



<b>CRITERION 1: Effective leadership</b>	1.1 Focus on student learning  1    2    3    4	1.2 Dynamic and distributive leadership  1    2    3    4	1.3 Sustaining improvement efforts  1    2    3    4	<b>Criterion 1 Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished	
<b>CRITERION 2: Quality teaching and learning support</b>	2.1 Quality classroom instruction  1    2    3    4	2.2 Coordinated and aligned curriculum and assessment  1    2    3    4	2.3 Coordinated and job-embedded professional development  1    2    3    4	<b>Criterion 2 Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished	
<b>CRITERION 3: System-wide improvement</b>	3.1 Effective use of data  1    2    3    4	3.2 Strategic allocation of resources  1    2    3    4	3.3 Policy and program coherence  1    2    3    4	<b>Criterion 3 Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished	
<b>CRITERION 4: Clear and collaborative relationships</b>	4.1 Professional culture and collaborative relationships  1    2    3    4	4.2 Clear understanding of school and district roles and responsibilities  1    2    3    4	4.3 Engaging the community and managing the external environment  1    2    3    4	<b>Criterion 4 Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished	
<b>Preliminary Summative Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory    2 – Basic 3 – Proficient        4 – Distinguished <table border="1" style="float: right; margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td>Total: ____</td> </tr> </table>					Total: ____
Total: ____					

Step 1: The administrator is given a **summative rating** using the following **summative rating bands**.

**Summative Rating (Individual):**

4-6 Unsatisfactory  <b>Administrator summative rating:</b> _____	7-10 Basic  <b>Administrator summative rating:</b> _____	11-14 Proficient  <b>Administrator summative rating:</b> _____	15-16 Distinguished  <b>Administrator summative rating:</b> _____
---	---	---	--

**Step 2: Calculating the Student Growth Rating** ♦ Central Office Evaluation Summative Rating Sheet ♦ Orting School District 2016-2017 ♦ Name

E-1.1 Orting students will graduate college ready.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E-1.2 Orting students will earn passing or at standard grades.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E-1.3 Orting students will meet established benchmarks leading to college readiness.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E-2.1 Orting students will graduate career ready.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E- 2.2 Orting students will consistently attend school.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E-2.3 Orting students will develop a high school and beyond plan which demonstrates each student’s ability to identify key transition knowledge and skills.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E- 3.1 Orting students’ high school graduation rates will exceed the state average and will be equitable for identified targeted groups of students.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E-3.2 Orting students will explore, develop and monitor growth goals in six prioritized domains that contribute to effective learning in school and that help ensure successful life-long learning.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished

E-3.3 Orting students will exhibit the behavioral skills needed to be successful learners and citizens.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
E-3.4 Orting students will demonstrate competency in digital citizenship and technology literacy.	<b>Student Growth Rating:</b> 1 – Unsatisfactory 2 – Basic 3 – Proficient 4 – Distinguished
Directions for Step 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each of the three student growth indicators are rated separately</li> <li>The three student growth ratings are added together (not a holistic Score)</li> <li>Evaluator places administrator in a <b>student growth category</b> based on <b>student growth bands</b> (below)</li> </ul>	<b>Preliminary Student Growth Rating:</b>  Total: _____

Step 3: Using the **student growth ratings**, the administrative team is placed in a **student growth category** using the following rating bands.

**Student growth categories (collective):**

10-19 LOW	20-30 AVERAGE	31-40 HIGH
<b>Administrator student growth rating:</b> _____	<b>Administrator student growth rating:</b> _____	<b>Administrator student growth rating:</b> _____

\*Note: A student growth rating of “1” for ANY of the student growth indicators results in a LOW overall student growth rating.

**Check one to determine subsequent actions:**

- The administrator falls into a **summative category** of Distinguished and has a collective AVERAGE or HIGH **student growth rating**, the administrator receives an **overall summative rating** of Distinguished and should be recognized or rewarded.
- The administrator falls into a **summative category** of Basic, Proficient, or Distinguished and has a collective LOW **student growth rating**, so the administrators must participate in a **student growth inquiry**.
- The administrator falls into a **summative category** of unsatisfactory, so performance issues must be addressed. Minimally, the administrator must be placed on a **probationary plan of improvement**.

It is my judgment, based upon the adopted criteria that this staff member’s performance has been  Satisfactory  Unsatisfactory during this evaluation period.

(Note: A central office administrator’s work will not be judged satisfactory if the overall summative rating is level 1 or level 2 when the administrator has more than 2 years of experience and level 2 has been received 2 consecutive years or 2 out of 3 consecutive years.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Evaluation Conference

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Evaluator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator’s Signature

My signature above indicates that I have seen this evaluation, including the criteria rating sheets. It does not necessarily indicate agreement with the findings. I understand that I may submit a written response to this evaluation.