

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Title:** Principal and Teacher Evaluation Instrument State Level Ratings

**Type of Executive Summary:**

- Action
- Action on First Reading
- Discussion
- Information

**Policy Implications:**

- Constitution \_\_\_\_\_
- General Statute # \_\_\_\_\_
- SBE Policy # TCP-C-006
- SBE Policy Amendment
- SBE Policy (New)
- APA # 16 NCAC 6C .0504
- APA Amendment
- APA (New)
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Jesse Dingle (Director, Talent Management and Development)

**Description:**

Based on the new standards for teachers and school executives a new evaluation instrument and evaluation policies were approved by the State Board of Education at the June 2008 meeting. Currently, ratings from these two instruments are not required to be collected by the State. Access by the SBE to these ratings would allow for further validation of these two instruments as well as provide quantitative-based research data that could help improve classroom instruction and school-based leadership.

**Resources:**

NA

**Input Process:**

The proposal is based on input from and conversations with representative stakeholders.

**Stakeholders:**

Assistant Principals, Principals, Superintendents, Teachers

**Timeline For Action:**

This item is being presented for Discussion at the May 2009 SBE meeting and will be brought back for Action at the June 2009 SBE meeting.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the State Board of Education identify and adopt a process whereby a random sample of principal ratings utilizing the North Carolina Principal Evaluation Instrument and a random sampling of teacher ratings utilizing the North Carolina Teacher Evaluation Instrument are collected and analyzed.

-----  
**Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:**

- Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)  
\_\_\_\_\_

-----  
Motion By: \_\_\_\_\_

Seconded By: \_\_\_\_\_

Vote: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain \_\_\_\_\_

Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_ Postponed \_\_\_\_\_ Revised \_\_\_\_\_

---

\*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Jesse Dingle (807-4007)

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Title:** Principal/Assistant Principal Evaluation Instrument

**Type of Executive Summary:**

- Action
- Action on First Reading
- Discussion
- Information

**Policy Implications:**

- Constitution \_\_\_\_\_
- General Statute # \_\_\_\_\_
- SBE Policy # \_\_\_\_\_
- SBE Policy Amendment
- SBE Policy (New)
- APA # \_\_\_\_\_
- APA Amendment
- APA (New)
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Presenter(s):** Dr. Jesse Dingle (Director, Talent Management and Development)

**Description:**

In May 2008 the State Board of Education adopted an evaluation instrument aligned to the School Executive Standards for School Executives: Principals and subsequently developed a policy for the evaluation process. At the time of the development of the principals' evaluation instrument, no such instrument was developed for assistant principals. Consequently, there is no evaluation instrument for Assistant Principals that is aligned with the new School Executive Standards. Adoption of an assistant principal evaluation instrument will require validation of a proposed or development of a new one. It is proposed that we allow McRel to perform the necessary steps to validate using the current principal evaluation for assistant principals. Adoption of the North Carolina Principal Evaluation Instrument for use with assistant principal evaluations would provide an instrument aligned with the Standards and suitable for Assistant Principal evaluations.

**Resources:**

NA

**Input Process:**

The proposal is based on input from and conversations with representative stakeholders.

**Stakeholders:**

Assistant Principals, Principals, Superintendents, Teachers

**Timeline For Action:**

This item is being discussed at the May 2009 SBE meeting and will return for Action at the June 2009 SBE meeting.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the SBE allow McRel to begin validation process to determine suitability of using principal evaluation instrument for evaluating assistant principals.

-----  
**Audiovisual equipment requested for the presentation:**

- Data Projector/Video (Videotape/DVD and/or Computer Data, Internet, Presentations-PowerPoint preferred)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Audio Requirements (computer or other, except for PA system which is provided)  
Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
  - Document Camera (for transparencies or paper documents – white paper preferred)  
\_\_\_\_\_
-

Motion By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Vote: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved \_\_\_\_\_

Seconded By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Abstain \_\_\_\_\_  
Postponed \_\_\_\_\_ Revised \_\_\_\_\_

---

\*Person responsible for SBE agenda materials and SBE policy updates: Linda Jones, 807-3914

## **Recommendation for Assistant Principals Evaluation Instrument and Process**

**Prepared for NC Twenty-first Century Professionals Committee**

**NC State Board of Education**

**April 23, 2009**

McREL has been asked to provide a recommendation about the best, most effective and scientifically sound, way to provide North Carolina's State Board of Education (SBE) and Department of Public Instruction (DPI) with a valid and reliable instrument and process through which to evaluate North Carolina's Assistant Principals. In late March, McREL recommended to Rebecca Garland and Jesse Dingle that a good way to complete this work would be to use the Principal Evaluation materials and validate them for use with Assistant Principals. This recommendation was made after much thought on the part of the McREL team and discussions with others in the field about whether this is a sound strategy.

During subsequent discussions with other DPI staff members, it has become clear that there are different viewpoints about this issue and how the Assistant Principals instrument should be developed, including the following:

1. A group of NC education leaders would develop a new instrument for Assistant Principals and McREL would conduct the validation study.
2. McREL would play an advisory role in the development of a new instrument for Assistant Principals using the same standards and elements as those for principals and McREL would validate the instrument based on data collected by DPI.
3. McREL would develop and validate, in collaboration with DPI and school district personnel a new instrument.
4. The existing Principal instrument would be validated for use with Assistant Principals.

While each of these approaches has merit, it is McREL's view that the most appropriate approach would be to validate the existing instrument for use with Assistant Principals. This recommendation is not made lightly, but rather after much thought and consideration of the following issues that impact the SBE's decision about how to move forward.

### **The Approved School Executive Standards Document:**

As approved by SBE, the *North Carolina Standards for School Executives* states that "The North Carolina School Executives Standards have been developed as a guide for principals and assistant principals as they continually reflect upon and improve their effectiveness as leaders throughout all of the stages of their careers. Although there are many influences on a school executive's development, these standards will serve

as an important tool for principals and assistant principals as they consider their growth and development as executives leading schools in the 21<sup>st</sup> century." It seems clear from language such as this that the intent of these standards was to treat the principals and assistant principals in similar ways, to hold them to the same standards and expect of them the same practices. If that is the case, then any activity that would involve making significant distinctions between expectations for Principals and Assistant Principals would be counter to the guidance provided by SBE.

### **Linkages with Higher Education**

Representatives of North Carolina's public and private higher education institutions provided invaluable guidance to the McREL team as a part of its development of the evaluation process for their Masters in School Administration (MSA) programs. These discussions and the work of these groups led to a rubric for graduates of these programs that are totally aligned with the rubric for principals. The linchpin of this work was the requirement that graduates of these programs are ready to be principals and that their performance in their masters programs be at least at the level of a developing principal. Setting this as the standard of performance for MSA graduates sets clear expectations that such graduates be ready to run a school. To change that approach now would send a clear message to higher education institutions that they need to rethink their previous work and now set a new set of expectations for graduates based on the assumptions that their graduates are not ready to run a school but rather to work under the supervision of the person who does so. It also sends a message to current and aspiring Assistant Principals that their job is less important than that of the Principal. This approach is counter to the language of the *North Carolina Standards for School Executives*.

### **Succession Planning**

With the number of principals who are expected to retire in the near future, it is critical to the success of North Carolina's schools that a large pool of educators with deep expertise in how to run a school be available to fill vacant positions. Holding Assistant Principals to a different set of expectations lessens the likelihood that they will be prepared to step in when the time is needed.

## Budget Options for Assistant Principals Evaluation Instrument

### Option 1: Revalidate the Principal Instrument for use with Assistant Principals

Summary Expenses			
Revalidate Principal Instrument for Assistant Principals			
	6/1/09 - 11/30/09	12/1/09- 6/30/10	
	2009 YEAR	2010 YEAR	Total Contract
Hours	306	358	664
Salary Expense	20,609	25,438	46,048
Travel Expense	2,722	5,716	8,437
Service Centers	6,550	8,028	14,578
Indirect	8,217	10,775	18,992
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>38,099</b>	<b>49,957</b>	<b>88,056</b>

The Service Center allocations include costs for temporary labor, postage, rent, equipment usage, telephone, print and publication, duplicating, supplies and other expenses. These costs are allocated based upon this project's percentage of effort.

### Option 2: Develop a New Instrument for Assistant Principals

Summary Expenses			
Develop and Validate New Assistant Principal Instrument			
	6/1/09 - 11/30/09	12/1/09 - 6/30/10	
	2009 YEAR	2010 YEAR	Total Contract
Hours	388	452	840
Salary Expense	34,157	42,139	76,296
Travel Expense	14,615	27,666	42,281
Consulting	18,000	18,000	36,000
Service Centers	8,289	10,154	18,442
Indirect	20,642	26,939	47,580
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>95,703</b>	<b>124,897</b>	<b>220,600</b>

The Service Center allocations include costs for temporary labor, postage, rent, equipment usage, telephone, print and publication, duplicating, supplies and other expenses. These costs are allocated based upon this project's percentage of effort.

Option 1 includes preparing directions for Assistant Principals to complete the evaluation process, send their evaluation materials to McREL, and have McREL staff members evaluate the validity of the process and instrument.

Option 2 involves a revision to the Assistant Principal document, conducting a pilot test and field test of the new materials, and conducting the validity study.

Please note that neither of these estimates includes training of any type. It is McREL's understanding that all training activities should be conducted by DPI.