



SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM

2023-2024

Purpose

Table of Contents

Part I: Evaluation System Overview..... 3

Part II: Evaluation System Requirements 3

Part III: Evaluation Procedures 5

Part IV: Evaluation Criteria 6

 A. Instructional Leadership 6

 B. Other Indicators of Performance 6

 C. Performance of Students..... 7

 D. Summative Rating Calculation..... 8

Appendix A – Evaluation Framework Crosswalks..... 10

Appendix B – Observation Instruments for School Administrators 10

Appendix C – Student Performance Measures 10

Appendix D – Summative Evaluation Forms 15

Part I: Evaluation System Overview

In Part I, the district shall describe the purpose and provide a high-level summary of the school administrator evaluation system.

The purpose of the school administrator evaluation system is to measure performance and growth in key operational and instructional standards within the framework, and to self-assess and guide professional practice.

Part II: Evaluation System Requirements

In Part II, the district shall provide assurance that its school administrator evaluation system meets each requirement established in section 1012.34, F.S., below by checking the respective box. School districts should be prepared to provide evidence of these assurances upon request.

System Framework

- The evaluation system framework is based on sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices.
- The observation instrument(s) to be used for school principals and assistant principals include indicators based on each of the role-specific descriptors of the Florida Educational Leadership Standards (FELS) adopted by the State Board of Education.

Training

- The district provides training programs and has processes that ensure:
 - Employees subject to an evaluation system are informed of the evaluation criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation before the evaluation takes place; and
 - Individuals with evaluation responsibilities and those who provide input toward evaluations understand the proper use of the evaluation criteria and procedures.

Data Inclusion and Reporting

- The district may provide opportunities for parents and instructional personnel to provide input into performance evaluations, when the district determines such input is appropriate.

Evaluation Procedures

- The district's system ensures all school administrators are evaluated at least once a year.
- The district's evaluation procedures comply with the following statutory requirements in accordance with section 1012.34, F.S.:
 - The evaluator must be the individual responsible for supervising the employee; the evaluator may consider input from other personnel trained on the evaluation system.
 - The evaluator must provide timely feedback to the employee that supports the improvement of professional skills.
 - The evaluator must submit a written report to the employee no later than 10 days after the evaluation takes place.

School Administrator Evaluation System

- The evaluator must discuss the written evaluation report with the employee.
- 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.
- The evaluator must submit a written report of the evaluation to the district school superintendent for the purpose of reviewing the employee's contract.
- The evaluator may amend an evaluation based upon assessment data from the current school year if the data becomes available within 90 days of the end of the school year.

Use of Results

- The district has procedures for how evaluation results will be used to inform the
 - Planning of professional development; and
 - Development of school and district improvement plans.
- The district's system ensures school administrators who have been evaluated as less than effective are required to participate in specific professional development programs, pursuant to section 1012.98(10), F.S.

Notifications

- The district has procedures for the notification of unsatisfactory performance that comply with the requirements outlined in section 1012.34(4), F.S.
- The district school superintendent shall annually notify the Department of Education of any school administrators who
 - Receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluation ratings; or
 - Are given written notice by the district of intent to terminate or not renew their employment, as outlined in section 1012.34(5), F.S.

District Self-Monitoring

- The district has a process for monitoring implementation of its evaluation system that enables it to determine the following:
 - Compliance with the requirements of section 1012.34, F.S., and Rule 6A-5.030, F.A.C.;
 - 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 the implementation of evaluation system(s);
 - Use of evaluation data to identify individual professional development; and,
 - Use of evaluation data to inform school and district improvement plans.

Part III: Evaluation Procedures

In Part III, the district shall provide the following information regarding the observation and evaluation of school administrators. The following tables are provided for convenience and may be customized to accommodate local evaluation procedures.

1. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(b), F.S., all personnel must be fully informed of the criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation process before the evaluation takes place. In the table below, describe when and how school administrators are informed of the criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation process.

Personnel Group	When Personnel are Informed	Method(s) of Informing
Assistant Principals	July- prior to opening of schools	Face to face leadership training meeting with all Assistant Principals and Principals
Principals	July – prior to opening of schools	Face to face leadership training meeting with all Assistant Principals and Principals

2. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a)3., F.S., evaluation criteria for instructional leadership must include indicators based upon each of the FELS adopted by the State Board of Education. In the table below, describe when and how evidence of demonstration of the FELS is collected.

Personnel Group	When Evidence is Collected	Method(s) of Collection
Assistant Principals	2 times per year	Through observation and documentation review aligned to the crosswalk with the school leader and recorded in the iObservation system
Principals	2 times per year	Through observation and documentation review aligned to the crosswalk with the school leader and recorded in the iObservation system

3. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a), F.S., a performance evaluation must be conducted for each employee at least once a year. In the table below, describe when and how many summative evaluations are conducted for school administrators.

Personnel Group	Number of Evaluations	When Evaluations Occur	When Evaluation Results are Communicated to Personnel
Assistant Principals	1	Formative observations/documentation collected throughout the year	All evaluation information is communicated with the employee by end of May
Principals	1	Formative observations/documentation collected throughout the year	All evaluation information is communicated with the employee by end of May

Part IV: Evaluation Criteria

A. Instructional Leadership

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding the instructional leadership data that will be included for school administrator evaluations.

1. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a)3., F.S., at least one-third of the evaluation must be based upon instructional leadership. In Collier County, instructional leadership accounts for 67% of the school administrator performance evaluation.
2. Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the instructional leadership rating for school administrators, including performance standards for differentiating performance.

The scoring process for the Marzano Focused School Leadership Evaluation Model is similar to how teachers are scored in the Focused Teacher Evaluation Model. The steps are as follows:

- a. Step one: rate the elements in each domain and find the average if there are multiple scores for each element.
- b. Step two: multiply the score for each element by the weight for the element (see chart in section D)
- c. Step three: add together weighted scores for a final status score for instructional practice.

B. Other Indicators of Performance

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding any other indicators of performance that will be included for school administrator evaluations.

1. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a)4., F.S., up to one-third of the evaluation may be based upon other indicators of performance. In Collier County, other indicators of performance account for 1% of the school administrator performance evaluation.
 - a. **Deliberate practice is included as part of the leadership practice score.**
 - b. **Administrators can earn an additional one (1) point out of 100 points (1%) on the final evaluation through his/her performance on deliberate practice.**
2. Description of additional performance indicators, if applicable.
 - a. **The scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(d), F.A.C.]. Each administrator will select two elements for inclusion in their deliberate practice plan. The administrator will receive a score based on demonstrated growth for the selected deliberate practice elements. For example, if the administrator moves from the Applying (3) level to the Innovating (4) level, they receive a score of 4. The final deliberate practice plan score is the average of the three scores provided. Each administrator can earn one (1) additional point out of 100 points for the deliberate practice plan.**
3. Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the other indicators of performance rating for school administrators, including performance standards for differentiating performance.

Scoring of the deliberate practice plan. The deliberate practice is an additive model and up to one point will be added to the final status score ((Growth Plan Score –

minimum possible score)/(Maximum possible score-Minimum possible score) = % of maximum score). Then multiply the percentage by 100 to calculate the bonus that is to be added to the instructional practice score.

C. Performance of Students

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding the student performance data that will be included for school administrator evaluations.

1. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a)1., F.S., at least one-third of the performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of student performance, as determined by each school district. This portion of the evaluation must include growth or achievement data of the administrator's school(s) over the course of at least three years. If less than three years of data are available, the years for which data are available must be used. Additionally, this proportion may be determined by administrative responsibilities. In Collier County, performance of students accounts for 33% of the school administrator performance evaluation.
2. Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the student performance rating for school administrators, including performance standards for differentiating performance.

See appendix C

School Administrator Evaluation System

D. Summative Rating Calculation

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding the calculation of summative evaluation ratings for school administrators.

1. Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the summative rating for school administrators, including performance standards for differentiating performance.

Evaluation Category and Definition	Domains/Forms	Weight	Frequency (formal, informal, walk-through)
School Leaders Definition: Principals and Assistant Principals	Instructional Practice	67	Minimum of one formal observation
	Domain I: A Data-Driven Focus on School Improvement	20	
	Domain II: Instruction of a Viable and Guaranteed Curriculum	30	
	Domain III: Continuous Development of Teachers and Staff	20	
	Domain IV: Community of Care and Collaboration	10	
	Domain V: Core Values	10	
	Domain VI: Resource Management	10	
	Student Growth	33	

Weighting of Evaluation Components:

- Leadership Practice – 67%
- Deliberate Practice/Growth Plans – additive up to 1pt
- Student Data – 33%

The scoring process for the Marzano Focused School Leadership Evaluation Model is as follows:

- Step one:** rate the elements in each domain and find the average if there are multiple scores for each element.
- Step two:** multiply the score for each element by the weight for the element (see above)
- Step three:** add together weighted scores for a final status score for instructional practice.
- Step four:** instructional practice is added with the deliberate practice additive point (if one is available) and student growth is added for a final summative score which is rounded to the nearest tenth.

The Leadership Practice Score will be added to the final growth score to determine the final leadership effectiveness score using the scale below:

Final Proficiency Levels
Highly Effective = 80 -100
Effective = 52 - 79.999
Needs Improvement = 26 - 51.999
Unsatisfactory = Lower than 26

School Administrator Evaluation System

2. Pursuant to section 1012.34(2)(e), F.S., the evaluation system for school administrators must differentiate across four levels of performance. Using the district’s calculation methods and cut scores described above in sections A – C, illustrate how an elementary principal and a high school assistant principal can earn a highly effective and an unsatisfactory summative performance rating respectively.

Domains/Forms	Weight	Elementary Principal		High School AP	
		Highly Effective	Unsatisfactory	Highly Effective	Unsatisfactory
Instructional Practice	67	63.65	16.75	56.95	16.75
Domain I: A Data-Driven Focus on School Improvement	20	Element Average of 4 = $(67*(4/4(.2))) = 13.4$	Element Average of 1 = $(67*(1/4(.2))) = 3.35$	Element Average of 3 = $(67*(3/4(.2))) = 10.05$	Element Average of 1 = $(67*(1/4(.2))) = 3.35$
Domain II: Instruction of a Viable and Guaranteed Curriculum	30	Element Average 4 = $(67*(4/4(.3))) = 20.1$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.3))) = 5.025$	Element Average 4 = $(67*(4/4(.3))) = 20.1$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.3))) = 5.025$
Domain III: Continuous Development of Teachers and Staff	20	Element Average 4 = $(67*(4/4(.2))) = 13.4$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.2))) = 3.35$	Element Average 3 = $(67*(3/4(.2))) = 10.05$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.2))) = 3.35$
Domain IV: Community of Care and Collaboration	10	Element Average 3 = $(67*(3/4(.1))) = 5.025$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.1))) = 1.675$	Element Average 3 = $(67*(3/4(.1))) = 5.025$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.1))) = 1.675$
Domain V: Core Values	10	Element Average 4 = $(67*(4/4(.1))) = 6.7$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.1))) = 1.675$	Element Average 4 = $(67*(4/4(.1))) = 6.7$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.1))) = 1.675$
Domain VI: Resource Management	10	Element Average 3 = $(67*(3/4(.1))) = 5.025$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.1))) = 1.675$	Element Average 3 = $(67*(3/4(.1))) = 5.025$	Element Average 1 = $(67*(1/4(.1))) = 1.675$
Student Growth	33	23.724	9.1	22.2	5
Deliberate Practice	1	0.67	0.1	1	0
Total Leadership Practice + Student Growth + DP	101	88.044	25.95	80.15	21.75

Final Proficiency Levels
Highly Effective = 80 - 100
Effective = 52 - 79.999
Needs Improvement = 26 - 51.999
Unsatisfactory = Lower than 26

Appendix A – Evaluation Framework Crosswalks

In Appendix A, the district shall include a crosswalk of the district's evaluation framework to each set of descriptors (i.e., assistant principal and school principal) of the Florida Educational Leadership Standards. See attached file below.



Crosswalk_Marzano
FSLE_Florida Model

Appendix B – Observation Instruments for School Administrators

In Appendix B, the district shall include the observation rubric(s) to be used for collecting instructional leadership data for school administrators.

Collier County utilizes the iObservation system to conduct observations and evaluations on all school-based administrators.



Marzano FSLE FL
Model Protocol w M



Marzano FSLE FL
Model Protocol w M



School Based
Administrator Evalu:



School Based
Administrator Evalu:

Appendix C – Student Performance Measures

In Appendix C, the district shall provide the student performance measures to be used for calculating the performance of students for school administrators.

Collier County Schools uses a variety of assessments to determine student performance in the calculation of VAM scores, including both state and local assessments. The state assessments include the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) (previous year scores only), Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) Progress Monitoring (PM) Assessments, Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS), and End-Of-Course (EOC) exams. Final exams and other assessments may also be used when appropriate. The assessments used by the subject are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

SY24 Courses Taught	Pre-Test*	Post-Test
Pre-Kindergarten	FAST STAR PM1 ELA	FAST STAR PM3 ELA
ELL	Prior year WIDA	Current year WIDA
ESE	State-Level VAM when provided (ESE Inclusion; some Self-Contained)	
	CCPS enCORE Collection Period 1 or KUILSA or FSAA Scale Score or FAST PM1 ELA	CCPS enCORE Collection Period 3 or KUILSA or FSAA Scale Score or FAST PM3 ELA
	If student scores not available, use Schoolwide Score	
Instructional Resource (IR)	Grade 5 FAST PM1 ELA	Grade 5 FAST PM3 ELA

School Administrator Evaluation System

Art/Music	Teacher-Submitted Portfolio Evidence	
Physical Education	Courses: Grade 4 PE, Grade 5 PE Requirements: 80% of students must have their four fitness scores entered for baseline and endpoint - if data is missing a VAM score of 1 will be assigned The VAM calculation is based 100% on fitness growth	
Kindergarten	ELA - FAST PM1 Math - FAST PM1 iReady Scale Score	ELA – FAST PM3 Math – FAST PM3 iReady Scale Score
Grade 1	ELA - FAST PM1 Math - FAST PM1 iReady Scale Score	ELA – FAST PM3 Math – FAST PM3 iReady Scale Score
Grade 2	ELA - FAST PM1 Math - FAST PM1 iReady Scale Score	ELA - FAST PM3 Math - FAST PM3 iReady Scale Score
Grade 3	ELA – FAST PM1 Math – FAST PM1 iReady Scale Score Science – Prior Year Grade 2 District Post-Test	ELA - FAST PM3 Math - FAST PM3 iReady Scale Score Science – Grade 3 District Post Test
Grade 4	ELA – FAST PM1 Math – FAST PM1 iReady Scale Score Science – Prior Year Grade 3 District Post-Test	ELA – FAST PM3 Math – FAST PM3 iReady Scale Score Science– Grade 4 District Post-Test
Grade 5	ELA – FAST PM1 Math – FAST PM1 iReady Scale Score Science – Prior Year Grade 4 District Post-Test	ELA – FAST PM3 Math – FAST PM3 iReady Scale Score Science– NGSSS Science Grade 5

**When applicable, prior grade level post-tests will be considered as pre-tests for the next grade level.*

Table 2: Secondary Pre- and Post-Measures

Subject	SY24 Courses Taught	Pre-Test*	Post-Test
Advanced Studies	AICE	Prior Year: EOC or FAST PM3 or FSA or District Post-Test <i>(as appropriate for course)</i>	AICE Score
	AP		AP Score
	Pre-AICE		FAST PM3
ELA	ELL	Prior year WIDA	Current Year WIDA
	State Assessed	ELA – FAST PM1 ELA	ELA – FAST PM3 ELA
	Non-State Assessed	Prior Year: District Pre-Test or FSA ELA or FAST PM3 ELA	District Post-Test
	Career and Technical	Teacher-Submitted Portfolio Evidence (majority CTE course load) OR FAST PM1 ELA and FAST PM3 ELA if portfolio not required based on course load	

School Administrator Evaluation System

Electives	Driver's Education, First Aid Safety, and Care / Prevention of Athletic Injuries	Prior Year FSA ELA or FAST PM3 ELA	District Post-Test
	Performing Fine Arts	Teacher-Submitted Portfolio Evidence	
	ROTC	District Pre-Test or Prior Year: FSA ELA or FAST PM3 ELA	District Post-Test
	World Languages	District Pre-Test	District Post-Test
ESE	ESE	FAST PM1 ELA (ESE Inclusion; some Self-Contained)	FAST PM3 ELA (ESE Inclusion; some Self-Contained)
		Prior Year: KUILSA or Florida Alternate Assessment (FSAA)	KUILSA or Florida Standards Alternate Assessment (FSAA)
		Schoolwide Score used if no student scores available	
Math	Middle School	FAST PM1 or FAST PM3 Math FY23	FAST PM3 and / or Algebra 1 EOC
	High School	Most Recent Prior Year FAST Math or FSA Math or EOC	Algebra 1 EOC
		Most Recent Prior Year FAST Math or FSA Math or EOC	District Post-Test or Geometry EOC

All final scores include a schoolwide component. Results will be converted to a summative evaluation rating per Florida statute 1012.34. Collier County will use the state-determined 3-year VAM score for each principal/assistant principal in calculations when it is available. All VAM scores will be assigned to a category of effectiveness ranging from Highly Effective to Unsatisfactory.

- Highly Effective:** There is consistent evidence that a principal/assistant principal is demonstrating the identified competencies as evidenced by a combined score on the Observation Evaluation and student growth systems.
- Effective:** The principal/assistant principal is demonstrating the identified competencies most of the time as evidenced by a combined score on the Observation Evaluation and student growth systems.
- Needs Improvement:** The principal/assistant principal is inconsistent in demonstrating the identified competencies as evidenced by a combined score on the Observation Evaluation and student growth systems.
- Unsatisfactory:** There is little or no evidence that a principal/assistant principal is demonstrating the identified competencies as evidenced by a combined score on the Observation Evaluation and student growth systems.

Step 1 For Administrators

After the one-year individual teacher VAM scores are calculated, the average teacher VAM score by school can be calculated. This is used as 50% of the one-year administrator VAM score. The remaining 50% consists of a Schoolwide score. The Schoolwide score is based on the higher of the state-calculated Schoolwide VAM score or the district-calculated school gains as compared to school gains in other schools with the same level and school grade across the state. The School Grades Component Score data will be used to calculate the district Schoolwide score. These Schoolwide scores are calculated based on gains in the overall School Grades percentage. For FY24, the gains will be from FY22 to FY24 due to the change to FAST testing in FY23.

VAM Calculation Step 2: Calculate Individual School Administrator 3-Year VAM Score

Florida statute 1012.34(3)(a)1 states that VAM scores must be based on three years of student data; therefore, the 1-year VAM score is combined with the 1-year VAM scores from the previous two years. Please note the 1-year scores used from previous years are not the same as the VAM points assigned in previous years because VAM points are a 3-year score. There are two ways these 1-year VAM scores can be combined. The first method is an average of the three years with each year receiving equal weight (see Figure 2).

Method 1: $(SY24 + SY23 + SY22)/3 = 3\text{-year VAM score}$

The second method gives more weight to the most recent year. The current year accounts for 50% of the score, the prior year accounts for 30% of the score, and two years prior accounts for 20% of the score (see Figure 3).

Method 2: $0.5(SY24) + 0.3(SY23) + 0.2(SY22) = 3\text{-year VAM score}$

The higher of the two VAM scores is used as the school administrator's 3-year VAM score.

VAM Calculation Step 3: Convert 3-Year VAM Score to VAM Points

Now that the 3-year VAM score has been calculated, it can be converted to VAM points. The scale for VAM points is a minimum of 4 and a maximum of 33. Three-year VAM scores are converted to VAM points using the formula:

Method 3:

$$VAM\ points = \frac{(29 * VAM\ Score) - 17}{3}$$

Table 6: Examples of Converting VAM Scores to VAM Points

VAM Score	VAM Points
4	33
3.5	28.17
3	23.33
2.5	18.5
2	13.67
1.5	8.83
1	4

Calculation Step 4: Combine VAM Points with Observation Points to Get the Final VAM Score and Summative Evaluation Rating

These VAM points can now be combined with the observation points into the final VAM score. The observation score has a maximum of 67 total points (with an additive bonus of 1 deliberate practice point possible). If the teacher is not satisfied with the observation score, additional observations can be requested throughout the school year in order to improve. VAM points, however, are not flexible and cannot be changed once calculated. The VAM points, observation points, and the additive deliberate practice point are then added together to get the final Summative Evaluation score, which is scored out of 100 possible points and rounded to the NEAREST TENTH ONLY: a score of 79.9 does not round up to 80. The Summative Evaluation Rating is assigned categories based on the final score as follows:

Table 7: Summative Evaluation Rating Categories

Summative Evaluation Score	Summative Rating Category
Highly Effective = 80 -100	
Effective* = 52 - 79.999	
Needs Improvement = 26 - 51.999	
Unsatisfactory = Lower than 26	

Appendix D – Summative Evaluation Forms

In Appendix D, the district shall include the summative evaluation form(s) to be used for school administrators.



School Based
Administrator Evaluat