revealing areas for improvement. The assessment is tied to professional development via Educational Impact’s Online Academy.

PURPOSE(S)	<p>Provide current and aspiring school administrators with a comprehensive assessment of their strengths and weaknesses in a secure online environment.</p> <p>Provide a targeted professional development tool that reveals areas for improvement and generates prescriptive professional development plans.</p>
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.</p>
FEATURES	<p>Enables school leaders to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Receive anonymous feedback on hard-to-measure skills; » Compare priorities with supervisors and teachers; » Receive skill-building suggestions; » Find resources for additional professional development; and » See what supervisors and staff believe to be the leader’s major strengths and weaknesses.
STANDARDS	<p>Aligned to Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and a variety of state standards for school administrators.</p>
CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	<p>Competency rating results are based on student achievement and ties to higher education, standards-based instruction, and social development.</p>
COMPONENTS	<p>An online self-assessment (94 questions that focus on 47 leadership areas), supervisor and staff surveys, and a personal learning plan.</p>

PROCESS/TIMELINE	<p>Can be administered anytime during the academic year and includes the following four steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » School leader first answers the self-assessment in all leadership areas. » Supervisors and up to 10 teachers/co-workers are invited to also complete assessments of the school leader. » School leader compares self-assessment results to results submitted by his/her raters. » After results are presented, the school leader can create a personal learning plan to target “areas of need.”
EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	<p>Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.</p>
DIFFERENTIATION	<p>Can be administered to current and aspiring principals with a variety of experience levels.</p>
Information and Measures	
SOURCES	<p>Online self-assessment information on 47 leadership areas; survey feedback from supervisors and staff.</p>
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Results are presented in the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Competency ratings (see the following Ratings section); » Importance rankings; » Hidden strengths; and » Blind spots. <p>An array of reports and bar charts allows users to view results in a variety of ways.</p>
RATINGS	<p>Competency ratings are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » In-depth knowledge/very capable; » Considerable knowledge/capable; » Basic knowledge/somewhat capable; » Little knowledge/not very capable; or » No evidence of knowledge/incapable.

VALIDITY	Developed for school leaders to direct their personal development and not intended as an evaluation tool; therefore, the authors felt it was unnecessary to test the tool with a psychometric study.
RELIABILITY	Developed for school leaders to direct their personal development and not intended as an evaluation tool; therefore, the authors felt it was unnecessary to test the tool with a psychometric study.
Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	Troy University (AL); Marana School District (AZ); Red Clay School District (DE); University of Georgia; Gallia County Local Schools (OH); Charter School Specialists (OH); Pickaway County Educational Service Center (OH); Milford Exempted Village School District (OH)
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	Self-assessment; supervisor assessment; and staff assessment.
COST	Program subscriptions are based on the number of IDs purchased and the number of programs accessed by each ID. The greater the volume of IDs purchased, the lower the individual cost per ID. Each user is required to have his/her own ID and password. Each subscription is good for one full year from the activation date. Educational Impact will send a free price quote upon request. EI offers School District License pricing for unlimited number of users.
CONTACT INFORMATION	http://www.educationalimpact.com/

Comprehensive Assessment of Leadership for Learning (CALL)

Summary

CALL, developed by researchers from the University of Wisconsin at Madison, is a 360° online formative assessment tool to guide leadership for learning in all school types (elementary through high school) using task-based measures of leadership practices.

PURPOSE(S)	<p>Provide formal and informal leaders with an extensive set of locally relevant data surrounding the tasks of leadership.</p> <p>Focus staff conversations around relevant practices.</p>
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>Developed by researchers at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; based on over 20 years of research that identifies which tasks result in improved teaching and learning outcomes. CALL measures five domains of practice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Focusing on learning; » Monitoring teaching and learning; » Building nested learning communities; » Acquiring and allocating resources; and » Maintaining a safe and effective learning environment.
FEATURES	<p>Provides the most complete set of data available surrounding the tasks of leadership that can be successfully addressed across a school setting by any number of formal and informal leaders through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Data-based feedback for leaders; » Targeted action planning for local schools; » Detailed feedback to guide professional development; » Research-based information for improved teaching and learning; and » Schoolwide measures of distributed leadership tasks.
STANDARDS	<p>While CALL was not built from existing standards, the authors conducted a comparison with ISLLC standards, and found them to be congruent. A copy of the crosswalk can be obtained from the contact whose information follows.</p>

CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	Domain 1 of leadership practice (<i>Focus on Learning</i>) maintains a wide focus on learning, learning plans, and services for students who traditionally struggle; subdomains 2.1 and 2.2 (<i>Summative Evaluation of Student Learning</i> and <i>Formative Evaluation of Student Learning</i>) focus on student learning.
COMPONENTS	<p>Online survey taken by principals, school staff, and teachers.</p> <p>An additional component, CALL feedback, is currently in development as an online tool that will be available to principals and will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Online data visualization; » Customizable reports and item breakdown; » Identification of assets and changes for each local school; and » Live links to the latest research and practical advice.
PROCESS/TIMELINE	<p>Registration for the instrument requires a few minutes and a list of staff that will be taking the survey. CALL automates the invitation, login, and feedback tools to oversee implementation. Once registered, principals set a window for staff to take the survey and where principals return for feedback when it closes.</p> <p>Each respondent (principal, school staff, or teacher) is asked to review 21 subdomains or tasks of leadership in approximately 50 minutes.</p>
EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	CALL is an online-administered survey that does not require any evaluator training or expertise. CALL provides participating schools with the necessary materials to administer the survey.
DIFFERENTIATION	For use by elementary, middle, and high school principals and informal leaders.
Information and Measures	
SOURCES	Measures on the performance of key leadership tasks across the school are collected from principals, school staff, and teachers.

REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Multi-layer feedback, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Responses by domain, subdomain, and item-level analysis; » Numerical results and narrative description; and » Guide to target improvement effort. <p>Leaders can see numerical measures of a leadership task or review “next steps” feedback that suggests areas of growth in each subdomain.</p>
RATINGS	Ratings depend on the type of question; usually a five-point scale with examples of practice.
VALIDITY	<p>A four-year grant supported testing in 120 schools across the country. Construct validity and predictive validity were assessed using data from a large sample of teachers and school leaders across the country.</p> <p>The assessment was vetted by expert practitioners and is being piloted in schools in Wisconsin and Mississippi.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>Researchers reported reliability as .7 or above for 11 of the 20 subdomain scales. For each scale with a reliability score below .7, items have been reviewed, added, or revised in those scales to improve reliability. The reliability analysis will be repeated for CALL Version 2.0.</p>
Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	Pilot testing in Wisconsin and Mississippi.
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	CALL is currently being pilot tested, and a copy of the principal survey can be found online.
COST	Free to districts that want to pilot it.
CONTACT INFORMATION	Mark Blitz, mblitz@wisc.edu

Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System

Summary

The Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System developed by Dr. James Stronge is a performance appraisal process that articulates principals' duties and responsibilities and criteria by which to judge their effectiveness. The system is a multifaceted view of effective principalship that draws from empirical research, case studies, and a meta-review of principal effectiveness.

PURPOSE(S)	<p>Provide a research-based set of performance standards, data collection tools, and scoring rubrics related to what constitutes an effective principal.</p> <p>Provide a focus for principals as they implement practices to improve student learning and support the professional growth of school and division staff.</p> <p>Provide research-based practices designed to enable principals and other building-level school administrators to develop their leadership skills in an ongoing and sustainable manner.</p>
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>Leader Performance Standards are based upon Dr. Stronge's ASCD books, <i>Qualities of Effective Principals</i> (Stronge, Richard, & Catano, 2008) and <i>Principal Evaluation</i> (Stronge, 2013). Leader Performance Standards are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Instructional Leadership; » School Climate; » Human Resources Management; » Communications and Community Relations; » Professionalism; and » Student Progress.

<p>FEATURES</p>	<p>Professional growth and accountability oriented.</p> <p>Simplified set of research-based performance standards.</p> <p>Multiple data sources.</p> <p>Includes measures of student progress.</p> <p>Fully customizable to district and state requirements.</p> <p>Includes performance standards, performance indicators, and performance appraisal rubric.</p> <p>Self-reflection is systematically embedded in the evaluation.</p> <p>Compatible with OASYS web-based performance management system (see OASYS resource summary).</p>
<p>STANDARDS</p>	<p>Aligned with InTASC (teacher) and ISLLC (principal) standards.</p>
<p>CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT</p>	<p>The system relies half on the assessment of student growth and half on measures of student achievement.</p> <p>Data sources for student growth include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Percentage of students taking the SAT; » Percentage of students who are advanced proficient on a college-ready assessment; » Percentage increase in minority students taking Advanced Placement courses and/or exams; » Percentage of students meeting industry standards in career/technical education; » Percentage increase in students taking more academically rigorous classes; » Percentage increase in graduation and completion indices » Percentage of student athletes on the honor roll during competitive season; » Percentage of students in band/theater on honor roll during season or rehearsal period; » Percentage decrease in school suspensions; » Percentage of students involved in community service; and » Other relevant measures.

<p>COMPONENTS</p>	<p>Performance appraisal rubrics for each Leader Performance Standard.</p> <p>Goal Setting/Student Learning Objectives Form and Protocol.</p> <p>Observation/Site Visit Form.</p> <p>Documentation Log Form.</p> <p>Client surveys.</p> <p>Interim Evaluation Form.</p> <p>Summative Evaluation Form.</p> <p>Performance Improvement Protocol.</p> <p>All forms and protocols are available electronically via OASYS (see OASYS resource summary).</p>
<p>PROCESS/TIMELINE</p>	<p>The evaluation process lasts an entire academic year and can be designed as a multi-year (e.g., three-year) evaluation cycle.</p>
<p>EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)</p>	<p>Evaluators must participate in a three-day training.</p> <p>Certification of evaluators is provided with successful completion of the initial training, and inter-rater reliability training.</p>
<p>DIFFERENTIATION</p>	<p>Depends on percentages dictated by state policy. Guidelines include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Principals of grades K–8 would have 20%–25% of their evaluation based on value-added measures (e.g., student growth percentiles) and 20%–25% based on other student academic progress measures, with other measures and percentages determined by the district. » High school principals would have 40%–50% of their evaluation based on student academic progress measures, with other measures and percentages determined by the district. Building-level administrators who are at different career stages may have a differentiated evaluation design.

Information and Measures	
SOURCES	<p>Multiple data sources, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Goal setting for school improvement; » Measures of student progress; » Informal observations/site visits; » Documentation log; and » Client surveys.
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Summative assessment score includes a computation of the point value assigned to the principal's rating.</p> <p>Diagnostic profile of the principal.</p>
RATINGS	<p>Rating levels are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Exemplary; » Proficient (expected level of performance); » Developing/Needs Improvement; and/or » Unacceptable. <p>If determined by the developer and district, alternative ratings can be used, e.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Highly Effective; » Effective; » Partially Effective; and/or » Ineffective.
VALIDITY	<p>Performance qualities in this model are based on extant literature that examines what constitutes principal effectiveness.</p> <p>Robust criterion validity and solid construct validity have been reported by the developer.</p> <p>Validation studies are under way in states to compare evaluation ratings with student achievement using key aspects of Stronge's teacher and this leader evaluation model.</p>

RELIABILITY	Research on leader effectiveness is currently being conducted in the U.S., China, Australia, and New Zealand. See Contact Information.
Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	<p>The developer, Dr. James Stronge, and associates are currently</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Working with the Virginia Board of Education to lead a work group on principal evaluation guidelines (Bernard et al., 2011). » Consulting in China, Taiwan, Saint Kitts, Ecuador, Brazil, South Africa, and the Association of American Schools in South America. » Engaged in multi-year partnerships with the states of Georgia, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Virginia; cohorts of school districts in Arizona and Wisconsin; and other local school districts in various states, to assess the development, training, and implementation of statewide teacher evaluation programs.
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	<p>Performance indicators.</p> <p>Rating levels.</p>
COST	<p>Evaluation system and electronic management platform:</p> <p>\$24/user/year with installation fee waived</p> <p>OASYS system included.</p> <p>Training and professional development: \$150/person/day for training in multi-district workshop settings or \$3,000-\$4,000/day for in-district training (prices may vary for individualized specifications).</p>
CONTACT INFORMATION	<p>http://www.strongeandassociates.com;</p> <p>http://www.strongeandassociates.com/files/MyLearningPlan-OASYS.pdf</p>

Leadership Development Program (LDP)

Summary

LDP, developed by the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL), is a professional development support plan for experienced managers and principals, which consists of training leaders in collaboration, understanding systems, integrating multiple perspectives, and planning for higher levels of impact. The program includes a comprehensive pre-program assessment, 360° leadership assessments, and a five-day training.

PURPOSE(S)	Address the leadership tensions for mid- to senior-level managers; encourage leaders to effectively manage complexity and take wise and productive action amidst complex, rapidly changing conditions.
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>The program is designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Connect leaders and teachers to set direction, grow alignment, build commitment, and manage change; » Encourage collaboration across the organization; » Develop leaders and teachers to effectively manage complexity and take productive action amid complex conditions; » Leverage the experience gained from multiple life roles; and » Build resiliency to effectively manage stress, uncertainty, and setbacks.
FEATURES	<p>The program includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Research-based content; » Personalized assessment and feedback; » Intensive individual and group coaching; » Experiential exercises; » A safe environment for practicing behaviors; and » Interactive peer-to-peer learning.
STANDARDS	Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.

CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	<p>After the training program, the following results have been reported by participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Increase in schools meeting their adequate yearly progress; » Decrease in staff turnover; » Improvement in student attendance and discipline; and » Increase in student academic progress.
COMPONENTS	<p>LDP consists of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Pre-program: comprehensive assessments. » Program: interactive classroom experience. » Post-program: application and sustainability.
PROCESS/TIMELINE	<p>Participants receive a set of comprehensive assessments seven weeks in advance of training.</p> <p>After participants complete the assessment, the five-day interactive classroom experience follows.</p> <p>The application and sustainability component includes two 45-minute follow-up coaching sessions by telephone, 3–6 month post-program assessment to gather data about improvement efforts and to inform ongoing development, an online portal with resources and support, and e-learning opportunities.</p>
EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	<p>Current program trainers include managers in the nonprofit sectors and lead faculty members and adjuncts in the education sectors.</p>
DIFFERENTIATION	<p>Designed for experienced managers who work in the “middle zone” of the organization; principals and assistant principals are included at this level.</p>
Information and Measures	
SOURCES	<p>Results from the comprehensive leadership assessments, the training program, and post-program feedback.</p>
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Individual results are held in the strictest of confidence. Normed data is shared upon request. See Contact Information below.</p>
RATINGS	<p>Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.</p>

VALIDITY	The assessments used in the LDP are consistently normed for various populations by sector and demographics.
RELIABILITY	The assessments used in the LDP are consistently normed for various populations by sector and demographics.
Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	<p>The CCL annually serves over 20,000 individuals and 2,000 organizations across the public, private, nonprofit, and education sectors, including more than 80 of the Fortune 100 companies. Among current LDP users are Bayer; the Kentucky State Chamber of Commerce (program for principals); the South Carolina Department of Education; and the National Hispana Leadership Institute. Since 1970, nearly 470,000 leaders, including superintendents and school principals, have graduated from a CCL program.</p> <p>Since 1990, the center has been contracted to train superintendents and principals from various districts across the country.</p>
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	Training agenda and registration forms.
COST	Tuition cost is \$6,900 for five days of training at a U.S.-based campus. Scholarships are available for educators.
CONTACT INFORMATION	http://www.ccl.org/leadership/programs/LDPOverview.aspx ; info@ccl.org ; 800.780.1031.

McREL Principal Evaluation System

Summary

The McREL Principal Evaluation System is a formative, rubric-driven evaluation tool based on three major components of *Balanced Leadership*®—Developing Purposeful Communities, Managing Change, and Focus of Leadership). Principal performance is linked to 21 research-based benchmark behaviors associated with high levels of student performance. The system helps districts recognize excellence, especially in those principals who have mastered critical competencies and can serve as exemplars, role models, and coaches for others.

PURPOSE(S)	<p>Develop individual leadership improvement goals based on the outcome of the evaluation.</p> <p>Inform districtwide leadership professional development needs.</p> <p>Inform higher education regarding the development of leadership development programs.</p>
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>Enables principals to identify opportunities for continued improvement, aggregating data from reviews into reports that can assist in charting individual professional growth and districtwide professional development.</p> <p>Derived from a meta-analysis of 69 studies that explored the relationship between student achievement and school-level leadership. Results identified 21 leadership responsibilities and 66 associated practices (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).</p>
FEATURES	<p>Users can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Create professional growth plans; » Use the software for managing leader evaluation; » Track, report, and store evaluation data; » Prepare and submit reviews; and » Analyze data and create custom reports. <p>The system offers free help-desk support.</p> <p>The system can be customized to meet any school or district needs.</p>
STANDARDS	<p>The 21 leadership responsibilities and 66 related practices are the basis for the rubric. Three sets of rubrics align with the <i>Balanced Leadership Framework</i>; ISLLC standards.</p>

CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	The system can integrate student achievement data into evaluation data to balance principals' performance with student achievement data.
COMPONENTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Principal Evaluation Rubric. » Principal Summary Evaluation Worksheet. » Principal Summary Goal Setting Form. » Mid-year Goal Form. » An online system to capture data. » Help-desk support.
PROCESS/TIMELINE	<p>In order to complete the evaluation system, there are seven steps to follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Principals must attend an orientation to become familiar with the system. » Principals and evaluator each complete a Principal Evaluation Rubric as a self-assessment. » Principal and evaluator meet to discuss the results of the self-assessment. » Principal and evaluator meet for a mid-year evaluation discussion. » Principal and evaluator complete a performance assessment. » Principal and evaluator meet for an end-of-the-year performance discussion. » During a final evaluation and goal-setting meeting, principal and evaluator agree upon performance goals and recommendations for a professional development plan.
EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	Evaluators must participate in professional development in order to understand and implement the system.
DIFFERENTIATION	Can be used by all school-level leaders.

Information and Measures	
SOURCES	<p>Principal Evaluation Rubric.</p> <p>Principal Summary Evaluation Worksheet: Ratings on principal leadership responsibilities associated with: Developing Purposeful Communities, Managing Change, and Focus of Leadership.</p> <p>Principal Summary Goal-Setting Form.</p> <p>Mid-Year Evaluation Discussion</p> <p>An online system to capture data.</p>
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Formative rubric ratings.</p> <p>Evaluator comments.</p> <p>Summary rating forms.</p> <p>Professional development plans.</p> <p>Results presented in graphs and charts.</p>
RATINGS	<p>The system uses a five-point rating scale for all 21 leadership responsibilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Developing » Proficient » Accomplished » Distinguished (comments required) » Not Demonstrated (comments required) <p>The categorical ratings reflect a growth model by describing what leaders should know and be able to do to improve their schools' performance and have a positive effect on student achievement.</p>

VALIDITY	<p>McREL used an interactive process, guided by a task force of North Carolina educators, to develop and pilot test the instrument in 19 school districts. Results of the pilot test were incorporated into a revised version, which was field-tested with a larger number of educators, with positive results.</p> <p>When validating the instrument, McREL followed APA standards for personnel evaluation and also met the AERA standards for personnel evaluation (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council for Measurement in Education, 1999). Project researchers calculated content, criterion, and predictive validity. Several researchers not affiliated with the project reviewed the data and methodology, ultimately approving McREL's methods.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.</p>
<h3 style="background-color: #2e7d72; color: white; padding: 5px;">Additional Information</h3>	
CURRENT USERS	<p>Currently actively used in the following states and territories: Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Utah, Wyoming, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands.</p>
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	<p>Principal Evaluation Rubric Sample.</p> <p>Principal Summary Evaluation Worksheet.</p> <p>Rating Form Sample</p> <p>Principal Summary Goal Setting Form</p> <p>Mid-year Goal Form</p>
COST	<p>District pricing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » 50 or more principals = \$250/principal/year » 26 to 49 principals = \$275/principal/year » 1 to 25 principals = \$300/principal/year <p>Minimum subscription is \$1,500. In addition, at least two days of professional development is required, at \$9,200/day (including travel expenses). There is no charge for the use of the paper/pencil version; however, if using the paper/pencil version, districts are not allowed to place the instrument on any electronic platform.</p>
CONTACT INFORMATION	<p>http://www.mcrel.org</p>

Multidimensional Leadership Assessment System/Leadership Performance Matrix

Summary

The Multidimensional Leadership Assessment System/Leadership Performance Matrix, developed by Dr. Douglas Reeves at the Leadership and Learning Center, is an educational leadership assessment tool that facilitates an administrator’s growth and effectiveness in order to support teaching excellence and student learning. The assessment focuses on the dimensions of leaderships revealed by research as key to performance.

PURPOSE(S)	<p>Provide an assessment of the key dimensions of leadership related to student achievement.</p> <p>Provide continuous formative assessment for leaders at every level, including building administrators, central office leaders, and senior leaders at the district and state levels (The Leadership Performance Matrix).</p>
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>Dr. Douglas Reeves developed the system based on a review of clusters of effective leadership practice of more than 2,000 schools in the U.S. and Canada, including more than 1.5 million students in high- and low- poverty schools, high- and low-second-language schools, and schools from urban, suburban, and rural environments.</p> <p>The ten dimensions of leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Resiliency; » Personal behavior; » Student achievement; » Decision-making; » Communication; » Faculty development; » Leadership development; » Time/task/project management; » Technology; and » Professional development.

<p>FEATURES</p>	<p>Promotes observations and evaluations as part of a holistic learning system.</p> <p>Documents judgments about leadership performance through supporting evidence.</p> <p>Offers continuous feedback for veteran, new, and aspiring leaders.</p> <p>Supports collaborative processes and collegial conversations to help sustain Professional Learning Communities.</p> <p>Uses “word pictures” to ensure common understanding of leadership actions that impact teacher performance and student achievement.</p> <p>Collects parent input on individual instructional personnel through a survey.</p> <p>Includes customizable rubrics and weightings to meet local needs, organized in a ten-dimension tool.</p> <p>Can be uploaded into any technology system.</p>
<p>STANDARDS</p>	<p>The tool and professional development align to research-based teacher rubrics, including those developed by Marzano and Danielson, and integrate with multiple electronic platforms.</p> <p>The Leadership Performance Matrix has been analyzed against Florida Principal Leadership Standards and has been aligned to ISLLC and New Leaders standards.</p>
<p>CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT</p>	<p>Evaluation of leadership personnel is based 50% on student achievement and 50% on leadership practice. Percentages can be adjusted by the district.</p> <p>Student achievement is determined by the total school index derived from the value-added model identified by the district, end-of-course exams, and standardized mastery exams (e.g., AP exams).</p>

<p>COMPONENTS</p>	<p>The Leadership Performance Matrix includes the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Individualized professional growth plan. » Multiple assessments targeting specific leadership dimensions. » Scoring guide. » Matrix reflection guide. » Staff questionnaire. » Coaching protocols and guides. » Implementation rubrics. » Summative evaluation form.
<p>PROCESS/TIMELINE</p>	<p>The system utilizes a seven-step process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Orientation prior to using the system. 2. Pre-planning meeting in which the leader and the evaluator address evaluation processes, expectations, and the completion of the self-assessment. 3. Initial meeting in which the leader and evaluator address results of the self-assessment and additional information is gathered for the evaluation process. 4. School leader collects data agreed upon in step 3. 5. Mid-year meeting in which the leader and evaluator discuss formative progress toward achieving annual goals. 6. School leader synthesizes information gathered in steps 4 and 5 in order to prepare a consolidated assessment. 7. End-of-the-year meeting in which the leader and evaluator discuss progress in completing the evaluation process.
<p>EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)</p>	<p>All personnel conducting leadership observations can be trained in this model in order to employ the same criteria for assessment across all observations.</p>
<p>DIFFERENTIATION</p>	<p>Offers continuous feedback for veteran, new, and aspiring leaders at every level, including building administrators, central office leaders, and senior leaders at the district and state levels.</p>

Information and Measures	
SOURCES	<p>Scores on leadership assessments.</p> <p>Score on staff questionnaire.</p> <p>Results from the summative evaluation form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » The weight of each dimension. » Summary of Dimensions using the rating scale. » Overall Performance Score, calculated from the Summary of Dimensions. » Sources of Evidence, based on all components of the matrix. » Evaluator comments.
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Numerical results and narrative description.</p> <p>Summary of rating forms.</p> <p>Evaluator comments.</p>
RATINGS	<p>Includes a four-level rating scale for the ten leadership dimensions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Exemplary (statewide impact); » Proficient (local impact); » Progressing (leadership potential); or » Not meeting standards.
VALIDITY	<p>The Leadership and Learning Center can assist local school districts to address local assessments of validity and reliability. See Contact Information.</p>

RELIABILITY	The developer notes that it is critical to the overall accuracy and reliability of this evaluation system that evaluators share a common understanding of leadership performance expectations and rating levels. To achieve overall accuracy and reliability of the evaluation system, the Leadership and Learning Center strongly recommends that organizations conduct “norming sessions,” where all leaders review leadership performance in the form of case studies, assign a score, and then discuss their scores and specify why they gave them. Using a rubric and holding “norming sessions” help organizations achieve inter-rater reliability. The Leadership and Learning Center can assist local school districts to address local assessments of validity and reliability. See Contact Information.
Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	Florida Department of Education (Putnam County School District, 2012); New York and Oklahoma.
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	Performance rubrics.
COST	Multi-District Overview Package: \$14,057 (up to 60 participants). Implementation Option 1: \$25,357 (one-day rubric customization and implementation sessions). Implementation Option 2: \$42,307 (two-day rubric customization and implementation support). Implementation Option 3: \$53,607 (two-day rubric customization session; four-day and four-webinar implementation and monitoring support).
CONTACT INFORMATION	http://www.leadandlearn.com/

MyLearningPlan Observation & Appraisal System (OASYS)

Summary

MyLearningPlan OASYS is a web-based observation and appraisal management system that offers district leaders the ability to schedule, manage, complete, and report all components of the evaluation process for teachers, principals, administrators, and non-instructional staff. The system is integrated with the Professional Development Management System (MyLearningPlan). OASYS is rubric-agnostic, working with a variety of evaluation forms, formats and processes.

PURPOSE(S)	Provide an online management system for streamlining the administration of all components and procedures pertaining to educator evaluation.
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>Enables the administration of all facets of leader evaluation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Classroom observations and school site visits; » Informal learning walks; » Self-reflective assessments; » Documentation logs; » Analysis of student growth and student achievement data; » Student learning objectives; » Peer review and observation; » Portfolio evaluation; » Individual or team-based action research; and » Evaluation scoring (composite score calculations).

FEATURES	<p>Allows users to create and administer various documents, processes, and formats needed to support the evaluation process for a range of people, such as principals, assistant principals, department chairs, and other instructional leaders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Users can use current district- or state-developed frameworks and rubrics or adapt forms from the OASYS library to support transparency and consistency. » Manages all forms, rubrics, and standards <p>The technology allows users to customize the properties of each form as needed in order to collect and align multiple measures and calculate a final effectiveness rating or composite score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Users can assign different components to different evaluation types or groups and then track completion and progress of results. » Users can manage scheduling, review cycles, and workflow confidentiality, and compile and finalize online summaries, through secure online procedures. <p>Differentiates effectiveness and records data in real time, using multiple rating categories for performance-based assessment.</p> <p>Can automatically recommend targeted professional learning based on evaluation results.</p> <p>As needs evolve, users with designated system rights can easily create and edit their own forms and rubrics online to accommodate changes without having to rely on the vendor to make updates.</p> <p>Can be used on any handheld device, tablet computer, or laptop, including iPads, iPods, iPhones, and any Android device.</p>
STANDARDS	Depend on rubric or framework used.
CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	Depends on rubric or framework used; in general, student growth measures and student achievement measures can be collected, weighted, and included as part of the automatic calculation of summative scores configured to meet specific state or district requirements.
COMPONENTS	Depend on rubric or framework used; the system manages all forms, rubrics, and standards.
PROCESS/TIMELINE	Regardless of the rubric or framework used, the initial set-up, roll-out, and training requires, on average, six weeks.

EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	Initial training is offered for evaluators.
DIFFERENTIATION	Superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals with different experience levels, and anyone with district professional learning responsibilities can serve as an evaluator and/or be evaluated through the system. The evaluation and growth of any support staff, such as nurses and custodians, can also be managed through OASYS.
Information and Measures	
SOURCES	Depend on rubric or framework used.
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Results can be reported using:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Reporting tools; » System reports; » Rubric explorer; » Growth explorer; » Detail view; and/or » Final evaluation summaries. <p>The system can generate graphic reports for analysis of data across multiple evaluations and user groups.</p>
RATINGS	The system is flexible enough to manage manual ratings or automatically calculate ratings based upon rubric scores, other measures, and/or imported student scores.
VALIDITY	The system is not limited to a single prescribed rubric or framework; however, if desired, the system can be preconfigured with a valid and reliable framework of the district's choice, such as the Stronge Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System described above. By design, OASYS is rubric-agnostic, which means that any valid and reliable rubrics and frameworks can be uploaded and managed within the system.
RELIABILITY	The system is not limited to a single prescribed rubric or framework; however, if desired, the system can be preconfigured with a valid and reliable framework of the district's choice, such as the Stronge Leader Effectiveness Evaluation System described above. By design, OASYS is rubric-agnostic, which means that any valid and reliable rubrics and frameworks can be uploaded and managed within the system.

Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	Over 250 school districts, regional service centers, and state departments of education use OASYS, including Mat-Su School District (AK); Tempe Elementary School District (AZ); Okaloosa School District (FL); Olathe School District (KS); West Springfield Public Schools (MA); Lamphere School District (MI); Binghamton School District (NY); Rhode Island Department of Education; Shelby County School District (TN); and Cooperative Education Service Agency 6 (WI).
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	<p>Observation forms.</p> <p>Rubric designer and scoring forms.</p> <p>Assessment forms.</p> <p>Data analysis.</p>
COST	<p>For subscribers currently using MyLearningPlan, the cost for initial OASYS setup and training is \$3,000, with a \$12/user annual fee.</p> <p>For non-current MyLearningPlan subscribers, cost for initial OASYS setup and training is \$3,500, with a \$15/user annual fee.</p>
CONTACT INFORMATION	http://www.mylearningplan.com/Content/Home/contact_us.html

Principal Leadership Competencies/Principal Evaluation Rubric

Summary

The Principal Leadership Competencies/Principal Evaluation Rubric developed by Kim Marshall is a summative evaluation tool made up of a set of rubrics. It is designed to give principals and other school-based administrators an end-of-the-year assessment of where they stand in all performance areas and detailed guidance on how to improve.

PURPOSE(S)	Provide an assessment for school principals in six domain levels at the end of each school year.
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>A set of rubrics organized around six domains of a principal's job performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Diagnosis and Planning; » Priority Management and Communication; » Curriculum and Data; » Supervision, Evaluation, and Professional Development; » Discipline and Parent Involvement; and » Management and External Relations. <p>Each rubric has a set of subcomponents that further define it.</p> <p>The lead author, Kim Marshall, developed the rubric with input from other educational researchers (Jon Saphier, Charlotte Danielson, Douglas Reeves, and Paul Bambrick-Santoyo).</p>
FEATURES	<p>Must be completed by a supervisor who has been in the school frequently throughout the school year.</p> <p>Implementation instructions and goals are backed up by evaluators' evidence.</p> <p>Language is constructive to professional growth.</p> <p>Designed as an end-of-the-year summative evaluation tool, not as a checklist for school visits.</p> <p>Rubrics are also available through the T-EVAL online software platform.</p>
STANDARDS	Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.

CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	Student achievement is not explicitly included in these rubrics. How student results factor into evaluation is for each district or governing board to decide.
COMPONENTS	Principal Evaluation Rubrics. Performance domains. Rating scale.
PROCESS/TIMELINE	The rubrics can be completed after a number of site visits have taken place (to be determined by district agreements). The process can be enhanced if the supervisor and principal fill out the rubrics in advance and then meet and compare them one page at a time. It is also recommended that the rubrics be used as an end-of-the-year summative evaluation tool.
EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	A supervisor needs to have been in the school frequently throughout the year; the developer notes that it is irresponsible to fill out the rubrics based on one visit and without ongoing dialogue.
DIFFERENTIATION	The Principal Evaluation Rubric is designed to be used to evaluate any principal.
Information and Measures	
SOURCES	Rating scores and comments from the 60-item rubric, which measures six domains of principal effectiveness.
REPORTED INFORMATION	After an evaluation, the principal receives six rubric pages with scores and comments, and one Evaluation Summary Page, which contains ratings on each individual rubric.
RATINGS	Each rubric uses a four-level rating scale: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, or Does Not Meet Standards.
VALIDITY	No research has been conducted on the rubric's validity; however, the inputs in the rubrics are aligned with research-based factors related to principal effectiveness and student achievement. The rubric has been adopted by the New York State Education Department, which has rigorous criteria for research-based instruments (New York State Education Department, 2012).
RELIABILITY	No research has been conducted on the rubric's reliability; however, the inputs in the rubrics are aligned with research-based factors related to principal effectiveness and student achievement. See Contact Information.

Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	<p>Because the rubrics are open-source, it is very difficult to get an accurate count of districts and others using them.</p> <p>Numerous districts and charter management organizations have adopted this resource, including Friendship Charter School (DC); Greater Newark Academy (NJ); and Hamilton County Schools (TN). It has also been used as a guide to develop the Minnesota state rubric and approved as an evaluation resource by the states of New Jersey and New York.</p>
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	<p>Rubrics.</p> <p>Online blog with resources.</p>
COST	<p>The rubrics are free of charge and open-source. Implementation support from the developer involves a full-day training session for all administrators using the rubrics (\$1,000 for Kim Marshall's time) and a follow-up meeting mid-year to fine-tune and troubleshoot (\$500).</p>
CONTACT INFORMATION	<p>http://www.marshallmemo.com/</p>

School Leadership Evaluation Model

School Leadership

Summary

The School Leadership Evaluation Model developed by Dr. Robert Marzano is an online professional development system that builds the competencies of effective school leaders and enables the evaluator to analyze leadership style and determine areas for development and improvement. The goal of the School Leadership Evaluation Model is to support leaders to be highly effective, lifelong learners, and to significantly impact student growth and achievement over time.

PURPOSE(S)	Provide a leadership evaluation framework to maximize the impact on raising student achievement and to encourage continual improvements in school leadership through deliberate practice.
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>Based on research findings, 24 categories of principal actions and behaviors were identified and organized into five domains to spur measurable teacher improvement with corresponding gains in student achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » A data-driven focus on student achievement; » Continuous improvement of instruction; » A guaranteed and viable curriculum; » Cooperation and collaboration; and » School climate. <p>The model evaluates three components of leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Leadership practice; » Deliberate practice; and » Student growth data.
FEATURES	<p>Incorporates data from a variety of sources.</p> <p>Focuses evaluations on leadership elements that have been shown by research to impact student achievement.</p> <p>Integrated with the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model, but works with all teacher evaluation frameworks.</p> <p>Leverages principals' high-value activities to empower teacher improvement and to raise student achievement.</p> <p>Cloud-based and accessible with iPads, notebooks, and laptops through iObservation software.</p>

STANDARDS	Aligned to ISLLC standards and skills.
CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	The evaluation of principal actions is linked to teacher improvement and student achievement gains. iObservation software can include school value-added measures as a component of the final evaluation score, linking principal practice to student learning gains for the school.
COMPONENTS	Domain scales. Assessment forms. Evaluator feedback. iObservation software.
PROCESS/TIMELINE	The evaluation model can be completed in one academic year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Training for principals and assistant principals. » Initial meeting between evaluator and leader. » Data collection, monitoring, and feedback at the beginning of the academic year. » Midpoint evaluation between evaluator and leader. » Data collection, monitoring, and feedback. » Consolidated leadership assessment forms. » Year-end meeting between evaluator and leader.
EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	Evaluators using this model may include central office administrators, supervising principals, and/or principals who evaluate assistant principals. The implementation process requires a few days of training and follow-up sessions to ensure rater agreement, leveraging the iObservation software. Support is provided through the first year of implementation to ensure success.
DIFFERENTIATION	All principals, assistant principals, and struggling school administrators can use the framework and assessment for growth, development, and evaluation.

Information and Measures	
SOURCES	<p>Rating scales and sample evidence.</p> <p>Performance ratings and feedback received from evaluator.</p>
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Evidence of successful performance per domain.</p> <p>Information is reported through the iObservation data system using data reports showing growth, focus areas, discussions and conferences, and action plans.</p>
RATINGS	<p>Scale values:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Innovating; » Applying; » Developing; » Beginning; and/or » Not using.
VALIDITY	<p>Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>Research did not uncover information that may be available for this topic. Contact information for this resource follows.</p>
Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	<p>Approved for use in the states of Florida, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Washington, and others.</p>
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	<p>Rubrics and evaluation forms.</p>
COST	<p>Training sessions are \$4,500 and the iObservation data system is \$2,000.</p>
CONTACT INFORMATION	<p>http://www.marzanoresearch.com/;</p> <p>http://www.marzanocenter.com/; 877.411.7114.</p>

Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)

Summary

The Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED) is an evidence-based, multi-rater rating scale that assesses principals' learning-centered leadership behaviors known to directly influence teachers' performance and, in turn, students' learning. VAL-ED measures critical learning-centered leadership behaviors for the purposes of diagnostic analyses, performance feedback, progress monitoring, and professional development planning, with input from the principal and the principal's supervisor.

PURPOSE(S)	<p>Provide an accurate and useful measure of the effectiveness of school leaders by presenting a detailed assessment of principals' performance.</p> <p>Focus on leadership behaviors known to influence teacher performance and student learning.</p>
Structure	
DESIGN/ORIGIN	<p>A group of two school leadership researchers, a school psychologist, and a psychometrician developed the VAL-ED in response to the paucity of sound principal evaluation instruments. The design was driven by current evidence-based approaches to measure leadership behaviors known to influence teacher performance and student learning.</p> <p>The VAL-ED is a 72-item instrument that assesses six core component subscales across six process subscales. Core components are characteristics of schools that support the learning of students and enhance the ability of teachers to teach. The VAL-ED's key processes refer to how leaders create core components.</p>
FEATURES	<p>Can be used as part of a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of a leader's behaviors by providing a detailed picture of perceived performance.</p> <p>Grounded in research- and evidence-based practices of effective principal leadership behavior.</p> <p>Uses psychometric properties.</p>
STANDARDS	<p>Developed following the guidance of the <i>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i> (American Educational Research Association et al., 1999), and aligned to the ISLLC standards.</p>
CONNECTION TO STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	<p>The model focuses on key leadership behaviors that affect value added to student achievement through the core components (i.e., improvements in student achievement, student attendance, student graduation rates, and college enrollment).</p>

COMPONENTS	<p>Online and paper assessments.</p> <p>A 72-item rating scale.</p> <p>E-mail to the participating principal to track his/her progress.</p>
PROCESS/TIMELINE	<p>The assessment takes 20–25 minutes to complete and can be used annually or more frequently to measure performance growth, guide professional development, and facilitate a data-based performance evaluation.</p> <p>Can be administered anytime during the academic year</p>
EVALUATORS (FACILITATORS)	<p>Training on how to read and understand reports from the VAL-ED, analyze survey results, and make recommendations based on findings is provided by the Discovery Education Professional Development Team.</p>
DIFFERENTIATION	<p>Appropriate for principals with a variety of experience levels in elementary, middle, and/or high schools in urban, suburban, and/or rural settings.</p>
Information and Measures	
SOURCES	<p>Results from the rating scale.</p> <p>A leadership development plan can be developed based on the rating scale results.</p>
REPORTED INFORMATION	<p>Results are reported on two sets of six scales and by a total score.</p> <p>Results are reported graphically and in tabular form.</p> <p>National norms are also provided.</p> <p>Reports of results highlight key areas of strength and needed growth.</p> <p>When used appropriately, VAL-ED results yield norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores for evaluating learning-centered leadership.</p>

RATINGS	<p>The VAL-ED provides the following ratings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Below Basic: Exhibits leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are unlikely to influence teachers or student achievement positively. » Basic: Exhibits leadership behaviors that are likely to influence teachers positively and that result in acceptable value added to student achievement. » Proficient: Exhibits leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are likely to influence teachers positively and result in acceptable value added to student achievement. » Distinguished: Exhibits leadership behaviors at levels of effectiveness that are virtually certain to influence teachers positively and result in strong value added to student achievement.
VALIDITY	<p>Developers report strong content validity.</p> <p>A study provided evidence on the validity of the conceptual framework and showed that VAL-ED scores are higher for principals with longer assignments in the same building. A regression analysis offered modest validity evidence, suggesting that principals' experience was statistically significant at the .05 level and that high school principals had .17 points lower effectiveness ratings than principals in elementary schools (Porter et al., 2010).</p>
RELIABILITY	<p>Scale and total score reliabilities were high (.87–.97) and the standard error of measurement was low across scales and respondents (.05) (Porter et al, 2011).</p> <p>A third party study by Condon and Clifford (2010) looked at the published research on the VAL-ED and rated its reliability as “high” (0.98). Only the number of teacher responses were large enough to be analyzed.</p> <p>Test/retest reliability is currently being examined.</p>

Additional Information	
CURRENT USERS	The VAL-ED has been adopted and/or utilized in state principal evaluation systems, e.g., Alabama, Kentucky, New York, and Ohio and district systems in Florida. As of July 2012, VAL-ED is being used by 3,000 schools in 39 states.
SAMPLE TOOLS, INSTRUMENTS, FORMS	VAL-ED user's guide, short form assessment, and a sample set of items.
COST	The cost is \$360 per principal and includes everything except professional development fees that are dependent on specific arrangements with the user.
CONTACT INFORMATION	http://www.discoveryeducation.com/administrators/assessment/val-ed/

References

- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council for Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Bernard, C., Koslowski, J., Ellena, D. S., Word, J. A., & Barrack, R. (2011). *A VASSP special report: Revising the principal evaluation system in the commonwealth*. Richmond, VA: Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.vassp.org/VASSPBulletin_11-11.pdf
- Blitz, M. (2012). *A case study comparison of school leadership practice against the Comprehensive Assessment of Leadership for Learning (CALL) pilot results*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Retrieved from http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/publications/workingpapers/WorkingPaper_No_2012_05.pdf
- Center for Creative Leadership. (n.d.). *Leadership development program*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccl.org/leadership/programs/LDPOverview.aspx>
- Condon, C., & Clifford, M. (2010). *Measuring principal performance: How rigorous are commonly used principal performance assessment instruments?* (Quality School Leadership Brief). Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved from <http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/QSLBrief2.pdf>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008 as adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/EducationalLeadershipPolicyStandardsISLLC2008asAdoptedbytheNationalPolicyBoardforEducationalAdministration.html>
- Educational Impact. (2007). *360 degree leadership competencies and questions*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationalimpact.com/360assessment.html>
- Educational Impact. (2006). *Where do I start? Tips to help you administer the 360 degree assessment*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationalimpact.com/360assessment.html>
- Leadership and Learning Center. (2012). *Leadership Performance Matrix: A means for effective leadership evaluation and formative feedback for improvement*. Retrieved from <http://www.leadandlearn.com/services/leadership/teacher-and-leader-performance-evaluation-system>
- Marshall, K. (2011). *Principal evaluation rubrics*. Retrieved from <http://www.marshallmemo.com/articles/MarshallPrincipalEvalRubricsAug21,11.pdf>
- Marzano Center (Learning Sciences). (2012). *The Marzano School Leadership Model – Focused on instruction for whole school improvement*. Retrieved from <http://www.marzanocenter.com/Leadership-Evaluation>
- McREL. (2012). *McREL online teacher and principal evaluation systems*. Retrieved from <http://www.mcrel.org/evalsystems/>
- MyLearningPlan OASYS. (2012). *Integrating educator evaluation and professional development to support ongoing growth – Addressing state, district, and Race to the Top requirements*. Retrieved from <http://www.mylearningplan.com/Content/Home/oasys.html>
- New York State Education Department. (2012). *Guidance on New York State's annual professional performance review for teachers and principals to implement Education Law 3012-c and the commissioner's regulations*. New York, NY: Author. Retrieved from <http://engageny.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/APPR-Field-Guidance.pdf>
- Porter, A. C., Polikoff, M. S., Goldring, E. B., Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., & May, H. (2010). *Developing a psychometrically sound assessment of school leadership: The VAL-ED as a case study*. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46, 135.
- Porter, A. C., Polikoff, M. S., Goldring, E. B., Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., & May, H.

- (2011). Investigating the validity and reliability of the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education. *The Elementary School Journal*, 111(2), 281–313.
- Putnam County School District. (2012). *Evaluation systems for leadership personnel*. Palatka, FL: Author. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/putnamschools/docs/evaluation-leadership-personnel-2_01.
- Sanders, N. & Kearney, K. (2011 June). *A brief overview of principal evaluation literature: Implications for selecting evaluation models*. San Francisco, CA: California Comprehensive Assistance Center, WestEd. p. 3. Available at <http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/cs/smu/view/rs/26715>
- Stronge, J. (2013). *Principal evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Stronge, J., Richard, H. B., & Catano, N. (2008). *Qualities of effective principals*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Stronge, J., & Tonneson, V. (2012). *Evaluation framework*. Retrieved from <http://www.strongeandassociates.com/evaluation.html>.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning. Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org/products-and-services/products/product-listing/01_09/product-82.



730 Harrison Street

San Francisco, California 94107-1242

Tel: 415.565.3000 | Toll-Free: (1-877) 4-WestEd