



**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH (PEPG) MODEL**  
**QUALITY ASSURANCE INVENTORY**

**Name of Model:** Auburn School Department Administrator Evaluation Framework

## TABLE 1: MULTIPLE MEASURES OF EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS

Provide clear evidence of compliance with the requirements described in the second column (As Defined in Rule Chapter 180). Include both relevant language from your model/system document and page numbers.

Required Model Component to be described in the Submittal	Defined in Rule Chapter 180	Articulation of component in the local system	Implementation guidance in the local system	Relevant Procedures
<p><b>Professional practice model applicable to teachers or principals</b></p>	<p>To evaluate the professional practice of principals, a school administrative unit must use a principal evaluation model that includes performance standards that align with the ISLLC 2008 standards; supporting descriptions or indicators for each standard as published or endorsed by the creator /sponsor of the standards; and rubrics for each standard that are aligned with the adopted standards and descriptors.</p>	<p>Performance in *six domains of school leadership (p.7-18)</p> <p>*Based on the National Association of Elementary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals.</p>	<p>A list of possible sources of evidence is provided for each domain, with rubrics for each domain describing four performance levels: Does not meet, Basic, Proficient, Exemplary (pp. 8-18).</p> <p>*Developed by Maine Principals' Association and aligned to the Marzano Leadership framework by ASD</p>	<p>For each of the six domains, the evaluator determines the rating (<i>Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement or Ineffective</i>) that matches the majority of evidence. A final scale is used to determine the administrator's overall professional practice rating (p.22).</p>

<p><b>Student Learning and Growth</b></p>	<p>Student learning and growth measures must be a significant factor in the determination of the summative effectiveness rating of an educator. To be considered “significant,” student learning and growth measures must have a discernible impact on an educator’s summative effectiveness rating.</p> <p>A student learning and growth measure must measure student growth in achievement, not solely the level of achievement:</p> <p>Multiple measures of student learning and growth must be used for each educator being evaluated. Large-scale, norm-referenced standardized tests may not be the sole type of student learning and growth measures used.</p>	<p>An administrator’s rating on student learning and growth will derive from the percentage of all teachers for whom the administrator has direct supervisory responsibility who achieve their student goals (as developed in the Plan Do Check Adjust (PDCA) template (p. 20)</p>	<p>Student Growth Scale (p. 23)</p> <p>Number of teachers_____</p> <p>Number of teachers meeting PDCA student growth goal_____</p> <p>100 - 90%= 4  89 - 75% = 3  74 - 60% = 2  &lt; 60% = 1</p>	<p>Administrators will demonstrate student growth through results of PDCA goals of the teachers for whom they have direct supervisory responsibility. School-wide and/ or district-wide student achievement results will be used to assure progress toward district goals and the adequate alignment to the PDCAs. Additional measures will be identified in the Administrator Professional Growth Plan/ PDCA and will connect to the individualized SMART goals (p. 20)</p> <p>School-wide and/ or district-wide student achievement results will be used as evidence of progress toward district goals and to ensure that teachers’ student growth goals are rigorous and aligned to school or district achievement goals; these school or district wide student achievement data will not be factored into an administrator’s summative rating on the student growth axis of the summative effectiveness rubric (p. 23).</p>
---	---	--	--	---

<b>A description of other measures of educator effectiveness, if any, that will be used in determining the educator's summative effectiveness rating</b>	Other measures are not required by law in model/system, but information is required in the submittal in order to inform the Maine DOE as to how the Summative Effectiveness Rating is derived.	Only two measures, professional practice and student learning and growth are used in the summative rating, but multiple sources of evidence will inform the professional practice rating, and multiple measures of student growth are derived from multiple teachers' student growth goals.		
--	--	---	--	--

## TABLE 2: DESCRIBES PROCESS FOR DETERMINING TEACHER OF RECORD

*See definitions for both Teacher of Record and Principal in second column and provide evidence as applicable.*

Required Model Component to be described in the Submittal	Defined in Rule Chapter 180	Articulation of component in the local system	Implementation guidance in the local system	Relevant Procedures
<b>Teacher of Record</b>	<p><b>For Teacher PEPG model:</b>                      The Teacher of Record is a teacher to whom the academic growth of a student in a course or other learning experience is attributed, in whole or in part, as described in Section :</p> <p>(1) The student is enrolled in the course or other learning experience taught by that teacher;</p> <p>(2) The student was present and was subject to instruction by that teacher at least 80% of the scheduled instructional time for that course or learning experience with that teacher; and</p> <p>(3) The student took both the pre-test and the post-test designed to measure achievement in that course or learning experience.</p> <p>_____</p> <p>A SAU must provide each teacher with a list of students for whom the teacher is likely to</p>	<p>Not applicable to principal PEPG model</p>		

be the teacher of record, and must provide the teacher an opportunity to request review and revision of the list to correct any inaccuracies on the list. A list of those students must be provided within a reasonable time after the beginning of the course or learning experience, and must include information about the pre-test taken by each student and the scheduled instructional time for that course or learning experience with that teacher. A proposed final list of students must be provided to the teacher within a reasonable amount of time before the end of the course or learning experience, and must include a calculation of the amount of time that the student was present and taught by that teacher. The PE/PG system must include a process by which a teacher can contest and seek correction of determinations of “teacher of record” status.

**For Principal Model:**  
“Principal” means a person serving in a position that requires certification under State Board of Education Rule Chapter 115, Part II, Section 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7. This includes a person serving as principal, assistant principal, teaching principal, career and technical

	education administrator and assistant career and technical education administrator.			
--	---	--	--	--

### Table 3: Summative Rating

Attempt to distinguish between the components of the summative rating process; if information applies to more than one component, please repeat the information rather than citing a previous section.

Required Model Component to be described in the Submittal	Defined in Rule Chapter 180	Articulation of component in the local system	Implementation guidance in the local system	Relevant Procedures
<p><b>A description of the four rating levels</b></p>	<p>Each PE/PG system must result in placement of educators into one of the following four summative effectiveness rating categories: Highly Effective; Effective; Partially Effective; and Ineffective.</p> <p>While implementing a PE/PG system, a school administrative unit may use different labels for its four rating levels, as long as the levels align with the levels above, and the labels above are used for purposes of applying laws and rules.</p>	<p><b>Highly Effective</b> ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds proficiency and could serve as a model for leaders district-wide or even statewide.</p> <p><b>Effective</b> ratings represent fully satisfactory performance. It is the rigorous standard expected for most experienced building administrators and the goal for new building administrators or building administrators performing at the Needs Improvement level.</p> <p><b>Needs Improvement</b> ratings mean that performance is meeting proficiency in some components but not others.</p> <p><b>Ineffective</b> ratings indicate performance that is unacceptably low on one or more Domains and makes little or no progress on most student outcome targets.</p> <p>(p. 24)</p>	<p>Few building administrators are expected to demonstrate Highly Effective performance on more than a small number of practice and student outcome targets.</p> <p>Effective building administrators demonstrate acceptable leadership practice and meet or make progress on all student outcome targets.</p> <p>Domains resulting in a Needs Improvement rating are in need of focused growth plan in order to demonstrate proficiency. Improvement is necessary and expected.</p> <p>Ratings of <i>Ineffective</i> are always cause for concern.</p> <p>(p. 24)</p>	
<p><b>Method of combining the</b></p>	<p>A school administrative unit shall adopt a method of combining qualitative and</p>	<p>This framework uses a decision matrix with Instructional and Professional Practice on the Y axis</p>		<p>To assign a summative rating the evaluator takes the following</p>



<p><b>multiple measures of educator effectiveness, weights, targets and actual performance to arrive at a summative effectiveness rating for an educator</b></p>	<p>quantitative measures of educator effectiveness to determine an educator's summative effectiveness rating.</p> <p>The method may include, but is not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Assigning numerical values to each element in the system and weighting them to provide a single numerical result [or]</li> <li>2. Creation of a two-dimensional matrix with professional practice on one axis and student learning and growth on the other axis. The intersection of the levels results in one of the four possible ratings (effective, highly effective, partially effective and ineffective).</li> </ol>	<p>and Student Growth on the X axis. One of four rating levels results from the combining of ratings on the two measures. When major discrepancies between the two ratings are found, no rating is given until a specific review of evidence is performed and a resolution is reached (p. 23).</p>		<p>steps:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review all evidence collected.</li> <li>2. ...Use the [professional practice rubric] to determine an Instructional and Professional practice rating in each domain.</li> <li>3. Determine the Student Growth Measures Rating using the Student Growth Scale.</li> <li>4. Determine the Summative Effectiveness Rating using the Matrix</li> </ol> <p>(p. 23)</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>A description of the results and consequences of being placed in each of the rating levels</b></p>	<p>A school administrative unit must set forth the professional growth opportunities and the employment consequences tied to each rating level. An educator who is rated ineffective must be provided an opportunity to develop and implement a professional improvement plan.</p>	<p>Professional growth or improvement plans assigned on the basis of the Summative Effectiveness Rating</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Highly Effective</b>.....Self-Directed Professional Growth Plan</li> <li>• <b>Effective</b>—Self-Directed Professional Growth Plan</li> <li>• <b>Needs Improvement (first such rating)</b>—Monitored Professional Improvement Plan</li> <li>• <b>Needs Improvement ( second such rating)</b>— Intensive Support Plan</li> <li>• <b>Ineffective (first such rating)</b>— Intensive Support Plan</li> </ul>	<p>Each plan involves professional development goals and clear action steps, prepared using the PDCA and SMART goal templates. An administrator on an Intensive Support Plan who does not score Effective in all six domains shall be considered for immediate release from district employment, unless otherwise specified by district policy or agreements. An administrator may also be considered for dismissal if he or she receives an “<i>Ineffective</i>” rating on one domain in any given year provided there is sufficient evidence to warrant dismissal.</p>	<p>District policies and procedures apply in these matters.</p>
<p><b>Professional Improvement Plan</b></p>	<p>In addition to a summative effectiveness rating, each educator must receive a written evaluation that includes a narrative providing recommendations and commendations that describe the educator’s effectiveness.</p> <p>An educator who receives a summative effectiveness rating of “ineffective” must be provided the opportunity to develop and implement a professional improvement plan. The PE/PG system plan must assign responsibility to one or more supervisors or administrators to work with the educator and to oversee development and</p>	<p>Detailed descriptions of the self-directed, monitored, and intensive support plans are provided, including the level of supports for administrators in need of improvement.</p> <p><b>SAMPLE:</b> An Administrator who receives a “<i>Needs Improvement</i>” rating in any of the six domains in two consecutive school years or a score of “<i>Needs Improvement</i>” or “<i>Ineffective</i>” in more than one domain for any single year will develop, together with the evaluator, an Intensive Support Plan. The Intensive Support Plan will, at minimum, identify the standards to be improved immediately, the goals to be accomplished, the activities that</p>	<p>Each plan involves written professional development goals and clear action steps, prepared using the PDCA and SMART goal templates.</p>	<p>A specially designed form for the Intensive Support Plan provides the basis for a structured, supportive improvement plan.</p>

	<p>implementation of a professional improvement plan. The professional improvement plan must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Be in writing;</li><li>2. Be developed with input from the educator;</li><li>3. Set forth clear, measurable objectives and deadlines; and</li><li>4. Be focused on improvement in the specific areas of evaluation identified as needing improvement.</li></ol>	<p>must be undertaken to improve, identify the standards in need of improvement, goals and activities that will lead to improvement, supportive resources, and the timeline for improving performance to the Effective level. An administrator on an Intensive Support Plan who does not score Effective in all six domains shall be considered for immediate release from district employment, unless otherwise specified by district policy or agreements. An administrator may also be considered for dismissal if he or she receives an <i>"Ineffective"</i> rating on one domain in any given year provided there is sufficient evidence to warrant dismissal. District policies and procedures apply in these matters.</p> <p>(p. 24)</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

**TABLE 4: IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES**

Required Model Component to be described in the Submittal	Defined in Rule Chapter 180	Articulation of component in the local system	Implementation guidance in the local system	Relevant Procedures
<p><b>Notice of Person Overseeing Evaluation</b></p>	<p>A school administrative unit must provide to each educator who will be evaluated under this rule the name and contact information of the administrator responsible for overseeing the evaluation and support process for that educator</p>	<p>The Annual Process timeline and list of responsibilities calls for an individual conference between the “superintendent/evaluator” by September 30 of each year.</p>	<p>The evaluator’s name is included in the PDCA document.</p>	<p>The Annual Process requires a specified series of action steps take place by September 30:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Administrator completes and submits <b>self-assessment</b> (see Appendix A: Administrator Self-Assessment).</li> <li>▪ Administrator completes <b>Administrator Professional Growth Plan/ PDCA</b>, which identifies at least one goal that targets student growth and at least one professional growth goal. The PDCA can be developed in one of three ways:</li> <li>▪ Individually - Final completed document will be submitted to Superintendent / Evaluator for approval;</li> <li>▪ Through a collaborative process of peer review - Final completed</li> </ul>

				<p>document will be submitted to Superintendent/ Evaluator for approval;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conference with Superintendent/ Evaluator.</li> </ul> <p>(p.6)</p>
<p><b>Evaluation Frequency and ongoing Observation and Feedback</b></p>	<p>A school administrative unit shall determine and set forth in its system plan, the frequency with which it will conduct full evaluations leading to summative effectiveness ratings. A school administrative unit is not required to conduct a full evaluation leading to a summative effectiveness rating of each educator in each year. The frequency of full evaluations may vary depending on the effectiveness rating of an educator. However, full evaluations must be conducted at least every three years, even for highly effective educators.</p> <p>Regardless of whether an educator is evaluated formally in a particular year, observations of professional practice and formative feedback must occur each year and throughout the school year for all educators.</p>	<p>Principals receive summative effectiveness ratings annually.</p> <p>The Annual Process calls for specific requirements related to observation and feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superintendent/ Evaluator provides formative feedback based on observations (a minimum of 2).</li> <li>• Superintendent/ Evaluator and Administrator conference as deemed appropriate during this time.</li> </ul> <p>Administrator accesses formative feedback and performance evidence through self-selected peer review.</p>	<p>The Framework specifically calls for evaluators to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct walkthroughs or formal observations by May 31</li> <li>• Conference with administrators as deemed appropriate throughout the year</li> </ul>	

<p><b>Training of Evaluators</b></p>	<p>A person is a qualified evaluator in a Chapter 508 system only if that person has completed training appropriate to the role he or she will play in the system.</p> <p>Evaluators must be trained in the specific professional practice model selected by the school administrative unit in which the evaluator will perform duties.</p> <p>A. Evaluators must complete training in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Conducting pre-observation and post-observation conferences;</li> <li>(2) Observing and evaluating the professional practice of teachers and/or principals;</li> </ul> <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(3) Developing and guiding professional growth plans.</li> </ul> <p>B. The training in observing and evaluating professional practice of teachers and/or principals must include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Training in evaluating performance based on evidence, and without bias;</li> <li>(2) Adequate time for evaluators to practice and become familiar with the model during their trainings.</li> <li>(3) Opportunity for evaluators to work collaboratively;</li> </ul>	<p>Because the Auburn School Department has aligned the MPA rubrics for the six domains of the professional practice element to the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model, we have contracted with Learning Sciences International to deliver training to evaluators and administrators in the professional practice domains and rubrics. The Auburn School Department will determine the need and provide for training in other elements of the Administrator Evaluation Framework, as established in Rule Chapter 180.</p>	<p>Collaborative observation, review, and feedback will be conducted regularly beginning in the pilot year in order to calibrate and recalibrate evaluators within a context of providing formative feedback.</p>	
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	--

	<p>(4) Training in assessing evidence of performance not directly observed in classroom observations or direct observations of principals and in incorporating that evidence into a summative evaluation;</p> <p>(5) Training designed to ensure a high level of inter-rater reliability and agreement. To continue to serve as a trained evaluator, an evaluator must maintain an identified minimum level of inter-rater reliability and agreement by participating in training or recalibration at intervals specified in the PE/PG system plan.</p>			
<p><b>Training of Educators (Principals)</b></p>	<p>Prior to implementing a PE/PG system, a school administrative unit must provide training to each educator who will be evaluated under the PE/PG system to provide the opportunity for each educator to understand:</p> <p>A. The structure of the system, including the multiple measures of educator effectiveness and the evaluation cycle;</p> <p>B. The names and roles of administrators and others whose decisions impact the</p>	<p>Because the Auburn School Department has aligned the MPA rubrics for the six domains of the professional practice element to the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model, we have contracted with Learning Sciences International to deliver training to evaluators and administrators in the professional practice domains and rubrics. The Auburn School Department will determine the need and provide for training in other elements of the Administrator Evaluation Framework as established in Rule Chapter 180.</p>		

	<p>educator's rating;</p> <p>C. How to participate in professional development opportunities to assist the educator in meeting professional practice standards used in the system;</p> <p>D. The results and consequences of receiving each type of summative effectiveness rating; and</p> <p>E. Other aspects of the system necessary to enable the educator to participate fully in the evaluation and professional growth aspects of the system.</p>			
<p><b>Peer review and collaboration</b></p>	<p>Peer review and collaboration Each PE/PG system must include a peer review component and opportunities for educators to share, learn and continually improve their practice. A school administrative unit shall specify in its system plans what peer review components will be included and what qualifications will be required of peer reviewers, including, but not limited to, training. Peer review includes, but is not limited to, observation of</p>	<p>Each Administrator shall include in the Administrator Professional Growth Plan opportunities for sharing, learning and continually improving practice by engaging in peer review (p. 20).</p>	<p>The peer review component is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• self-selected; documented in PDCA;</li> <li>• for formative evaluation purposes only;</li> <li>• only used as part of the Summative Evaluation Rating when the principal chooses to include the evidence.</li> </ul> <p>(p.20)</p>	



	<p>peers, review of portfolios and other evidence offered to demonstrate an educator's performance, and review of professional improvement plans. Peer review is for formative evaluation purposes only, and must not be included in determining the summative effectiveness rating unless the peer reviewer is trained in the evaluation process as required under Section 11 of this rule, and the educator being evaluated chooses to include the peer review as part of the summative effectiveness rating. Educator opportunities for sharing, learning and continually improving practice include, but are not limited to, providing opportunities for mentoring and coaching, involvement in professional learning communities, and targeted professional development.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

**TABLE 5: COMMITTEES ENGAGEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS IN DEVELOPMENT OF MODEL**

*For each section, provide a concise explanation of how your committees were formed and describe the procedures used to reach agreement on committee composition and decisions.*

Required Model Component to be described in the Submittal	Defined in Rule Chapter 180	Articulation of component in the local system	Implementation guidance in the local system	Relevant Procedures
<p><b>Development Committee/“Initial Group of Stakeholders”</b></p> <p><b>A description of how educators were involved in development of the system</b></p>	<p>Title 20-A of the Maine Revised Statutes, Section 13705 requires school administrative units to develop PE/PG systems “in collaboration with teachers, principals, administrators, school board members, parents and other members of the public.”</p> <p>A majority of the members of the initial group of stakeholders must be composed of at least a majority of teachers. Of the teachers appointed to the initial group of stakeholders, 2/3rds must have the endorsement of the majority of the teachers in the school administrative unit and 2/3rds must have the endorsement of the majority of the school administrative unit’s governing body.</p> <p>For a school administrative unit that has established an initial</p>	<p><b>Local Development Committee:</b> The Auburn School Department formed its development committee in October of 2013. The administration sent out an open invitation to all teachers and those who wished to join were accepted. The committee consisted primarily of teachers and administrators and included a school board member, and parents in the community. When the legislature amended the rule to require that the development committee be composed of a majority of teachers, the ASD conducted a poll of district teachers, who consented to the continuation of the original group. District educators who are not on the development committee are kept apprised via updates in the quarterly newsletter.</p> <p><b>State Development Team:</b> For</p>		

	<p>group of stakeholders ...prior to the effective date of this rule, the existing group of stakeholders, with the consent of a majority of teachers in the school administrative unit, may continue as constituted even if the group of stakeholders does not meet the specific composition established in paragraph A.</p>	<p>the purposes of adopting the ASD Administrator Evaluation Framework, a collaborative group— comprising ASD administrators, Maine DOE staff, and representatives of The Maine Principals' Association—convened to review the framework document that had been developed by the ASD development committee, make revisions, and finalize the document.</p>		
<p><b>Decision-Making</b></p>	<p>The initial group of stakeholders must use a consensus decision-making process to develop the performance evaluation and professional growth system.</p>	<p>ASD development committee has used a consensus-based decision-making process from its inception.</p> <p>The state development team described above encountered a number of decisions-making points. Through discussion, review of Maine law, and consultation with additional administrators, agreement was reached on all aspects of the system.</p>		
<p><b>Steering Committee</b>  <b>A description of when and how the Steering Committee was formed and the mechanism by which the Steering Committee's review will lead to revision of the PE/PG system to ensure that it is</b></p>	<p>Each school administrative unit shall form a Steering Committee to regularly review and refine the PE/PG system to ensure that it is aligned with school administrative unit goals and priorities. The Steering Committee must include representatives of the local education association, appointed by the local association, teachers, administrators and other school administrative unit staff. The Steering Committee must be formed no later than the beginning</p>	<p><b>State Steering Committee:</b> For the purposes of adopting and monitoring the the ASD Administrator Evaluation Framework as a state PEPG model, the steering committee component will be satisfied by the regular meetings of the collaborative that reviewed and brought the framework into compliance with the law and rule.</p>		

<p><b>aligned with school administrative unit goals and priorities</b></p>	<p>of the pilot period of the PE/PG system. The school administrative unit shall ensure that the local Steering Committee is formed before the pilot begins and must ensure that the Steering Committee is involved in evaluating the results of the pilot.</p>			
<p><b>Piloting the model/System</b></p> <p><b>A description of the PE/PG system pilot, and what changes, if any, were made to the system plan as a result of the pilot.</b></p>	<p>The purpose of the pilot is to evaluate the school administrative unit's proposed PE/PG system. Data from the pilot must be used to inform potential refinement and improvement of the system.</p> <p>A school administrative unit shall design a pilot to include any aspects of the proposed PE/PG system that have been identified as concerns of local educators. School administrative units are encouraged to utilize student growth measures during the pilot.</p>	<p>The Maine DOE will work in partnership with the Auburn School Department and possibly one or two other school systems to pilot, monitor, and adjust the ASD Administrator Evaluation Framework prior to the beginning of the 2015-16 school year.</p>		
<p><b>Adoption of model/system by school board</b></p>	<p>The submittal must include evidence of adoption of the system by the school board</p>	<p><b>Local School Board:</b> The ASD school board has been regularly kept apprised of PEPG system developments and is represented on the development committee. At the end of the pilot period, the school board will be presented with the system documents for adoption.</p>		