



2015-2020

Leon LEADS Administrative Evaluation System



Rule 6A-5.030
Form AEST-2015
Effective Date: March 2016

Leon County Schools
Rocky Hanna, Superintendent
2015-2020

Table of Contents

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

Directions:

This document has been provided in Microsoft Word format for the convenience of the district. The order of the template shall not be rearranged. Each section offers specific directions, but does not limit the amount of space or information that can be added to fit the needs of the district. All submitted documents shall be titled and paginated. Where documentation or evidence is required, copies of the source document(s) (for example, rubrics, policies and procedures, observation instruments) shall be provided. Upon completion, the district shall email the template and required supporting documentation for submission to the address DistrictEvalSysEQ@fldoe.org.

****Modifications to an approved evaluation system may be made by the district at any time. A revised evaluation system shall be submitted for approval, in accordance with Rule 6A-5.030(3), F.A.C. The entire template shall be sent for the approval process.**

1. Performance of Students

The Student Performance Measure comprises 35% of all administrators' evaluations in Leon County Schools. The source of this student performance measure varies, including national and international assessments, state assessments, proficiency rates and growth data based on district, curricular, or teacher assessments.

Student Learning Objectives

Student learning objectives (SLOs) are based on data of the matched and qualified students assigned to a school and identify outcome measures of student learning. Where appropriate, baseline data is gathered from multiple sources including previous state assessment data, school level and classroom level assessments, as well as student performance on classwork during the first weeks of the school year. Each teacher meets with his or her administrator to discuss and develop goals based on this data. For those teachers with a national, international, or state assessment associated with the course, they are **required** to develop goals based on the outcome of their matched and qualified students on the corresponding assessment. The goals are aligned to the data and reflect all students and student groups assigned to the teacher. The teacher is expected to use these selected and approved assessments in measuring student proficiency and/or progress. The attainment of the student learning objectives is quantified and converted into the student performance measure reported on the administrator evaluation instrument based on the performance of the teachers.

Scoring Method and Calculation

The district-determined student performance measure for administrators is based on data from SLO targets met by teachers. See Appendix B for a list of courses and corresponding student performance measure. To convert Student Learning Objective data to student performance measures, a percentage of goal attainment will be calculated. Administrator performance will be assigned using quartiles. This percentage of Student Learning Objective (SLO) targets met will be used to assign each administrator a student performance measure score (1-4).

For all administrators, when available, we will include student performance data for at least three years, including the current year and the two years immediately preceding the current year. If less than the three most recent years of data are available, those years for which data are available will be used.

.....

2. School Leadership

School Leadership comprises 45% of all school administrators' evaluations in Leon County Schools.

The purpose of the evaluation system is to increase student learning by improving instructional practice and leadership within the learning environment. The Leon Educator Assessment and Development System (LEADS) is designed to assess the school administrator's performance in relation to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) and is based on the Marzano Framework for Effective Teaching.

The practices identified in the framework are strongly linked through research to increased student achievement (see Appendix F). An additional outcome goal of the system is for the administrator to use the evaluation to design a plan for professional growth (Deliberate Practice Plan). The designated supervisor will conduct the evaluation process in which the school administrator will actively participate through the use of reflection, presentation of artifacts, and deliberate practice.

The same core of effective strategies will be used by all evaluators for all school administrators. The strategies are captured as elements in an overall evaluation framework. The LEADS framework contains the following domains for School Leadership:

- Domain 1: Student Achievement
- Domain 2: Instructional Leadership
- Domain 3: Organizational Leadership
- Domain 4: Resource Allocation

The results of evaluations, along with student achievement data, will be used as the basis for School Improvement Plans and the District Improvement Plan.

Calculating the School Leadership Score – School Administrator

As mentioned previously, the School Leadership score equals 45% of a school administrator's overall evaluation. Within the School Leadership component, each domain is weighted according to the following percentages:

- Domain 1 Student Achievement
- Domain 2 Instructional Leadership
- Domain 3 Organizational Leadership
- Domain 4 Resource Allocation

All elements are averaged equally across all domains and combined for a final School Leadership score.

Alignment to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS)	
Domain/Standard	Evaluation Indicators
Domain 1: Student Achievement:	
1. Student Learning Results:	
Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's student learning goals.	
a. The school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula; and,	Effective school leaders achieve positive results on the school's student learning goals.
b. Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.	Effective school leaders achieve positive results on the school's student learning goals.
2. Student Learning As a Priority:	
Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success.	
a. Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning;	Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success.
b. Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning;	Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success.
c. Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students; and,	Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success.
d. Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.	Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success.
Domain 2: Instructional Leadership	
3. Instructional Plan Implementation:	
Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum and state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments.	
a. Implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C., through a common language of instruction;	Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs, and assessments.
b. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement;	Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs, and assessments.
c. Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance;	Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs, and assessments.
d. Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school; and,	Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional

	framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs, and assessments.
e. Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.	Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs, and assessments.
4. Faculty Development: Effective school leaders recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.	
a. Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan;	Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.
b. Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction;	Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.
c. Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served;	Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.
d. Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;	Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.
e. Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction; and,	Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.
f. Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.	Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.
5. Learning Environment: Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.	
a. Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy;	Effective school leaders structure and monitor a learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.
b. Recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning;	Effective school leaders structure and monitor a learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.
c. Promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students;	Effective school leaders structure and monitor a learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.
d. Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment;	Effective school leaders structure and monitor a learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.
e. Initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being; and,	Effective school leaders structure and monitor a learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.
f. Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.	Effective school leaders structure and monitor a learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.
Domain 3: Organizational Leadership	
6. Decision Making: Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data.	

a. Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency;	Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data.
b. Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions;	Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data.
c. Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed;	Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data.
d. Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate; and,	Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data.
e. Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.	Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data.
7. Leadership Development: Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization.	
a. Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders;	Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization.
b. Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders;	Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization.
c. Plans for succession management in key positions;	Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization.
d. Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning; and,	Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization.
e. Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders.	Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization.
8. School Management: Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.	
a. Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans;	Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.
b. Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization;	Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.
c. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development; and,	Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.

d. Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.	Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.
9. Communication: Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.	
a. Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders;	Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
b. Recognizes individuals for effective performance;	Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
c. Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community;	Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
d. Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school;	Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
e. Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.	Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
f. Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration; and,	Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
g. Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.	Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by

	building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.
Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior	
10. Professional and Ethical Behaviors:	
Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.	
a. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6A-10.080 and 6A-10.081, F.A.C.;	Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.
b. Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership;	Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.
c. Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community;	Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.
d. Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system;	Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.
e. Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it; and,	Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.
f. Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.	Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.

Procedures/Timelines

The designated supervisor of a school administrator is responsible for evaluating that administrator. The procedures for this process are as follows:

- a) On or before October 31, the designated supervisor will work collaboratively with the school administrator to develop a Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP), based on school data and individual principal needs, and to conduct the pre-appraisal conference (See Appendix C).
- b) During the year, the designated supervisor and other appropriate staff will work with the school administrator to provide technical assistance, as indicated by school data, individual needs identified during the pre-appraisal conference, and other needs as identified throughout the school year.
- c) For any school administrators with a Formal Improvement Plan (Appendix D) from the prior year, the designated supervisor and school administrator will work collaboratively to ensure that support is provided, as outlined in the plan, and to discuss progress.
- d) The designated supervisor will schedule at least one formal meeting between November 1 and April 1, which may include observations, discussions, or an interview with the school administrator to discuss progress toward meeting performance appraisal criteria. Unscheduled observations, discussions, and/or interviews may occur throughout the year.
- e) The final performance appraisal conference, to be completed by October 31 of each school year, will include: a rating of performance as measured by the performance appraisal summary and a review of the DPP. The pre-appraisal conference to develop plans for the upcoming year may be held at the same time.

- f) Based on documented evidence of need, a designated supervisor may make the decision that a performance appraisal conference can be held at any time during the school year.
- g) If a school administrator's overall performance appraisal rating is at needs improvement or unsatisfactory at any time during the school year, the designated supervisor will work collaboratively with the school administrator and other staff, as appropriate, to develop a Formal Improvement Plan. Ongoing support for improvement and feedback will be provided and additional performance appraisal conferences will be held as planned. Failure to improve, as outlined in the Formal Improvement Plan, will result in consequences outlined in the Formal Improvement Plan.

Within ten days of the performance appraisal conference resulting in a needs improvement or unsatisfactory rating, the school administrator may submit a written response to the designated director to be attached to the annual performance appraisal summary form.

.....

3. Other Indicators of Performance

In accordance with s. 1012.34(3)(a)4., F.S., Leon County Schools has chosen to add additional performance indicators to the Leon LEADS framework. For school administrators, Other Indicators of Performance will be evaluated using Domain 5: Professional Responsibilities from the School Administrator Leon LEADS framework (See Appendix E). Professional Responsibilities comprises 20% of all school administrators' evaluations in Leon County Schools, whether newly-hired or continuing with the district.

Domain 5 element ratings are earned through observations and all elements are averaged within the domain for a final Professional Responsibilities score based on the weighting described above.

.....

4. Summative Evaluation Score

A performance evaluation will be conducted for each employee at least once a year. This school administrator evaluation score will have a cut score of zero.

Prior to the end of the school year and in accordance with Local Education Agency (LEA) timelines, the designated supervisor shall conduct a summary evaluation conference with the school administrator. During the summary evaluation conference, the designated supervisor and school administrator shall discuss the administrator's Deliberate Practice Plan, the components of the Leon LEADS process, the school grade, state assessment results, artifacts submitted or collected during the evaluation process, and other evidence of the administrator's performance on the Leon LEADS Learning Map. (See Appendix E)

At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the designated supervisor shall:

- A. Examine all sources of evidence for each of the four domains as they apply to the administrator's School Leadership score within the Leon LEADS platform.
- B. Examine all sources of evidence for Domain 5 as they apply to the administrator's Professional Responsibilities score (Other Indicators of Performance) within the Leon LEADS platform.
- C. Review school student achievement data and SLO data.
- D. The evaluation may be amended based on achievement data that becomes available within 90 days of the end of the school year.
- E. Review the overall evaluation with the administrator, sign the form, and obtain the signature of the administrator. *A signature indicates acknowledgement, not agreement with the contents of the evaluation. Should an administrator wish to initiate a written response to the evaluation, it must be submitted to Human Resources to become a permanent attachment to his or her personnel file.*

Scoring Method

The school administrator summative evaluation score is comprised of three parts: School Leadership, Student Performance Measures, and Professional Responsibilities. The weighting of each component is as follows:

- School Leadership = 45%
- Student Performance Measures = 35%
- Professional Responsibilities = 20%

Within the School Leadership component, all elements are averaged equally across all domains and combined for a final score.

The Student Performance Measures score is calculated by the percentage of Student Learning Objectives met, using the average of up to three (3) years of SPM scores when appropriate and available per statute (s. 1012.34, F.S.).

The Professional Responsibilities score is determined by the administrators' ratings on the elements within Domain 5 Professional Responsibilities.

The final summative rating is then calculated using the weighting described above:

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{School Leadership} \times 0.45 \\ \text{Student Performance Measures} \times 0.35 \\ \hline + \text{Professional Responsibilities} \times 0.20 \\ \hline \text{Summative Evaluation Score} \end{array}$$

A corresponding final rating is then applied to the summative evaluation score. The four final rating categories are:

- **Highly Effective** – School administrator consistently and significantly exceeded the standard(s) of performance
- **Effective** – School administrator exceeded or demonstrated the standard(s) of performance most of the time
- **Needs Improvement or Developing (first three years of teaching)** – School administrator demonstrated adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) of performance, but did not demonstrate competence on all standards of performance
- **Unsatisfactory** – School administrator did not demonstrate competence on or adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) of performance.

Final rating categories are determined based on the following scale:

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (4)	EFFECTIVE (3)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT/DEVELOPING (2)	UNSATISFACTORY (1)
Overall Final Score of 3.35 – 4.0	Overall Final Score of 2.35 – 3.349	Overall Final Score of 1.35 – 2.349	Overall Final Score of 0 – 1.349

5. Additional Requirements

Roster Verification

The roster verification process is one of the most important factors in ensuring that **student** data is accurate. Each administrator is expected to ensure that the process as defined in Leon County Schools is executed accurately and in a timely manner. Administrators receive training on this process to ensure consistency. Since ~~VAM~~ Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) are based on the students assigned to an administrator's school as reported to DOE for Survey 2 (October FTE) and Survey 3 (February FTE), the roster verification process gives administrators and teachers the opportunity to ensure that the proper students are assigned to the school for calculation purposes.

As aforementioned, FLDOE matches students between Survey 2 (October FTE) and Survey 3 (February FTE) at the district and school levels, this matching process does not take into account any changes at the teacher and/or course levels. LCS recognizes the value of including changes at the teacher and/or course level so that rosters reflect the most accurate list of students for the school. This additional level of roster verification allows teachers and administrators to personally certify that the students included in the student performance measure portion of their evaluation should be included.

In order for teachers to verify the accuracy of their rosters at the teacher and/or course level, Technology & Information Systems (TIS) prints rosters for **all** teachers for every school, based on the FTE Submission Files. Administrators and teachers are expected to complete the following steps in the process:

1. School administrators are provided Matched Rosters to teachers.
2. If the teacher agrees that all students on the Matched Roster for their course(s) is accurate, he/she signs the roster and returns it to the administrator.
3. If the teacher identifies changes that should be made (i.e. removing a student or adding a student) to the roster, the teacher discusses the proposed change(s) with the administrator. If the change is approved by the administrator, he/she completes the Change Request Form with the requested information and submits it to TIS for processing.

Once TIS receives the completed Change Request Forms from school administrators, they process the changes (additions and deletions) in the Roster Verification Tool during the FLDOE open window.

In early June, roster verification concludes with the End of the Year files process. At this time, FLDOE sends EOY files from RVTool surveys 2 and 3 with flags preset for matching at the district and school levels for all schools. TIS edits the files by setting corresponding flags to "No" for students not matched at the teacher/course level. TIS then validates the outcomes of the teacher/course level matching to determine if the process as described above has successfully matched teachers with the students that the teachers have confirmed should be counted toward their SLO calculation.

Training

The designated supervisors for school administrators are the secondary and elementary Directors. They are responsible for the evaluation of all LCS school administrators. Before participating in the evaluation process, the designated supervisors are trained on the evaluation process and platform through the

Department of Professional Learning. They conduct formative and summative reviews for the evaluation process at least once per year, providing immediate feedback to the school administrator. The designated supervisors also lead Professional Learning Community meetings monthly with school administrators to discuss instructional leadership and practice. Supervisors oversee school administrators' participation in learning walks where they discuss instructional methods to improve student achievement throughout the year.

The Leon LEADS School Administrator Evaluation is presented to all LCS administrators during an administrator's meeting at the beginning of the school year. At this time, administrators are informed on evaluation criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the Leon LEADS evaluation plan.

Professional Development Plans

Evaluation results will be used to inform individual professional development. School administrators will develop Deliberate Practice Plans using individual data from the previous year's summative evaluation and school student achievement data.

Deliberate practice is a way for administrators to improve student learning outcomes by growing their expertise through a series of planned action steps, reflections, and collaboration. The Deliberate Practice Plan includes: identifying student learning objectives, targeting elements for growth in instructional leadership to support student achievement, focused feedback, progress monitoring, and observing/discussing teaching.

Formal Improvement Plan

A school administrator shall be placed on a Formal Improvement Plan whenever he or she:

- A. Is rated "Developing" or lower on the School Leadership component of the evaluation; and
- B. Is not recommended for dismissal, demotion, or non-reappointment.

A Formal Improvement Plan shall, at a minimum, identify the leadership strategies to be improved, the goals to be accomplished, and the activities the administrator should undertake to achieve proficiency. It must also include a timeline for achieving proficiency within one school year or shorter, as determined by the LEA.

See Appendix D.

Parental Involvement

As per Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)9., F.A.C., the evaluation system must include a mechanism to give parents an opportunity to provide input into performance assessments when appropriate. The Leon LEADS School Administrator Evaluation System provides this opportunity through three avenues:

- The Leon County School District Annual Climate Survey,
- Presentation to various stakeholder groups, such as District Advisory Council, and
- 360 surveys provided to various stakeholder groups, including parents, teachers, and staff.

Annual Review by District

A formal review will be conducted annually to determine the compliance of the district in implementing the School Administrator Evaluation Process with fidelity. The review will focus on the aspects of the system that support improvements in leadership, instruction, and student learning. In addition, the School Administrator Evaluation Committee meets regularly to ensure consistency in implementation and address any issues that arise throughout the year.

.....

6. District Evaluation Procedures

Employees, the Department of Human Resources, and the Superintendent have access to the Leon LEADS system to review all evaluations. Evaluators meet with employees individually to review and discuss their evaluations report. The summative evaluation report is provided to employees no later than 10 days after the evaluation is finalized. At this time, any notification of unsatisfactory performance is provided to the employee. Should an employee wish to initiate a written response to the evaluation, it must be submitted to Human Resources to become a permanent attachment to his or her personnel file.

A school administrator shall be placed on a Formal Improvement Plan whenever he or she:

- A. Is rated “Developing” or lower on the Instructional Practice component of the evaluation; and
- B. Is not recommended for dismissal, demotion, or non-reappointment.

An Instructional Support Plan shall, at a minimum, identify the leadership strategies to be improved, the goals to be accomplished, and the activities the school administrator should undertake to achieve proficiency. It must also include a timeline for achieving proficiency within one school year or shorter, as determined by the LEA.

DOE is notified annually of all LCS final evaluation ratings, including those who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

.....

7. District Self-Monitoring

LCS uses the Leon LEADS evaluation platform to conduct and monitor all evaluations and correlating observations of school leadership. Before participating in the evaluation process, designated supervisors must complete training on the evaluation platform, district policies and procedures, and process.

The designated supervisors meet regularly to discuss employee performance, appropriate ratings, and evidence to ensure to ensure evaluator accuracy and reliability. In addition, the designated supervisors divide school administrators into cadres of learners. These fifteen cadres function as professional learning communities that meet five times during the year. The purpose of these PLCs is to deepen the understanding of instructional leadership through learning walks and learning strategies discussion.

Leon LEADS provides reporting capability that allows the district to monitor timely feedback to school administrators that have been evaluated. Data extracted from Leon LEADS is used to determine appropriate and timely professional development needs for administrators and is used to develop administrator Deliberate Practice Plans, and school and district improvement plans.

.....

Appendix A – Checklist for Approval

Performance of Students

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

For all school administrators:

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

For all school administrators confirmed the inclusion of student performance:

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

For all school administrators:

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

Instructional Leadership

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

For all school administrators:

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

For all school administrators:

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

For all school administrators:

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

Other Indicators of Performance

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

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

Summative Evaluation Score

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

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

Additional Requirements

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

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

Description of training programs:

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

Documented:

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

For school administrators:

- Inclusion of opportunities for parents to provide input into performance evaluations when the district determines such input is appropriate.
- Description of the district's criteria for inclusion of parental input.

- Description of manner of inclusion of parental input.
- Description of the district's peer assistance process, if any.
- Description of an opportunity for instructional personnel to provide input into a school administrator's evaluation, if any.

District Evaluation Procedures

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

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

District Self-Monitoring

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

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

Appendix B – Student Performance Measures

District Assessment Chart for Teacher Evaluation 2015-2016	
Subject/ Class	Assessment
Pre-K	SLOs based on assigned students
Kindergarten	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade	assigned student specific FSA based SLOs
Fourth Grade	assigned student specific FSA
Fifth Grade	assigned student specific FSA
Fifth Grade Science	assigned student specific FCAT based SLOs
Kindergarten Art	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Fourth Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Fifth Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Kindergarten Music	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Fourth Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Fifth Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Kindergarten PE	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Fourth Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Fifth Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Sixth Grade Math	assigned student specific FSA
Sixth Grade Language Arts	assigned student specific FSA
Sixth Grade Social Studies	SLOs based on assigned students
Sixth Grade Science	SLOs based on assigned students
Seventh Grade Math	assigned student specific FSA
Seventh Grade Language Arts	assigned student specific FSA
Civics	assigned student specific EOC based SLOs
Seventh Grade Science	SLOs based on assigned students
Eighth Grade Math	assigned student specific FSA
Eighth Grade Language Arts	assigned student specific FSA

Eighth Grade Social Studies	SLOs based on assigned students
Eighth Grade Science	assigned student specific FCAT based SLOs
MS Art	SLOs based on assigned students
MS Music	SLOs based on assigned students
MS PE	SLOs based on assigned students
MS Home Economics	SLOs based on assigned students
MS Technology	SLOs based on assigned students
MS AVID	SLOs based on assigned students
Algebra 1	assigned student specific FSA/EOC
Geometry	SLOs based assigned student specific EOC
Biology	SLOs based assigned student specific EOC
Ninth Grade Language Arts/Reading	assigned student specific FSA
Tenth Grade Language Arts/Reading	assigned student specific FSA
Grade 11 Language Arts/Reading	assigned student specific FSA
US History	SLOs based on assigned student specific EOC
AP courses	AP exams
IB courses	IB exams
9-12 Math	SLOs based on assigned students
12 Language Arts/Reading	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Social Studies (excluding US History)	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Science	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Art	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Music	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 PE	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Culinary Arts	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Business/ Technology	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 AVID	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Carpentry	SLOs based on assigned students
Guidance Counselors	SLOs based on job functions
Media Specialists	SLOs based on job function/ assigned students
Academic Coaches	SLOs based on job function/ assigned students
Graduation Coach	SLOs based on job functions
Dean	SLOs based on job functions

Student Learning Objectives are calculated based on a percentage of attainment. The percentages are as follows:

Percentage of SLOs Met	SPM Score
75-100%	Highly Effective (4)
50-74%	Effective (3)
25-49%	Developing/Needs Improvement (2)
0-24%	Unsatisfactory (1)

Advanced Placement

LCS has established a “2” as the cut score for all AP exams. The global pass rate for each course establishes the cut score for a 4 (Exception: Spanish Language and Literature. For these courses, the Florida rate is used because it is higher than the global rate.)

A rate of 26% establishes the cut score for a 3.

A rate of 10% establishes the cut score for a 2.

ExamCode	ExamTitle	1	2	3	4
31	Computer Science A	0-9	10-25	26-63	64-100
55	German Language	0-9	10-25	26-66	67-100
58	Compare Gov & Politics	0-9	10-25	26-59	60-100
64	Japanese Lang & Culture	0-9	10-25	26-75	76-100
15	Art: Studio Art-2-D Desig	0-9	10-25	26-71	72-100
16	Art: Studio Art-3-D Desig	0-9	10-25	26-61	62-100
14	Art: Studio Art-Drawing	0-9	10-25	26-71	72-100
20	Biology	0-9	10-25	26-50	51-100
66	Calculus AB	0-9	10-25	26-55	56-100
68	Calculus BC	0-9	10-25	26-79	80-100
25	Chemistry	0-9	10-25	26-54	55-100
28	Chinese Language	0-9	10-25	26-94	95-100
35	Economics: Macroeconomics	0-9	10-25	26-53	54-100
36	English Language & Compos	0-9	10-25	26-60	61-100
37	English Literature & Comp	0-9	10-25	26-56	57-100
40	Environmental Science	0-9	10-25	26-48	49-100
43	European History	0-9	10-25	26-64	65-100
48	French Language	0-9	10-25	26-57	58-100
57	Government & Politics: Un	0-9	10-25	26-51	52-100
13	History of Art	0-9	10-25	26-57	58-100
53	Human Geography	0-9	10-25	26-50	51-100
60	Latin: Vergil	0-9	10-25	26-63	64-100
75	Music Theory	0-9	10-25	26-58	59-100
78	Physics B	0-9	10-25	26-61	62-100
82	Physics C - Electricity &	0-9	10-25	26-70	71-100
80	Physics C - Mechanics	0-9	10-25	26-72	73-100
85	Psychology	0-9	10-25	26-54	55-100
87	Spanish Language	0-9	10-25	26-74	75-100
89	Spanish Literature	0-9	10-25	26-66	67-100
90	Statistics	0-9	10-25	26-58	59-100
7	United States History	0-9	10-25	26-52	53-100
93	World History	0-9	10-25	26-47	48-100

83	Physics 1	0-9	10-19	20-38	39-100
84	Physics 2	0-9	10-19	20-38	39-100

International Baccalaureate

The chart below shows the range for IB cut scores with the following criteria:

- A 60% pass rate establishes the cut growth score for a 4.
- A 40% pass rate establishes the cut growth score for a 3.
- A 30% pass rate establishes the cut growth score for a 2.

IB Course	4	3	2	1
English A1 HL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
French B SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Latin HL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Latin SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Spanish AB, SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Spanish B HL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Spanish B SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Env. And Soc. SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Hist. Americas HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
History SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Philosophy HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Philosophy SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Psychology HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Psychology SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Chemistry HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Chemistry SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Math Studies SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Mathematics HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Mathematics SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Music HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Music SO.Perf. SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Visual Arts Option A HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Visual Arts Option A SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29

- IB subject exams are scored on a 1-7 scale. 4 is considered a passing score.
- In most cases, there is one teacher for two classes—the standard level and the higher level. Of the six exams, a minimum of three and maximum of four are taken at the higher level (after a minimum of 240 teaching hours) and the remaining two or three subjects are taken at standard level (after a minimum of 150 teaching hours). IB students are expected to take their examinations at the conclusion of the two-year Diploma Programme. However, the IB permits

students to take one or two standard level examinations at the end of the first year of the Diploma Programme. The remaining exams are taken at the conclusion of the second year of the Diploma Programme. Higher level exams can only be taken at the end of the second year. In many schools, all examinations are taken in the final year.

Appendix C – Deliberate Practice Plan

School Leadership Deliberate Practice Plan

School Leader's Name and Position: _____	
Evaluator's Name and Position: _____	
School Year: _____	
Date Growth Targets Approved: _____	
_____	_____
School Leader's Signature	Evaluator's Signature
Deliberate Practice Growth Target: Domain _____ Element _____	
Focus Element:	
Focus: What specific student learning or achievement outcomes are you trying to improve with in your school?	
Growth Goal: Describe what you expect to know or be able to do as a result of this professional learning effort.	
Plan of Action: A general description of how you will go about accomplishing the target.	
Notes	

School Leadership Deliberate Practice Plan- Follow Up

School Leader's Name and Position: _____	
Evaluator's Name and Position: _____	
School Year: _____ Deliberate Practice Growth Target: Domain _____ Element _____	
Evidence: List evidence toward meeting the growth target. <i>(Professional Development, Book Study, etc....)</i>	
Impact: What impact did your Deliberate Practice have on your Instructional / Operational Leadership?	
Growth Goal: What did you learn or improve as a result of this Deliberate Practice?	
Feedback: What did you learn from your parent/community feedback? Teacher/staff feedback? (360 survey, climate survey, etc....)	
Date: _____	
_____ School Leader's Signature	_____ Evaluator's Signature
Comments: 	

Appendix D – Formal Improvement Plan

**SCHOOL DISTRICT OF LEON COUNTY
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM**

FORMAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____ ACADEMIC YEAR _____

ASSIGNMENT _____ PERSON COMPLETING FORM _____

1. Description of performance that needs improvement or is unsatisfactory:

2. Improvement desired

3. Assistance to be provided

4. Prescribed time limits

5. Possible Consequences

6. Principal/Assistant Principal comments (optional)

EVALUATOR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

7. Final Review and Results

DATE REVIEWED _____ EVALUATOR INITIALS _____ SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR INITIALS _____

Appendix E – Learning Map

Domain 1 Student Achievement	Domain 2 Instructional Leadership	Domain 3 Organizational Leadership	Domain 4 Resource Allocation	Domain 5 Professional Responsibilities
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Student Learning Results. Effective school leaders achieve positive results on the school's student learning goals. Student Learning as a Priority. Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Plan Implementation. Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. Faculty Development. Effective school leaders recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff. Learning Environment. Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Decision Making. Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission, and improvement priorities using facts and data. Leadership Development. Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization. School Management. Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment. Communication. Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The administrator manages the fiscal resources of the school in a way that focuses on effective instruction, achievement of all students, and optimal school operations. The administrator ensures each school goal receives the appropriate district, school, and classroom support to help meet the needs of all students. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Professional and Ethical Behaviors. Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader. The administrator ensures that curricular initiatives at the school level adhere to federal, state, and district standards. The administrator seeks out mentorship and/or mentors peers and shares ideas and strategies. The administrator adheres to state and district policies and procedures. The administrator participates in state, district, and school initiatives.

Leon LEADS
 School Administrator
 Evaluation Framework
Revised Oct. 2015
Based on the Principal Leadership Standards adopted by FLDOE

Appendix F

CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH ON THE
SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

Reference List

Derived from Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., Livingston, D., (in press).
Supervising the art and science of teaching. Alexandria, VA. ASCD.

References

- Barton, P. E. (2006). Needed: Higher standards for accountability. *Educational Leadership*, 64(3), 28-31.
- Burke, P., & Krey, R. (2005). *Supervision: A guide to instructional leadership*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Tomas.
- Burke, P., Krey, R. (2005). *Supervision: A guide to instructional leadership* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Calandra, B., Brantley-Dias, L., Lee, J. K., & Fox, D. L. (2009, Fall). Using video editing to cultivate novice teachers' practice. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(1), 73-94.
- Charalambos, V., Michalinos, Z., & Chamberlain, R. (2004). The design of online learning communities: Critical issues. *Educational Media International*, 135-143.
- City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Power, C. (2010). New direction in teacher preparation. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8) 6-13.
- Coggs, J. G., Ott, A., & Lasagna, M. (2010). *Convergence and contradictions in teachers' perceptions of policy reform ideas*. (Retaining Teacher Talent, Report No. 3). Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates and New York: Public Agenda. Available: www.learningpt.org/expertise/educatorquality/genY/CommunicatingReform/index.php
- Cooper, H., Robinson, J. C., & Patall, E. A. (2006). Does homework improve academic achievement? A synthesis of research, 1987-2003. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(1), 1–62.
- Cronin, J., Dahlin, M., Adkins, D., & Gage, Kingsbury, G.G. (October, 2007). *The proficiency illusion*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute and the Northwest Evaluation Association. (available online at http://www.edexcellence.net/doc/The_Proficiency_Illusion.pdf)
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Teaching and the change wars: The professional hypothesis. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), *Change wars* (pp. 45–70). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- David, J. L. (2010). What research says about using value-added measures to evaluate teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8), 81-83.
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., & Koestner, R. (2001). The pervasive effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation: Response to Cameron (2001). *Review of Educational Research*, 71(1), 43–51.
- Downey, C. J, Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K., Jr. (2004). *The three-minute classroom walk-through: Changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K. Jr. (2004). *The three-minute classroom walk-through: Changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Karhanek, G. (2004). *Whatever it takes: How professional learning communities respond when kids don't learn*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2006). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R. & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Editorial Projects in Education (2009). *The Obama education plan: An education week guide*.
- Ericsson, A., Charness, N., Feltovich, P., & Hoffman, R. (Eds.). (2006). *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Charness, N. (1994). Expert performance: Its structure and acquisition. *American Psychologist*, 49(8), 725–747.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363–406.
- Evertson, C., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fehr, S. (2001, August). *The role of educational supervision in the United States public schools from 1970 to 2000 as reflected in the supervision literature*. Doctoral Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Foltos, L. (n.d.). Peer coaching: Changing classroom practice and enhancing student achievement. Retrieved March 25, 2010 from <http://www.psctl.org/tl/resources/peercoachinglf.pdf>
- Gijbels, D., Dochy, F., Van den Bossche, P., & Segers, M. (2005). Effects of problem-based learning: A meta-analysis from the angle of assessment. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(1), 27–61.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (2003). *Looking in classrooms* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Grossman, P., & Loeb, S. (2010). Learning from multiple routes. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8), 22-27.
- Haas, M. (2005). Teaching methods for secondary algebra: A meta-analysis of findings. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(642), 24–46.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.

- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Jackson, C. K. & Bruegmann, E. (2009). *Teaching students and teaching each other: The importance of peer learning for teachers*. NBER Working Paper Series. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Jaffe, R., Moir, E., Swanson, E. & Wheeler, G. (2006). E-mentoring for student success: Online mentoring and professional development for new science teachers. In C. Dede (Ed.), *Online professional development for teachers: Emerging models and methods*, pp. 89-116. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Kane, T. J. & Staiger, D. O. (2005). *Using imperfect information to identify effective teachers*. Los Angeles, CA: (unpublished paper) School of Public Affairs, University of California-Los Angeles. (Note that this is in Toch and Rothman (2008))
- King, S. E. (2008, Winter). Inspiring critical reflection in preservice teachers. *Physical Educator*, 65(1), 21-29.
- Kleinman, G. M. (2001). *Meeting the need for high quality teachers: E-learning solutions*. White paper distributed at the U.S. Department of Education Secretary's No Child Left Behind Leadership Summit, Newton, MA. Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC).
- Linden, D. E., Bittner, R. A., Muckli, L., Waltz, J. A., Kriegenkorte, N., Goebel, R., Singer, W., & Munk, M. H. (2003). Cortical capacity constraints for visual working memory: Dissociation of fMRI load effects in a fronto-parietal network. *Neuroimage*, 20(3), 1518–1530.
- Mahaffey, D., Lind, K., & Derse, L. (2005). Professional development plan: Educator toolkit. Milwaukee, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom assessment and grading that work*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom assessment and grading that work*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2009). Setting the record straight on “high yield” strategies. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(1), 30-37.
- Marzano, R. J. (2010). Developing expert teachers. In R. J. Marzano (Ed.), *On excellence in teaching* (pp. 213-246). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

- Marzano, R. J. (2010). *Formative assessment and standards-based grading*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- Marzano, R. J., & Brown, J. L. (2009). *A handbook for the Art and Science of Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., & Kendall, J. S. (2007). *The new taxonomy of educational objectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, J. J., & Pollack, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mayer, R. E. (2003). *Learning and instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, Prentice Hall.
- Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity. Providence, RI: The Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Retrieved March 25, 2010 from www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/Coaching.pdf
- Newby, T. J., Stepich, D. A., Lehman, J. D., Russell, J. D., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. (2011). *Educational technology for teaching and learning* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Reeve, J. (2006). Extrinsic rewards and inner motivation. In C. Evertson, C. M. Weinstein & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 645–664). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Reeves, D. B. (2008). *Reframing teacher leadership to improve your school*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rosaen, C. L., Lundeberg, M., Cooper, M., Fritzen, A., & Terpstra, M. (2008, September/October). Noticing noticing: How does investigation of video records change how teachers reflect on their experiences? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 347-360.
- Rosenshine, B. (2002). Converging findings on classroom instruction. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *School reform proposals: The research evidence*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Research Policy Unit. Retrieved June 2006 from <http://eps1.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPRU%202002-101/Chapter%2009-Rosenshine-Final.rtf>.

- Ross, J., & Bruce, C. (2007). Teacher self-assessment: A mechanism for facilitating professional growth. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 23(2), 146-159. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.035
- Sadoski, M., & Paivio, A. (2001). *Imagery and text: A dual coding theory of reading and writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (2006). Mathematics teaching and learning. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 479-510.
- Semadeni, J. (2010). When teachers drive their learning. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8), 66-69.
- Sewall, M. (2009, Fall). Transforming supervision: Using video elicitation to support preservice teacher-directed reflective conversations. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 18(2), 11-30.
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The wisdom of crowds: Why the many are smarter than the few and how collective wisdom shapes business, economics, societies, and nations*. New York: Doubleday.
- Thirunarayanan, M. O. (2004). National Board Certification for Teachers: A billion dollar hoax. *Teachers College Record*. Date published: February 10, 2004 <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 11266. Date accessed: 5/18/2010 5:10:20 PM.
- Toch, T. & Rothman, R. (January, 2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Washington, D.C.: Education Sector.
- Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Twadell, E. (2008). Win-win contract negotiation: Collective bargaining for student learning. In *The collaborative administrator: Working together as a professional learning community*, pp. 218-233. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- U.S. Department of Education (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education.
- Weinstein, R. S. (2002). *Reaching higher: The power of expectations in schooling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness*. Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project. (retrieved, August 27, 2009 from <http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect.pdf>)
- Wubbles, T., Brekelmans, M., & den Brok, P., & van Tartwijk, J. (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in the Netherlands. In C. Evertson & C. S.

Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 1161–1191). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255-316.