

Administrative Personnel Evaluation Procedure

The Coeur d'Alene School District believes that administrator evaluation is a key component in assuring that the students of the District are provided with a high quality educational experience. To ensure this the District has developed an administrative evaluation tool and procedures for all certified administrators in the district. Administrators will receive a minimum of one annual evaluation.

Evaluation Objectives

The District's Principal Evaluation Program is designed to:

1. Maintain or improve each principal's job satisfaction and morale by letting him or her know that the Superintendent is interested in his or her job progress and personal development;
2. Serve as a systematic guide for planning each principal's further training and professional development;
3. Assure considered opinion of a principal's performance and focus maximum attention on achievement of assigned duties;
4. Assist in determining and recording special talents, skills, and capabilities that might otherwise not be noticed or recognized;
5. Assist in planning personnel moves and placements that will best utilize each principal's capabilities;
6. Provide an opportunity for each principal to discuss job problems and interests with the Superintendent; and
7. Assemble substantiating data for use as a guide, although not necessarily the sole governing factor, for such purposes as wage adjustments, promotions, disciplinary action, and termination.

The Superintendent shall have the responsibility for creating a plan for ongoing review of the District's Principal Evaluation Program that includes stakeholder input from teachers, Board Members, administrators, parents/guardians, and other interested parties. The Superintendent shall also create and implement a plan for ongoing training and professional development and the funding thereof for principals in the District's Performance Evaluation Program, including evaluation standards, forms, procedures, and processes and a plan for collecting and using data gathered from evaluation.

Evaluation Measures and Criteria

The Coeur d'Alene School District Administrator Evaluation Model shall be aligned to state standards, including but not limited to:

- Proof of proficiency in conducting teacher evaluations using the state's adopted model, the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching. Proof of proficiency in evaluating teacher performance shall be required of all administrators no later than August 31, 2019.
- Administrator evaluation standards shall address the following domains and the components:
 - Domain 1: School Climate
 - School Climate, Communication and Advocacy
 - Domain 2: Collaborative Leadership
 - Shared Leadership, Priority Management, Transparency, Leadership Renewal, and Accountability
 - Domain 3: Instructional Leadership
 - Innovation, Instructional Vision, High Expectations, Continuous Improvement of Instruction, Evaluation, and Recruitment and Retention.
- Professional Practice: Principal must receive an evaluation in which a majority of the summative evaluation results are based on Professional Practice.

The responsibility of evaluation of administratively certificated personnel is delegated in the following manner. The individuals assigned this responsibility shall have received training in administrator evaluations based on the statewide framework for evaluations.

- District Administrators will be evaluated by the Superintendent of Schools.
- Building Principals will be evaluated by the Directors of Secondary and Elementary Education.
- Other Building Administrators will be evaluated by Building Principals

Data used in admin evaluation will include but is not limited to:

- Individual Professional Learning/Growth Plans growth
- Building Goal growth to achievement
- Administrative meetings participation i.e. Admin Council, Admin Academies, Elementary and Secondary Admin Meetings
- Building walk-throughs and teacher observation artifacts
- Adherence to administrative responsibilities

Evaluation of all administrative personnel will be conducted in a fair and consistent manner. An annual evaluation shall include, at a minimum, two (2) formative observations and evaluative discussions. Formative observations may include but are not limited to walk-throughs with supervisors, participation at district meetings and performance on district committees. Evaluative discussions may include but are not limited to administrative growth plan conferences, goal planning conferences, and end of year evaluation conferences.

Evaluation Rating System: Observations will have a rating system with four (4) rankings used to differential performance of administrative certificate holders: Unsatisfactory being equal to 1; Basic/Emerging being equal to 2; Proficient being equal to 3, and Distinguished being equal to a rating of 4.

Each principal shall receive at least one (1) summative evaluation to be completed no later than June 1st for each annual contract year of employment. Each principal evaluation shall use multiple measures that are research based and aligned to the State minimum standards based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and include proof of proficiency in conducting teacher evaluations using the State's adopted model, the *Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching Second Edition*.

Summative Evaluation Overall Rating: The overall rating system will have four (4) rankings used to differential performance of administrative certificate holders: Unsatisfactory being equal to 1; Basic/Emerging being equal to 2; Proficient being equal to 3, and Distinguished being equal to a rating of 4. The Evaluator will decide the overall rating by yearly performance to include: component ratings, input, achievement, etc.

If it is deemed necessary to develop an Individualized Improvement Plan, the following may be included:

- **Peer Mentoring** – any Individualized Improvement Plan may include peer assistance, mentoring or instructional coaching. This can be initiated by the certified administrator or the supervisor.
- **Verbal Correction** – Prior to receiving a mark of “unsatisfactory” or “emerging/basic” in any element on the evaluation summary, the evaluator will provide a verbal warning, along with observable expectations for improvement and reasonable time to remediate.
- **Emerging/Basic** – The evaluator is required to include written comments on the Certified Administrator Evaluation describing the criteria resulting in any element being marked “emerging/basic.” When a certified administrator receives written notice on an evaluation summary that his/her performance in one or more domains is deemed to be “emerging/basic,” a Individualized Improvement Plan focused on improvement in that domain may result.

The certificated administrator will be encouraged to dedicate focused efforts to improve prior to the next evaluation cycle. Failure to show improvement in that domain on subsequent cycles may result in advancing to an “unsatisfactory” status.

- **Unsatisfactory Determination** – Certified administrators shall receive a mark of “unsatisfactory” only after receiving an emerging/basic in the same domain on the preceding evaluation unless there is compelling evidence or a justification to do so. The evaluator is required to include written comments on the Certified Administrator

Evaluation Summary describing the criteria resulting in any domain being marked as “unsatisfactory.”

Whenever a certificated administrator receives an evaluation on which his/her performance in one or more domains is deemed to be “unsatisfactory” by the evaluator, an Individualized Improvement Plan shall be developed in close collaboration with the evaluator.

The district administration will develop a plan for ongoing training and professional learning based upon the district’s evaluation standards and process as well as a plan for funding ongoing training and professional development for evaluators of principals.

Permanent records of each administrator evaluation will be maintained in the employee’s personnel file. All evaluation records will be kept confidential within the parameters identified in federal and state regulations regarding the right to privacy.

Per Idaho Code 33-515, nothing in this section shall prevent the board of trustees from offering a renewed contract increasing the salary of any certified person, or from reassigning an administrative employee to a non-administrative position with appropriate reduction of salary from the preexisting salary level. In the event the board of trustee reassigns an administrative employee to a non-administrative position, the board shall give written notice to the employee which contains a statement of the reasons for the reassignment. The employee, upon written request to the board, shall be entitled to an informal review of that decision by the local board of trustees.

Rebuttal/Appeal

Within seven (7) days from the date of the evaluation meeting with the Superintendent/designee the principal may file a written rebuttal/appeal of any portion of the evaluation. The written rebuttal/appeal shall state the specific content of the evaluation with which the principal disagrees, a statement of the reason(s) for disagreement, and the amendment to the evaluation requested.

If a written rebuttal/appeal is received by the Superintendent/designee, the Superintendent/designee may provide the principal with a written response, within 10 working days, stating the reason(s) why the Superintendent/designee will or will not amend the evaluation as requested.

If the Superintendent/designee chooses to amend the evaluation as requested by the principal then the amended copy of the evaluation will be provided to, and signed by, the principal and retained in the principal’s personnel file.

If the Superintendent/designee chooses not to amend the evaluation as requested by the principal then the evaluation along with the written rebuttal/appeal, and the Superintendent/designee’s response, if any, will be retained in the principal’s personnel file.

The Documentation Process

Evaluations will be made in writing and given to each administrator. Copies of the evaluations may be made available upon request for Board Members prior to the meeting in which the administrators will be reviewed by the Board.

The adopted documentation forms for the official record of the administrator supervision evaluation process which shall be filed in the employee's personnel file at the District Central Office. An Individualized Improvement Plan shall be filed as appropriate.

Reporting

The District will report the information required per the State Department of Education for State and Federal reporting purposes.

Evaluations will not be disclosed to the public without the administrators' written consent.

Procedure History:

Promulgated on: 12/7/15

Revised on: 6/6/16, 12/5/16, 12/4/17, 3/5/18, 10/5/20