

by Kim Marshall – Revised August 21, 2011

1. These rubrics are organized around six domains covering all aspects of a principal's job performance:
  - A. Diagnosis and Planning
  - B. Priority Management and Communication
  - C. Curriculum and Data
  - D. Supervision, Evaluation, and Professional Development
  - E. Discipline and Parent Involvement
  - F. Management and External Relations

The rubrics use a four-level rating scale with the following labels:

- 4 – Highly Effective
- 3 – Effective
- 2 – Improvement Necessary
- 1 – Does Not Meet Standards

2. The rubrics are designed to give principals and other school-based administrators an end-of-the-year assessment of where they stand in all performance areas – and detailed guidance for improvement. These rubrics are not checklists for school visits. To knowledgeably fill out the rubrics, a supervisor needs to have been in the school frequently throughout the year; it is irresponsible to fill out the rubrics based on one visit and without ongoing dialogue.

3. The *Effective* level describes solid, expected professional performance; any administrator should be pleased with scores at this level. The *Highly Effective* level is reserved for truly outstanding leadership as described by very demanding criteria; there will be relatively few scores at this level. *Improvement Necessary* indicates that performance has real deficiencies and must improve (although some novice administrators might start here). And performance at the *Does Not Meet Standards* level is clearly unacceptable and will lead to dismissal if it is not improved immediately.

4. To score, read across the four levels of performance for each criterion, find the level that best describes the principal's performance, and circle or highlight it. On each page, this will create a clear graphic display of overall performance, areas for commendation, and areas that need work. Write the overall score at the bottom of each page with brief comments, and then record all the scores and overall comments on the summary page.

5. Evaluation conferences are greatly enhanced if the supervisor and administrator fill out the rubrics in advance and then meet and compare one page at a time. Of course, the supervisor has the final say, but the discussion should aim for consensus based on actual evidence of the most accurate score for each criterion. Supervisors should go into evaluation process with some humility since they can't possibly know everything about an administrator's complex world. Similarly, administrators should be open to feedback from someone with an outside perspective – all revolving around whether the school is producing learning gains for all students.

6. Some supervisors sugar-coat criticism and give inflated scores to keep the peace and avoid hurting feelings. This does not help an administrator improve. The kindest thing a supervisor can do for an underperforming administrator is give candid, evidence-based feedback and robust follow-up support. Honest scores for all the administrators in a district can be aggregated into a spreadsheet that can give an overview of leadership development needs (see page 9 for a sample).

The principal:

	Recruits a strong leadership team and develops its skills and commitment to a high level.	Recruits and develops a leadership team with a balance of skills.	Enlists one or two like-minded colleagues to provide advice and support.	Works solo with little or no support from colleagues.
	Involves stakeholders in a comprehensive diagnosis of the school's strengths and weaknesses.	Carefully assesses the school's strengths and areas for development.	Makes a quick assessment of the school's strengths and weaknesses.	Is unable to gather much information on the school's strong and weak points.
	Challenges colleagues by presenting the gap between current student data and a vision for college success.	Motivates colleagues by comparing students' current achievement with rigorous expectations.	Presents data without a vision or a vision without data.	Bemoans students' low achievement and shows fatalism about bringing about significant change.
	Wins staff and student buy-in for a succinct, inspiring, results-oriented mission statement.	Produces a memorable, succinct, results-oriented mission statement that's known by all staff.	Distributes a boiler-plate mission statement that few colleagues remember.	Does not share a mission statement.
	Gets strong staff commitment on a bold, ambitious 3-4-year student achievement target.	Builds staff support for a 3-4-year student achievement target.	Expresses confidence that student achievement will improve each year through hard work.	Takes one year at a time and does not provide an achievement target.
	Wins staff ownership for a robust, research-based theory of action for improving achievement.	Researches and writes a convincing theory of action for improving achievement.	Accepts colleagues' current notions of how student achievement is improved.	Says that hard work improves achievement – but shows doubts that progress can be made.
	Collaboratively crafts a lean, comprehensive, results-oriented strategic plan with annual goals.	Gets input and writes a comprehensive, measurable strategic plan for the current year.	Writes a cumbersome, non-accountable strategic plan.	Recycles the previous year's cumbersome, non-accountable strategic plan.
	Fosters a sense of urgency and responsibility among all stakeholders for achieving annual goals.	Builds ownership and support among stakeholders for achieving annual goals.	Presents the annual plan to stakeholders and asks them to support it.	Gets the necessary signatures for the annual plan, but there is little ownership or support.
	Masterfully wins over resistant staff members who feared change and/or harbored low expectations.	Manages resistance, low expectations, and fear of change.	Works on persuading resistant staff members to get on board with the plan.	Is discouraged and immobilized by staff resistance, fear of change, and low expectations.
	Regularly tracks progress, gives and takes feedback, and continuously improves performance.	Periodically measures progress, listens to feedback, and revises the strategic plan.	Occasionally focuses on key data points and prods colleagues to improve.	Is too caught up in daily crises to focus on emerging data.











:

:

:

:

:

A.D \_\_\_\_\_ :

D

B. \_\_\_\_\_ C \_\_\_\_\_ :

D

C.C \_\_\_\_\_ D \_\_\_\_\_ :

D

D. \_\_\_\_\_ D \_\_\_\_\_ :

D

.D \_\_\_\_\_ :

D

\_\_\_\_\_ :

D

A C B :

A C B AD A :

:

D :

A :

D :

(

;

.)



## Spreadsheet of Rubric Scores of 12 Principals for PD Purposes

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Handette Merton	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	17			
Patricia Bobb	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	17			
Tom Robinson	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	3	18			
Tim Stovus	3	3	3	1	3	4	3	3	17			
Brazil Moore	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	24			
Marvin Marcus	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	24			
David Boggs	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	16			
Totals	34	36	34	33	34	34	34	35				

A D  
*Educational Leadership*, 1987  
 "Assessing Educational Leaders, (C , 2009)  
 A B  
*The Elementary School Journal*, 1985  
 A D A *Streamlined Seminar* ( . 11, #3),  
 D 1992  
*Building Teachers' Capacity for Success* A (A CD, 2008)  
 A , *Education Week*, A 12, 1995  
*Getting Things Done* D A ( , 2001)  
*Good to Great* C ( B , 2001)