



2019-2020

## Employee Performance

Michigan

Dean Evaluation and  
Educator Effectiveness  
Guide

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## OVERVIEW

## EVALUATIONS

The process .....	1
Dean rubric .....	1
Calibration.....	1
Tips for delivering evaluations.....	2
Competencies.....	2
Performance rating levels and evaluation scale.....	3
Quality of student learning.....	3
Administrator reliability and validity process plan .....	3
Training.....	3

## EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

What it is.....	4
Ratings .....	4
What the ratings mean.....	4
How the ratings are calculated.....	4

## OVERVIEW

National Heritage Academies' (NHA) college readiness goal is to have 90% of students who have been with NHA for three or more years meeting or exceeding the college readiness thresholds in both Math and Reading. There are three preconditions to meet this goal: 1) achieve high student attendance, 2) achieve high teacher attendance, and 3) hire and retain teachers, deans, and principals above the talent threshold.

Employee performance plays an integral role in meeting the college readiness goal, and NHA wants to equip its employees to be successful. This guidebook provides information about performance, evaluations, and state educator effectiveness.

## EVALUATIONS

### The process

NHA deans are evaluated annually by their principal. The locally developed evaluation rubric uses components from Robert J. Marzano, Kim Marshall and Patrick Lencioni, internationally recognized experts in the area of administrator effectiveness and specializing in the design of administrator evaluations. Our dean evaluation rubric facilitates conversation around clear expectations for performance and fosters continuous development. The evaluation is just one component of a larger process that occurs throughout the year. This process includes:

One-on-one meetings (O3s)

Feedback from students, parents and teachers

Mid-year self-assessment

Professional development, goal setting, and progress monitoring (including professional development plans)

Conversations around continual improvement

Annual performance evaluation

Information from evaluations contribute to decisions regarding promotion, compensation and employment, in addition to providing a platform for ongoing conversation between principals and deans. The evaluation also informs professional development.

### Dean rubric

Positions assigned to the Dean rubric include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Dean
- Academic Intervention Coach
- Interim Dean

### Calibration

Calibration is important for all evaluators at your school. School leaders review the evaluation rubrics together to ensure that each rating on the rubric means the same thing to everyone. This increases rater reliability and consistency and helps drive performance results.

Prior to the start of school, deans also receive training on the evaluation rubric by approved trainers through NHA. All approved trainers are educators that have received in-depth training on NHA's evaluation rubrics.

### Tips for Delivering Evaluations

- Make the meeting face-to-face and schedule plenty of time in advance. Clearly explain the agenda and purpose of what will be done during the evaluation meeting.
- Provide sincere, positive feedback for good performance. Do not "sugarcoat" negative behaviors, but provide adjusting feedback on behaviors that should start, stop or continue.
- Use the performance measures on the rubric to determine evaluation ratings, NOT hunches or feelings.
- Schedule a separate time to discuss compensation.

**NOTE: An employee does NOT automatically go on a performance improvement plan (PIP) if he/she receives “Ineffective” or “Developing” ratings within his/her performance evaluation. The leader of the employee will determine the best way to address the growth opportunity.**

## Competencies

NHA dean evaluations have three competencies: (1) Lead Instructional Excellence, (2) Quality of Student Learning, and (3) Professional Accountabilities.

The annual performance evaluation will include:

Competencies		Indicators
LEAD INSTRUCTIONAL EXCELLENCE	Key Practice 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Master and Model</li> </ul>
	Key Practice 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team Culture</li> <li>Staff Leadership</li> <li>Relational Leader</li> <li>Culture of Feedback</li> </ul>
	Key Practice 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coaching Environment</li> <li>Coaching Approach</li> <li>Feedback</li> <li>Reflection and Goal Setting</li> </ul>
	Key Practice 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School Improvement Process</li> <li>Teacher Development</li> </ul>
	Key Practice 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drive Instruction and Student Growth</li> <li>Professional Development</li> </ul>
	Key Practice 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NHA and School Systems and Procedures</li> </ul>
Quality of Student Learning		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positive Impact on Oral Reading Fluency <u>or</u> Positive Impact on Student Learning <u>or</u> Positive Impact on M-Step Results*</li> <li>Positive Impact on Additional Student Growth Measures*</li> </ul>
Professional Accountabilities		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dependability</li> <li>Core Values</li> <li>Communication</li> <li>Teamwork</li> </ul>

*\*Dependent upon specific dean role*

## Performance rating levels and evaluation scale

Deans will receive one of the following performance ratings:

Ineffective	Developing	Effective	Exemplary
Below expected performance level	Approaching expected performance level	Meets expected performance level	Model to other staff and shares knowledge

The dean evaluation rubric has criterion-referenced progressions of performance expectations. When evaluating deans, principals will consider each dean individually and review the rubric beginning at the left “Ineffective” column and progressing to the right “Exemplary” column. Deans need to fulfill each performance measure in its entirety before progressing to the next level.

The Quality of Student Learning competency is weighted at 40% of the overall evaluation rating, which consists of two equal components: M-Step student growth percentiles (SGP) or Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) and additional evidence of student growth. The Lead Instructional Excellence and Professional Accountabilities competencies are each weighted at 30% of the overall evaluation rating. The evaluation scales and corresponding ratings are as follows:

Ineffective: 1.00 - 1.89

Developing: 1.90 - 2.49  
 Effective: 2.50 - 3.49  
 Exemplary: 3.50 - 4.00

## Quality of Student Learning

Ratings for the Quality of Student Learning competency are based on wing or schoolwide SGP, wing ORF, and/or additional evidence of student growth, depending on the dean role. The table below indicates the data used for each dean role:

All K-2 Deans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20% ORF results for wing</li> <li>• 20% additional student growth measures for wing</li> </ul>
First Year 3-5, 6-8, and Intervention Deans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40% student learning for wing</li> </ul>
2+ Year 3-5, 6-8, and Intervention Deans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20% schoolwide M-Step SGP</li> <li>• 20% additional student growth measures for wing</li> </ul>

## Administrator reliability and validity process plan

Beginning in 2015-2016, NHA developed a plan that demonstrates the reliability and validity of administrator evaluations. NHA developed a performance rubric for administrators built around a research-based model with core tenets from Robert J. Marzano, Kim Marshall and Patrick Lencioni. To ensure reliability and validity of implementation of the tool, all dean evaluators are required to participate in training and calibration at least once per year. This increases rater reliability and consistency and drives performance results.

## Training

NHA offers many opportunities for professional development to help attract, retain and grow our staff. All new deans participate in New Dean Summit, a multiday immersion program designed to ensure buy-in to the school's mission and vision, address specific curricular and instructional needs and provide training on the evaluation tool. Roberto Martinez, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Jaclyn Jeffrey, School Leadership Development Director, Elisa Gibbs, Curriculum and Instruction Manager and Melissa VanKlombenburg, School Leadership Development Specialist provide session trainings. Ongoing coaching and additional training throughout the year actively supports deans. NHA has developed a collection of effective, industry-leading practices and incorporated them into its college readiness goal. NHA partner schools implement these practices to build a common approach designed to generate outstanding academic results.

To supplement formal trainings, deans participate in additional school-based staff-development days provided by school level leaders and Curriculum and Instruction associates.

## EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

### What it is

Some states, including Michigan, have implemented annual educator effectiveness ratings. The purpose of the ratings is to ensure that school districts review administrator performance on a regular basis, allowing schools to refocus resources. In accordance with Michigan law, the ratings include two components: 1) student growth and assessment data, and 2) administrator performance evaluation rating.

### Ratings

The state of Michigan rates educator effectiveness using the following rating levels:

Highly Effective  
 Effective

Minimally Effective  
Ineffective

***NOTE: NHA's internal evaluation ratings of Exemplary, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective are in alignment with state standards.***

## **What the ratings mean**

Michigan law states that if an administrator receives an overall ineffective or minimally effective rating, he/she must receive an individual improvement plan. The state also mandates termination of an administrator if they receive an overall ineffective rating on three consecutive educator effectiveness scores. This requirement does not dismiss the district's policy regarding at-will employment.

## **How the ratings are calculated**

Michigan law requires that student growth and assessment data account for 40% of the educator effectiveness rating. The remaining 60% of the rating is based on the annual overall evaluation rating. To meet this legal requirement, the annual performance evaluation rating services as the educator effectiveness rating that is reported to the state.

***NOTE: Data may change due to NHA and/or state legislative updates.***

NHA will provide each administrator with his/her educator effectiveness rating at the time the annual performance evaluation is delivered to the administrator.

Each year, NHA reviews state educator effectiveness legislation to ensure we meet any updated state requirements.