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AIR’s Educator Effectiveness:
Research and Technical Assistance to States

- Great Teachers and Leaders Comprehensive Center
- Teacher Incentive Fund Technical Assistance Center
- Race to the Top Technical Assistance Center
- Regional Educational Laboratory Network

www.air.org; www.tqsource.org
AIR’s Educator Talent Management Group

- Design systems
- Implement student growth measures
- Develop communications and engagement strategies.
- Evaluate implementation and impact
Why Principals Matter: According to Numbers

- 90,000 public school principals
- 98,706 public schools
- 3 million public school teachers
- 55 million PK-12 public school students
Why Principals Matter: According to the Research

Principal Evaluation: Current Practice

- Research provides little evidence that principal evaluation has impact.
- Principals view evaluation as having little influence on their work.
- Principals are held accountable to outcomes that they do not directly control and that provide little guidance on how to improve their work.
- Performance assessments are:
  - Inconsistently administered;
  - Not always aligned with professional standards or standards for personnel evaluation;
  - May not use instruments lacking adequate evidence and testing; and
  - Not practical for evaluators or principals

Clifford & Ross, 2011; Davis, et al., 2011; Orr, 2011; Goldring, et al., 2008
Renewed State Focus on Principal Evaluation

History of Federal Incentives
• Education Waivers
• Race to the Top
• School Improvement Grants
• Teacher Incentive Fund
• No Child Left Behind

Recent Federal Priorities
• Principals evaluated twice per year
• Evaluation organized around a framework that articulates levels of performance
• Principal observations
• Evaluation tied to student growth
• Performance supported by professional development
Renewed State Focus on Principal Evaluation


• Created by and for principals;
• Part of a comprehensive system of support;
• Flexible enough to accommodate differences in principals’ experiences;
• Relevant to the improvement;
• Based on accurate, valid and reliable information, gathered through multiple measures;
• Fair in placing a priority on outcomes that principals can control; and
• Useful for informing principals’ learning and progress.

Available at naesp.org and nassp.org
Analysis of Policy Trends:
New Legislation and Rules on Principal Evaluation

- 34 states have new legislation or administrative rules requiring improved principal evaluation systems since passage of RTTT in 2009.
- 24 states have new legislation or administrative rules on principal evaluation within the past two years.

Analysis of Policy Trends: Principal Evaluation Implementation Timelines

- 15 states are slated to implement new principal evaluation systems in 2012-13, and 7 are to implement in 2013-14.

- Of the 19 Race to the Top states, most are allowing less than 2 years for design, pilot, and implementation of new, statewide systems of principal evaluation.
  - 6 states have allowed less than 1 year to design and implement
  - 5 states have allowed 1 year for design and implementation
  - 3 states have allotted more than one year to design and implementation
Analysis of Policy Trends: 
Principal Evaluation Design Components

- Articulate system goals
- Define principal effectiveness and establish standards
- **Secure stakeholder engagement**
- Select measures
- Determine the evaluation structure
- **Select and train evaluators**
- Ensure data integrity
- Use evaluation results
- Test system performance

Clifford, Hansen & Wraight, 2012 available at [www.tqsource.org](http://www.tqsource.org)
Analysis of Policy Trends: Principal Evaluation Implementation Strategies

Three implementation models
• State-level system (e.g., Colorado, Maryland, Mississippi)
• Elective state-level (e.g., New York)
• District-level system, with oversight (e.g., Delaware, Florida, Missouri)

Models Vary
• Local Ownership
• Flexibility to reflect district/regional priorities
• Resource conservation
• Evaluator training and oversight
• Data collection and use
• System monitoring
• Pilot test design
Analysis of Policy Trends: The Crystal Ball

The need for pilot studies in states to determine fidelity, fairness, utility

Adjustments to the design and implementation timelines

Focus on continuous systems improvement and staged systems scaling

Increasing use of multiple practice and outcomes measures
  Observations
  School climate survey
  Student learning objectives
  360-degree measures
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Resources


- Center for Educator Compensation Reform: //www.cecr.ed.gov/
Resources


• Wallace papers: www.wallacefoundation.org