

Measuring Principal Performance In Minnesota

A Report
A Model &
Recommendations

February 1, 2012

A report to the Minnesota Legislature
on a Model for Principal Evaluation

Submitted by

Minnesota Department of Education
Minnesota Elementary School Principals Association
Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals

Background

The Minnesota model for principal evaluation was developed in response to legislation passed in the 2011 Special Session. Provisions in legislation require that all principals be evaluated annually and set criteria to be met for both the substance and the process of the evaluation.

Legislation established a working group of stakeholders to develop a state model for principal evaluation. This model is not mandated but serves as a resource to be used by local districts that are mandated to develop and maintain a model. As prescribed in statute, the working group was jointly convened by the Commissioner of Education and the Executive Directors of the Minnesota Elementary Principals Association (MESPA) and Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals (MASSP).

Members

Membership on the Working Group consisted of parents, school administrators, school board members, teachers, higher education, other school employees, and public members. Membership was outlined in statute and supplemented by choices made by the commissioner, MESPA and MASSP. (See Appendix A) A planning committee selected the membership and drafted and revised a schedule for the meetings. (See Appendix B)

Meetings

The Working Group held seven meetings beginning on October 24, 2011. Most meetings were from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. although additional time was scheduled for two meetings.

A joint meeting with the Teacher Evaluation Work Group was held that focused on student assessment and longitudinal data. Following presentations on available data by Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) assessment staff, a panel of local and state assessment experts presented information and answered questions about the use of student and school data to inform decision-making related to evaluation.

The final meeting took place on January 23, 2012, at which time the report and model were adopted. Agendas for the meetings included numerous presentations and both small and large group discussions. The agendas were prepared and adjusted based on the availability of presenters and the progress of the committee. (See Appendix C)

Charge:

The charge to the working group was threefold.

First, the committee was to develop a performance-based system model for annually evaluating school principals that is consistent with and designed to implement the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, sections 123B.143, subdivision 1, clause (3), and 123B.147, subdivision 3, paragraph (b),

Secondly, the committee was to submit a written report to the education committees of the legislature by February 1, 2012. The report was to include all of the group's working papers discussing the responses to the model that was developed.

Finally, the committee was requested to make recommendations for a performance-based system model.

In addition to being consistent with statutory requirements, when developing the system model, the committee was to at least consider the principal's role in developing and maintaining the following:

- 1) high standards for student performance;
- 2) rigorous curriculum;
- 3) quality instruction;
- 4) a culture of learning and professional behavior;
- 5) connections to external communities;
- 6) systemic performance accountability; and
- 7) leadership behaviors that create effective schools and improve school performance, including how to plan for, implement, support, advocate for, communicate about, and monitor continuous and improved learning.

The Working Group had the option to consider a multi-tiered evaluation system that would:

- 1) support newly licensed principals
- 2) provide opportunities for advanced learning for more experienced school leaders.

(See Appendix D for copy of statutes)

Statutory Requirements:

Minnesota's principal evaluation requirements are contained in M.S. 123B.147.

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to enhance a principal's leadership skills and support and improve teaching practices, school performance, and student achievement. Although the Working Group was directed to develop a model for evaluation, statute clearly indicates that it is the responsibility of a district to develop and implement a performance-based system for annually evaluating school principals assigned to supervise a school building within the district.

The evaluation must be designed to improve teaching and learning by supporting the principal in shaping the school's professional environment and developing teacher quality, performance, and effectiveness.

Requirements

Specifications in statute require that the evaluation:

1. be an annual evaluation;
2. include formative and summative evaluations;
3. be consistent with the job description, a district's long-term plans and goals, and the principal's own professional multiyear growth plans and goals;
4. include on-the-job observations and previous evaluations;
5. allow surveys to help identify a principal's effectiveness, leadership skills and processes, and strengths and weaknesses;
6. use longitudinal data on student academic growth as an evaluation component;
7. incorporate district achievement goals and targets;
8. be linked to professional development that emphasizes improved teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, student learning, and a collaborative professional culture;
9. implement a plan to improve a principal's performance; and,
10. specify the procedure and consequence if the principal's performance is not improved.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Waiver Principles

In November, shortly after the Working Group started, the MDE submitted an NCLB waiver application. Principle 3 in the waiver application requires the MDE to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems. Several specific expectations are included as part of this requirement. As a result these requirements in the NCLB waiver principles were also discussed and considered. See Appendix E for these requirements.

Context

A growing body of research highlights the impact of a competent school leader on student performance. The old job of principal as administrative building manager is no longer sufficient and is giving way to new expectations. Today the key role for a principal is inspiring, supporting and developing teachers because they account for the largest share of a school's impact on student learning.

The recruitment, hiring, assignment and development of effective teachers is one of the essential roles for a principal. Although the skill of a teacher is key to a student's success, the principal is the person positioned to ensure consecutive years of effective teaching for a student.

A principal develops a strong learning environment in several ways. This is done by....

- 1) creating a culture of high expectations,
- 2) assuring a safe and nurturing climate,
- 3) facilitating teacher collaboration,
- 4) establishing the foundational data and instructional systems,
- 5) observing and giving feedback on teacher practice, and
- 6) ensuring targeted professional development.

A study commissioned by the Wallace Foundation found that successful principals have the skills to influence student achievement through two distinct means:

- 1) the support and development of effective teachers, and
- 2) the implementation of effective organizational processes.

Personal leadership that clearly communicates expectations, aspirations and values aligned to a shared mission is important in motivating students, staff and the school community. This needs to be coupled with planning and operations in a school that organizes time effectively and aligns financial and human resources to support student learning. Part of leadership includes involvement with creating, implementing, promoting and communicating the mission, vision and goals for the district and as well as the school.

The Working Group considered these and other traits of leader performance as well as the statutory requirements in developing the model that is part of this report.

Work Group Process

A wide variety of information was presented and discussed by the committee. The process began with meetings examining the specifics in statute, developing some common understandings about terminology and reviewing information about other models and their design. The committee repeatedly returned to the specifics in statute during the development of the model in order to ensure fidelity to the direction from the legislature.

Other Models

Most states are in the development stages of creating models for administrator performance review and evaluation. A few states and districts are in the implementation or piloting stages of the development process. There are also models being developed by organizations, colleges, individual districts and vendors throughout the nation. Several models or portions of models were reviewed by the committee.

In Minnesota, MESPA and MASSP in collaboration with the Minnesota Association of School Administrators (MASA) and the Board of School Administrators (BOSA) developed a model. This model was presented to the legislature during the 2011 session and reviewed by the Work Group at its first meeting.

At the second meeting four other state models were presented; some of these are completed and others are still in development. These included models from Iowa, Illinois, North Carolina and Massachusetts. In addition details of the requirements contained in the NCLB Waiver application were presented and discussed. The committee then took time to compare and contrast the five models in the context of a rubric of essential components.

Gathering information

To develop a richer perspective and a deeper understanding of current practices, research and development of models on a national level, the committee heard presentations by national experts. These included Ben Fenton, Chief Strategy Officer and Co-Founder for *New Leaders for New Schools* and Joni Henderson, Director for *Discovery Education Assessment* who presented information about the *Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-Ed)* process and model. VAL-Ed has received high ratings from reviewers because of its ability to quantify its performance ratings.

A presentation on the developmental work being done by the University of Minnesota's National Institute for School Leaders was given by Kent Pekel, its director. Finally, the legal implications related to evaluation practices and statutory discipline requirements were outlined by Roger Aronson, an attorney who represents Minnesota principals in disciplinary actions.

Structure of the Model

Minnesota's statute outlines nine components for the model that include several sub-components. The Work Group identified and addressed the components and sub-components that would, in its opinion, most appropriately be written into a state model.

Local District Decisions

Some of components and sub-components are appropriately the responsibility of the local district or are dependent on the outcomes of the evaluation itself.

For example it would be difficult to write a district's goals into the state model. Also prescribing developmental activities for a growth plan that are tied to insights gained as an outgrowth of the evaluation itself is appropriately a decision between the principal and the evaluator. As a result these are not part of the model but will be included as direction for the district. These areas as specified in statute include the following:

- 1) support to improve a principal's instructional leadership, organizational management, and professional development, and strengthen the principal's capacity in the areas of instruction, supervision, evaluation, and teacher development;
- 2) the principal's job description,
- 3) a district's long-term plans and goals,
- 4) the principal's own professional multiyear growth plans and goals, all of which must support the principal's leadership behaviors and practices, rigorous curriculum, school performance, and high-quality instruction;
- 5) professional development that emphasizes improved teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, student learning, and a collaborative professional culture,
- 6) a plan to improve the principal's performance and specify the procedure and consequence if the principal's performance is not improved.

Components of the state model

The recommended state model includes three major components. These three areas are noted in statute.

The first is the supervisory evaluation conducted by the superintendent, or a designee that has been appropriately trained. This is to include on-the-job observations and previous evaluations.

The second is school level performance data tied to established goals related to student outcomes. This relates the component in statute specifying the use of longitudinal data on student academic growth as an evaluation component incorporating district achievement goals and targets.

The third is the use of surveys and other feedback from teachers and other stakeholders. The surveys or feedback are to be designed to help identify a principal's effectiveness, leadership skills and processes, and strengths and weaknesses in exercising leadership in pursuit of school success.

These three areas when combined will determine a principal's summative evaluation and performance rating. This report and the model will address each of these areas.

Performance Levels

The Minnesota state model will contain four performance categories. These are *Accomplished*, *Distinguished*, *Proficient* and *Unsatisfactory*. A designation of *Developing* may be assigned to performance for a principal undertaking a new assignment or a principal in a probationary period. It may also apply if a

significant change has occurred in district goals, curricula, leadership, or strategic vision. This designation may apply to any of the four performance designations.

Performance Measures

Five Performance Measures were developed and adopted by the committee. These incorporate the concepts identified in statute as direction to the committee. They are as follows:

- 1) Establishes a Vision and Mission Focuses on Shared Goals and High Expectations.
- 2) Provides Instructional Leadership for High Student Academic Performance
- 3) Manages Human Resources for Quality Instruction and Professional Growth
- 4) Builds Professional and Ethical Relationships Through Collaboration and Effective Communication
- 5) Strategically Manages Resources for Systemic Performance Accountability

Indicators for Performance Measures

For each Performance Measure several indicators were assigned. To develop these indicators the committee studied a wide variety of indicators, sometimes called descriptors, from several sources. This included indicators from the Minnesota Principal's model, other states' models, suggestions from New Leaders for New Schools and VAL-Ed, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and other sources.

Starting with an extensive list of indicators the committee went through several revisions to narrow the original list to a final concise list of expectations tied to the Performance Measures. The original list and the revisions to that list can be found on the website in the list of committee meeting documents. (See Appendix F)

See Addendum A for the final list of Performance Measures and the Indicators that became part of into the model.

Rubrics & Evidences

Rubrics identifying the behaviors, understandings and actions that are necessary to determine the level of attainment for each indicator were identified. The rubrics are designed to support consistency of implementation and decision-making by an evaluator. They also help describe expectations for performance and can serve as a basis for developing growth plans.

Rubrics are to be based on clearly defined evidence and measures. A variety of evidences and artifacts may be used to demonstrate that a particular competency has been met in whole or in part. These evidences may consist of observations, student or staff data, activities, documents and/or feedback that are tangible proof or confirm the work of the principal and support the rating given on a competency. The measures used in the evaluation system should have strong correlation to the criteria being evaluated. Examples of evidences are provided as part of the model but local districts should supplement or substitute as appropriate.

A complete set of rubrics for each Performance Measure and the Indicators for that area are attached to the model. Suggested evidences are also listed with each rubric. It is recommended that the evaluator use the rubric in the evaluation.

Process for Evaluation

Integral to the model is the process for completing the evaluation. Although this model does not include a specific timeline the steps fall naturally within a yearly timeframe and each district will be encourage to implement as appropriate to its needs.

The evaluation process consists of eight steps.

1. Orientation on the process at which a complete set of materials are outlined and discussed.
2. Pre-Planning on the part of the principal and includes reflection, self-assessment and identification of priorities.
3. A goal-setting conference between the supervisor and principal to reach agreement goals and review the process.
4. An evidence collection period for the principal and the evaluator to gather information and for the supervisor to observe practice.
5. A mid-year supervisor review to provide ongoing and timely feedback.
6. An end-of-year summative review to assemble all summary information and conference to review and discuss.
7. Summative performance rating to complete the review and to be signed by both the principal and evaluator.
8. Development of a growth plan and/or implementation of consequences.

Details for the process are outlined in the model.

Component II: School Performance Measures

In addition to the supervisory evaluation (Component I), the model includes two additional components as outlined in statute.

Component II, as identified in statute, requires the use of longitudinal data on student academic growth. The State Model incorporates this through a goal-setting process. The principal is asked to set specific goals related to student achievement and school performance and is then evaluated on attainment of those goals during the evaluation period. The goal setting is done in collaboration with the evaluator.

Identified goals would include proficiency or growth measures using MCA scores along with other NCLB areas such as graduation rates and reducing achievement gaps. Goals in this area may be subject and subgroup specific. School Performance Measures may also use other student data points including such things as other assessments (NWEA, MAP, ACT, NAEP), course completion information, attendance, suspensions or disciplinary referrals.

Component III: Other Feedback Measures from Stakeholders

The third component in the model requires the use of feedback from other school community stakeholders. Multiple measures that seek information from student, parents, colleagues and staff are to be used to inform the evaluation. A survey is the most commonly used method of gathering this information.

Nationally two approaches are used. One is to develop an in-house model and the second is to select from a list of certified external instrument or instruments. There are several examples that are available and list of examples are attached to the model.

The state model requires that feedback from stakeholders on a principal's performance be part of the summative evaluation and that at a minimum teacher feedback is included. A district may choose to gather feedback from other stakeholders but is not required. It will be a local district determination as to the type of instrument used to gather this feedback.

Recommended Model

See Addendum A for a copy of the State Model developed by the committee.

Recommendations

1. Pilot this model in ten districts of various sizes to evaluate the effectiveness of the model and refine the model as needed.
2. Districts will be encouraged to establish and support a District Evaluation Committee to review the effectiveness, accuracy, fairness and consistency of decisions made in the evaluation model.
3. Clarify in statute that data on individual principals generated under this subdivision are personnel data under Minnesota Statute, section 13.43
4. The legislature assures the resources of time, financial support, and evaluation expertise necessary to maintain the quality of the evaluation model and its local implementation.
5. Develop a professional development model supporting the state principal evaluation process that is sustained, supported by resources, and based on adult learning principles. The model should include
 - a. An initial orientation to the evaluation process for principals who will be evaluated.
 - b. Initial professional development supporting evaluators.
 - c. Ongoing professional development for
 - d. evaluators that calibrates evaluations annually to ensure continued rigor for the evaluation process.
6. Provide additional time to further refine the draft rubrics.
7. Provide additional time to review and identify appropriate surveys to provide examples for districts.
8. Address the requirements in Principle 3 in the NCLB Waiver, if granted, to assure state is meeting expectations in the waiver.

Conclusion

Although the timeline for development of the Minnesota State Model for Principal Evaluation was relatively short (about four months) the committee feels it is a comprehensive model and meets the requirements established in statute. This is a recommended model for consideration by districts but not a mandated model. A district should feel free to modify and adjust to meet its unique needs as long as they maintain and implement the three core components in making any changes.

At the heart of any evaluation is the desire for an exemplary principal as the educational leader and cheerleader in all schools. Instructional and organizational decisions that improve student achievement and contribute to a school culture where students and staff feel valued, supported and inspired will leave a lingering impression and impact on all who were a part of it.

Appendix A: Members, Planning Committee, Staff

Working Group Members

Co-chairs

Ken Dragseth,
Higher Education Administrative Licensing
Coordinator, University of Minnesota

Jackie Magnuson;
MSBA; Chair of the Rosemount-Apple Valley School
Board; Teacher in Northfield

Members

David Adney, Principal
Minnetonka High School; Minnetonka

Barbara Klaas, Parents United;
Hopkins School Board Member

Gary Amoroso, Executive Director
Minnesota Association of School Administrators

JoAnn Knuth, Executive Director,
MN Association of Secondary School Principals.

Jim Bartholomew, Director,
Minnesota Business Partnership

David Krenz, Superintendent,
Austin Public Schools

Ruthe Batulis, Eagan; President,
Dakota County Regional Chamber of Commerce

Mary Kuperus, Education Assistant;
New London-Spicer.

Rosalie Blaylark, PTA; Minneapolis
District Parent Advisory Council

Corey Lunn, Superintendent,
Stillwater Public Schools

Nomi Chial, Administrative Assistant
Shakopee High School

Mary Mackbee, Principal, St. Paul Central
MN Board of School Administrators

Kevin Donovan, MSBA;
Chair of the Mahtomedi School board

Diana McHenry, Middle School Teacher
Special Education, South Washington County.

John Hamann High School Principal, Underwood
MN State High School League

Nicholas J. Miller Associate Professor
St. Cloud State University

Kim Hartung, Hamline School of Education
Faculty Coordinator, Administrative Licensure,

Jon Millerhagen, Elementary Principal; Washburn
School, Bloomington

Greg Keith, Director of Teaching and Learning
East Metro Integration District

Trish Perry, Middle School Principal

New London-Spicer

Charlie Plumadore, Secondary teacher
Milaca Public Schools

Christopher Orr, Manager, Government Affairs,
MinnCan, St. Paul

Joe Rossow, Elementary Principal,
Dowling School, Minneapolis Public Schools

P. Fred Storti, Executive Director
MN Elementary School Principals Association

Diane Thompson, Elementary teacher;
West St. Paul Public Schools

Greg Vandal, Education Consultant
Vox Liberi, Sauk Rapids

Ex Officio Legislative Members:

Senator Terri Bonoff, Minnetonka SD #43
Senate Education Committee

Senator Carla Nelson, Rochester SD30
Senate Education Committee

Representative Dan Fabian, District 1A
House Education Committee

Representative Sandra Peterson, New Hope Dist.
45A : House Education Committee

Planning Committee

Gary Amoroso, Executive Director
Minnesota Association of School Administrators

Roger Aronson, Attorney / Lobbyist
Representing MASSP & MESPA

Rose Hermodson, Assistant Commissioner
Minnesota Department of Education

JoAnn Knuth, Executive Director,
MN Association of Secondary School Principals.

Stan Mack, Executive Director
Minnesota Board of School Administrators (BOSA)

P. Fred Storti, Executive Director
MN Elementary School Principals Association

Staff

Bobbie Burnham, Program Manager
Minnesota Department of Education

Deborah Leudtke, School Support Supervisor
Minnesota Department of Education

Appendix B: Working Group Schedule

Monday, October 24 1:00 – 4:00 TIES Snelling Room

- Introductions
- Charge to the group
- Review of legislation
- Presentations by MESPA, MASSP and BOSA of Work Completed
- Next Steps
- Set Calendar and Adjust agenda for future meetings

Monday, November 7 1:00 – 4:00 TIES Snelling Room

- Review of information at federal level-NCLB Waiver Principles
- Review of models from state and national sources (NC, IL, IA & Other)
- Compare and contrast models
- Set calendar and adjust agendas for upcoming meetings

Monday, November 14 1:00 – 4:00 TIES Snelling Room

- Presentation: MN Principals Academy
- Presentation: New Leaders for New Schools
- Terminology & structure of model
- Begin development of model, recommendations & report
- Issues: **Proficiency categories & Core Competencies**
- Set calendar and agendas for upcoming meetings

Monday, December 5 1:00 – 4:00 TIES Snelling Room

- Presentation by Val-Ed
- Legal Implications
- Continue development of model, recommendations & report
- Issues: **Indicators/Descriptors; Evidences**
- Set calendar and agendas for upcoming meeting

Monday, December 12 11:30 – 4:30 TIES Snelling Room

- Prepare and discuss questions for January meeting on assessment
- Continue development of model, recommendations & report
- Issues: **Timelines, process, forms & developmental expectations**

Thursday, January 19 1:00 – 3:30 MDE CC B Rooms 15 & 16

- Joint meeting with teacher evaluation working group on issues related to assessment and longitudinal data

Separate Meeting for Work Group 3:30 to 5:00

- Review outline of draft report, discussion and revisions of model.
- Complete discussion of outstanding issues

Monday, January 23 1:00 – 4:00 TIES Snelling Room

- Review and Adopt Model and Final Report to Legislature
- Develop recommendations

Appendix C: Agendas for meetings

October 24, 2011

- 1:00** **Introductions:** Co-Chairs Jackie Magnuson & Ken Dragseth
- Goals
 - Assumptions
 - Vision
- 1:30** **Review of Charge to Group:** Rose Hermodson
- Develop a performance-based system model
 - Submit a written report by February 1, 2012
 - Make recommendations
- 1:45** **Review of legislation:** Roger Aronson & Rose Hermodson
- Consideration in 123B.147 Clarification of issues
 - Working Group Direction in Statute
 - Interaction of language
 - What needs to be clarified
 - Outstanding issues
 - Common understandings
- 2:30** **Break**
- 2:45** **Presentation by BOSA, MESPA & MASSP of organizations' evaluation model**
Fred Storti, JoAnn Knuth & Stan Mack
- 3:45** **Next Steps**
- Agenda items
 - Set calendars
- 3:55** **Housekeeping Items: Mileage, etc.**
- 4:00** **Adjourn**

November 7, 2011

- 1:00** **Introductions:** Co-Chairs Jackie Magnuson & Ken Dragseth
- Overview of agenda
- 1:05** **NCLB Waiver Overview:** Sam Kramer MDE
- Actions Needed for ESEA Flexibility
 - Questions being addressed by Waiver Group
- 1:30** **Waiver requirements related to Principal Evaluation:** Bobbie Burnham MDE
- Old focus vs. New focus
 - Timeline for implementation
 - Requirements for waiver
 - Outstanding issues
- 2:00** **Review other state models NC & IA**
- Fred Storti & Gary Amoroso
- 2:30** **Break**
- 2:45** **Review of other state models IL & MA**
- Stan Mack & Bobbie Burnham
- 3:15** **Compare and Contrast with MN model and Waiver Requirements**
- Small group discussion: Bobbie Burnham and Rose Hermodson
 - Reporting out
- 3:55** **Next Steps**
- Agenda items
 - Set calendars
 - Housekeeping, Mileage, etc.
- 4:00** **Adjourn**

November 14, 2011

- 1:00** **Overview of agenda:** Co-Chairs Jackie Magnuson & Ken Dragseth
- 1:05** **National Institute for School Leaders:** Kent Pekel, University of Minnesota
- 1:30** **New Leaders for New Schools:** Ben Fenton, Chief Strategy Officer and Co-Founder
- Designing and implementing evaluation systems based on research around effective principal practices.
 - What is going on in other states and districts on principal evaluation.
 - Specific recommendations for designing principal standards for performance based on New Leaders research.
 - Review some existing principal evaluation instruments.
- 2:30** **Break**
- 2:45** **Terminology & Structure of Model**
- Charge to Group/Val-Ed Components
 - What needs clarification and defining
- 3:00** **Development of Model: Group Discussion and Decision**
- Group decision making process
 - Issue 1: Proficiency Categories
 - Issue 2: Core Competencies
- 3:55** **Next Steps**
- Calendar and agenda items
 - Housekeeping, Mileage, etc.
- 4:00** **Adjourn**

December 5, 2011

- 1:00** **Overview of agenda:** Co-Chairs Jackie Magnuson & Ken Dragseth
- 1:05** **Legal Implications:** Roger Aronson
- 1:30** **Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-Ed):**
Joni Henderson, Director, Discovery Education Assessment
- VAL-ED Standards
 - VAL-ED the instrument overview
 - Sample principal report
 - Sample district report
- 2:30** **Break**
- 2:45** **Development of Model: Group/Small Group Discussion**
- Proficiency Categories
 - Rubric for categories
- 3:00** **Development of Model: Group/Small Group Discussion**
- Core Competencies
 - Indicators for competencies
- 3:55** **Next Steps**
- Calendar and agenda items
 - Housekeeping, Mileage, etc.
- 4:00** **Adjourn**

December 12, 2011

- 11:30** **Overview of agenda:** Co-Chairs Jackie Magnuson & Ken Dragseth
- Group decision process
 - NCLB waiver requirements
- 11:45** **Decision # 1: Proficiency/Performance Levels:** Committee Process
- Number & Title of categories
- 12:00** **Decision # 2: Proficiency/Performance Levels:** Committee Process
- Rubric

- For each competency?
 - For each proficiency level?
- 12:30 Decision # 3: Refine Core Competencies:** Committee Process
- How many
 - Wording
- 1:00 Decisions # 4-11: Indicators for Core Competencies:** Committee Process
- Review of December 5th feedback
 - Selection of indicators for each competency
- 1:45 Break**
- 2:00 Timelines, Process and Forms:** Presentation, Bobbie Burnham, MDE Staff
- Group Discussion of Timelines, process and forms
 - Decision # 12-14
- 2:30 Decision # 15: Components of Model; Portions assigned to each area**
Commissioner Brenda Cassellius
- Student Outcomes; supervisory observations; surveys; other, etc
- 3:30 Develop Questions for January 19th meeting**
- Achievement
 - Growth
 - Longitudinal data
 - Other Data
- 4:00 Adjourn**

January 19, 2012 Joint meeting: Principal & Teacher Evaluation Work Groups

Agenda:

- 1:00 Overview of agenda:** Brenda Cassellius and Rose Hermodson
- NCLB waiver requirements updated—Sam Kramer
 - M.S. 120B.35 Student Academic Achievement and Growth
- 1:15 Assessment Data:** Jennifer Dugan, Assessment Director
- Definition and Understanding of Assessment Terms
 - Proficiency; What is measured; How calculated
 - Value Added/Growth; What is model; How determined
 - Achievement Gap
 - Graduations Rates
 - Formative and Summative Assessments; Industry standards
 - Validity & Reliability of assessments
- 2:00 Longitudinal Data:** Cathy Wagner
- What is available
 - Statutory items—State & Federal requirement
 - College and Career Readiness Courses in High School
 - Course Completion; Rigorous Coursework
 - Evaluation vs. accountability; How to use this data source
- 2:30 Break**
- 2:45 Reaction Panel**
- David Heistad, Assessment Director for Minneapolis Public Schools
 Dr. Lloyd Komatsu, Assessment & Evaluation Coordinator, Forest Lake Public Schools
 Mark Davidson, Professor of Educational Psychology, U of M Dept. of Education
 Mark Kelemen, New Leaders for New Schools (National Perspective)
- Issues:**
- Local Use of Assessment for Evaluation Models
 - School level measures (Principals/teachers)
 - Other local options (NWEA, ACT, etc.)

- Non-tested areas (Social Studies, Sciences, Industrial Tech, etc.)
 - K and lower grade levels where no MCAs
 - For specialist; Music, Phy. Ed, Art etc.
 - Others: Counselors; Media, Band, Psychologist, Social Workers, etc.

3:30 Adjourn Joint meeting

3:45 Convene Principal Meeting

Overview of agenda: Co-Chairs Jackie Magnuson & Ken Dragseth

Review of Model and Draft Report: Rose Hermodson & Bobbie Burnham

- Core Competencies
- Indicators
- Rubrics/Evidences
- Process

4:30 Decisions on Final Components of State Model;

- Portions assigned to each area
- Student Outcomes; supervisory observations; surveys; other, etc
- Develop Recommendations

5:30 Adjourn

January 23, 2012

1:00 Overview of agenda: Co-Chairs Jackie Magnuson & Ken Dragseth

1:15 Review and approval of final evaluation model

2:00 Review and approval of report

3:00 Review and approval of recommendations

4:00 Adjourn

Appendix D: Statutory Direction

2011 First Special Session: Chapter 11 Language on Principal Evaluation Working Group

Sec. 47. IMPLEMENTING A PERFORMANCE-BASED EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR PRINCIPALS.

(a) To implement the requirements of Minnesota Statutes, sections 123B.143, subdivision 1, clause (3), and 123B.147, subdivision 3, paragraph (b), the commissioner of education, the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Minnesota Association of Elementary School Principals must convene a group of recognized and qualified experts and interested stakeholders, including principals, superintendents, teachers, school board members, and parents, among other stakeholders, to develop a performance-based system model for annually evaluating school principals. In developing the system model, the group must at least consider how principals develop and maintain:

- (1) high standards for student performance;
- (2) rigorous curriculum;
- (3) quality instruction;
- (4) a culture of learning and professional behavior;
- (5) connections to external communities;
- (6) systemic performance accountability; and
- (7) leadership behaviors that create effective schools and improve school performance, including

how to plan for, implement, support, advocate for, communicate about, and monitor continuous and improved learning.

The group also may consider whether to establish a multi-tiered evaluation system that supports newly licensed principals in becoming highly skilled school leaders and provides opportunities for advanced learning for more experienced school leaders.

(b) The commissioner, the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Minnesota Association of Elementary School Principals must submit a written report and all the group's working papers to the education committees of the legislature by February 1, 2012, discussing the group's responses to paragraph (a) and its recommendations for a performance-based system model for annually evaluating school principals. The group convened under this section expires June 1, 2012.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This section is effective the day following final enactment and applies to principal evaluations beginning in the 2013-2014 school year and later.

Language in 123B.147

Sec. 22. Minnesota Statutes 2010, section 123B.147, subdivision 3, is amended to read:

Subd. 3. **Duties; evaluation.** (a) The principal shall provide administrative, supervisory, and instructional leadership services, under the supervision of the superintendent of schools of the district and ~~in accordance with~~ according to the policies, rules, and regulations of the school board of education, for the planning, management, operation, and evaluation of the education program of the building or buildings to which the principal is assigned.

(b) To enhance a principal's leadership skills and support and improve teaching practices, school performance, and student achievement, a district must develop and implement a performance-based system for annually evaluating school principals assigned to supervise a school building within the district. The evaluation must be designed to improve teaching and learning by supporting the principal in shaping the school's professional environment and developing teacher quality, performance, and effectiveness.

The annual evaluation must:

- (1) support and improve a principal's instructional leadership, organizational management, and professional development, and strengthen the principal's capacity in the areas of instruction, supervision, evaluation, and teacher development;
- (2) include formative and summative evaluations;
- (3) be consistent with a principal's job description, a district's long-term plans and goals, and the principal's own professional multiyear growth plans and goals, all of which must support the principal's leadership behaviors and practices, rigorous curriculum, school performance, and high-quality instruction;
- (4) include on-the-job observations and previous evaluations;
- (5) allow surveys to help identify a principal's effectiveness, leadership skills and processes, and strengths and weaknesses in exercising leadership in pursuit of school success;
- (6) use longitudinal data on student academic growth as an evaluation component and incorporate district achievement goals and targets;
- (7) be linked to professional development that emphasizes improved teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, student learning, and a collaborative professional culture; and
- (8) for principals not meeting standards of professional practice or other criteria under this subdivision, implement a plan to improve the principal's performance and specify the procedure and consequence if the principal's performance is not improved.

The provisions of this paragraph are intended to provide districts with sufficient flexibility to accommodate district needs and goals related to developing, supporting, and evaluating principals.

EFFECTIVE DATE. This section is effective for the 2013-2014 school year and later.

Appendix E: NCLB Waiver Requirements

Requirements related to principal evaluation that are part of the NCLB Waiver application are part of Principle #3 and are listed below:

Principle #3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership

3.A Develop and Adopt Guidelines for Local Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Supports Systems

Option A

If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide:

- i. the SEA's plan to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year;
- ii. a description of the process the SEA will use to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines; and
- iii. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 15).

- 3.B Provide the SEA's process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, including mechanisms to review, revise, and improve, high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA's adopted guidelines.

Appendix F: Website Papers/Working Group Documents.

Visit the Minnesota Department of Education website to view all the documents from the working group at the following:

<http://education.state.mn.us/MDE/Welcome/AdvBCT/PrincEvalWorkGroup/index.htm>

General Documents

[Meeting Schedule](#)

[Member Roster](#)

[Planning Committee](#)

Documents from October 24, 2011 Meeting:

Agenda

[10-24-11 Evaluation of Principals](#)

[10-24-11 Framework](#)

[10-24-11 Measuring Principal Effectiveness](#)

[10-24-11 Legislative Components](#)

[10-24-11 Statute](#)

Documents from November 7, 2011 Meeting

Agenda

[11-7-11 Supporting Effective Instruction Overview](#)

[11-7-11 Elementary and Secondary Education Act Flexibility](#)

[11-7-11 Flexibility Self Assessment](#)

[11-7-11 Elementary and Secondary Education Act Side by Side](#)

[11-7-11 Model - Breakthrough Framework - Massachusetts](#)

[11-7-11 Principal Evaluation Model - North Carolina](#)

[11-7-11 Principal Evaluation Model- Iowa](#)

[11-7-11 Principal Performance Review - Illinois](#)

Documents from November 14, 2011 Meeting

Agenda

[11-14-11 VAL-ED Principal Report Sample](#)

[11-14-11 Minnesota Principal Academy](#) by Kent Pekel

[11-14-11 Reporting Back](#) From November 7 meeting

[11-14-11 New Leaders](#) by Ben Fenton

[11-14-11 Core Competencies](#)

[11-14-11 Statute 2011](#)

[11-14-11 Proficiency Categories](#)

Documents from December 5, 2011 Meeting

Agenda

[12-5-11 Reporting Back](#)

[12-5-11 VAL-ED Standards](#)

[12-5-11 VAL-ED Overview Presentation](#)

[12-5-11 Sample District Report A-Z December 2010](#)

[12-5-11 New Leaders in Minnesota-Indicators List](#)

[12-5-11 Sample Principal Report A-Z May 2009](#)

[12-5-11 Reporting Back](#)

Documents from December 12, 2011 Meeting

Agenda

[12-12-11 Revised Core Competencies with Indicators Worksheet](#)

[12-12-11 Rubrics Timelines and Process Presentation](#)

[12-12-11 NCLB Waiver Language for Principal and Teacher Evaluation](#)

[12-12-11 Core Competencies](#)

[12-12-11 Feedback On Indicators List](#)

[12-12-11 Work Plan Presentation](#)

To be added

Documents from January 19, 2012 Meeting

Documents from January 23, 2012 Meeting