

# Principal Input Model Template

SY 20\_\_ - 20\_\_

<b>Principal Name:</b>	<b>Principal's School/Program:</b>
<b>Grade Level(s) in Principal's Building/Program:</b>	<b>Grade Level(s) Covered in Principal's Input Model:</b>
<b>Identified focus area(s) for the input model:</b>	
<b>Reason this focus area(s) was chosen (evidence it was needed):</b>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	

Both quantitative and qualitative data can be used to demonstrate evidence of principal practice that promotes student growth. The evidence that is selected should be tangible processes, structures, and/or academic outcomes that exist in a school and may fall into one of the following categories:

- Observable elements of principal practice: These elements include but are not limited to leadership team meetings, principals observing teacher practice, or principal to teacher feedback conversations, conducting professional development for staff, leading book studies or presenting at school board meetings.
- Indirect elements of principal practice: These elements include but are not limited to programs and policies the principal has created and/or implemented, an evaluator attending teacher team meetings or collaboration sessions or observing teacher practice across multiple classrooms where the principal is not present, review of building schedules, observing prominence of goals, mission and vision statements throughout the building.
- Artifacts documenting principal practice: These include but are not limited to the strategic school plan, documentation of the school's instructional framework, and communications to families and community members, social media presence and board reports.
- School data: This includes but is not limited to leading indicators, direct evidence of student performance, school climate surveys and stakeholder feedback.

## Principal Action Plan for Focus Area(s)

Please use this area to define the action plan being implemented.

# Principal Rubric for Evaluation of Focus Area as stated in the Input Model Description

Independent -----TO----- Collaborative

	No Evidence (0)	Ineffective (1)	Developing (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)
<b>Criteria 1:</b>  <b>Context Analysis/ Needs Assessment</b>	Leader does not use any data in this decision making process or does not complete an analysis of building or student needs.	Leader reflects on a few data sets. Additionally, the data sets are not current or reflective of the current school environment. There is no evidence that stakeholder groups were engaged in the process. The leader acts in a silo to make decisions for the school community.	Leader identifies current and historical data and uses it to pinpoint a key problem of practice or area for improvement. There is little evidence that stakeholder groups were engaged in the process. This analysis is very two-dimensional and involves looking at only one or two sets of data..	Leader identifies a wide range of current and historical data and engages in analysis to identify a key problem of practice or area for improvement. There is evidence that some stakeholder groups were engaged in the process. This analysis involves multiple points of data including but not limited to, process, demographic, performance, and perceptual data.	Leader identifies a wide range of current and historical data and engages in analysis to identify a key problem of practice or area for improvement. It is evident that key stakeholder groups - school educators and administrators, families, community members and students were part of the process. This analysis involves multiple points of data including but not limited to, process, demographic, performance, and perceptual data.

**Evidence of Criteria 1:**

	No Evidence (0)	Ineffective (1)	Developing (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)
<b>Criteria 2:</b>  <b>Planning and Input</b>	<p>There is no plan that has been created or shared with staff, families, and students across the school community.</p>	<p>The plan is unknown, not commonly understood, and/or has not been shared with staff, families, and students across the school community.</p> <p>The school leader has not developed a plan that is connected to the long-term vision.</p> <p>The school leader has not developed goals or the current goals are not aligned to the long-term vision and as a result there is no plan for evaluation or monitoring..</p>	<p>The plan is created with limited input by stakeholders, and is in the process of being shared with staff, families, and students across the school community.</p> <p>The school leader has a plan and is in the process of developing how the school community will work to realize the vision.</p> <p>The school leader is in the process of adapting an evaluation and monitoring plan or has a plan but is not implementing it.</p>	<p>The plan is created and supported by a representative group of staff, families, and students and some affiliated partnerships.</p> <p>The school leader shares the implementation for student achievement and well-being with the school community of stakeholders and has a plan for how to work together to realize this vision.</p> <p>The school leader and community stakeholders monitor and evaluate progress once or twice a year.</p>	<p>The plan is created and supported by staff, families, and students and is uniformly seen, heard, and known across the entire school community and affiliated partnerships.</p> <p>The school leader champions the implementation of the mission for student achievement and well-being and holds the school community of stakeholders accountable for working to realize the long-term vision and the school priorities.</p> <p>The school leader and community stakeholders regularly monitor and evaluate progress and make adjustments when goals are not achieved, improvements are needed, and priorities become misaligned.</p>

**Evidence of Criteria 2:**

	No Evidence (0)	Ineffective (1)	Developing (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)
<b>Criteria 3:</b>  <b>Outcomes/</b> <b>Criteria for</b> <b>Success</b>	<p>The leader has not articulated the goals to stakeholder groups, therefore measurement is not possible.</p>	<p>The leader articulates goals. The goals have not been met.</p> <p>The process results in no improvement in student success/building growth.</p>	<p>The leader articulates measurable goals. The goals have been partially met.</p> <p>The process results in minimal improvement in student success/building growth.</p>	<p>The leader articulates clearly measurable goals. The measurable goals have been met.</p> <p>The process results in measurable improvement in student success/building growth.</p>	<p>The leader articulates clearly measurable goals. The measurable goals have been exceeded.</p> <p>The process results in significant improvement in student success/building growth.</p>

**Evidence of Criteria 3:**

	No Evidence (0)	Ineffective (1)	Developing (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)
<p><b>Criteria 4:</b></p> <p><b>Process Analysis/ Articulate professional learning that supports these actions/ expectations</b></p>	<p>The leader does not review the plan or outcomes. There has been little to no data collected to measure these outcomes therefore success or weakness is impossible to measure.</p> <p>There is no professional learning for the principal, faculty or staff to support the implementation of this plan.</p>	<p>The leader reviews their plan and anticipated outcomes on his/her own. Some data is used in this analysis, but data is minimal and/or incomplete. The reflection does not identify successes or weaknesses. As a result a plan moving forward is not possible based on the current outcomes.</p> <p>Professional learning for the year is misaligned or only tangentially related to the implementation of this plan.</p>	<p>The leader analyzes their plan and anticipated outcomes. This analysis involves some stakeholder input and data. The reflection identifies successes and/or weaknesses. In response to reflection, some recommendations are made but a formal plan has not been adopted.</p> <p>Some professional learning is related to the implementation of the plan.</p>	<p>The leader, in conjunction with a team of stakeholders, analyzes their plan and anticipated outcomes. This analysis involves stakeholder input and data. The reflection identifies successes and weaknesses. Additionally, findings are shared with the greater school community. In response to the reflection, recommendations are made for how to proceed moving forward.</p> <p>The leader allocates resources to provide professional learning to his/herself, the faculty and staff; this professional learning is directly related to the implementation of the plan.</p> <p>There is some evidence of monitoring the professional learning to ensure alignment to the plan.</p>	<p>The leader, in conjunction with a representative team of stakeholders, analyzes their plan and anticipated outcomes. This analysis involves stakeholder input and multiple points of data. The reflection is thorough, identifies key successes and key weaknesses. Additionally, findings are shared with the greater school community through multiple formats. In response to the reflection, recommendations are made for how to proceed moving forward. This includes a well thought out action plan that includes regular progress monitoring.</p> <p>The leader allocates resources to provide professional learning to his/herself, the faculty and staff.</p> <p>The leader continually monitors the professional learning to ensure alignment with the plan.</p> <p>The leader works with faculty and staff to identify and monitor change in practice as a result of the professional learning and in support of the plan.</p>

**Evidence of Criteria 4:**

## **Scoring:**

Collect sufficient evidence for each of the criterion. Label the evidence as quantitative (QN) or qualitative (QT). Align the evidence with the rubric and score accordingly. Scoring should be based on the preponderance of evidence. A total of all four criteria will be added together to result in a total score that can be placed on the HEDI scale. (final page)

## **Scoring Guide:**

Criteria 1: Leader is given a score from 0 - 4

Criteria 2: Leader is given a score from 0 - 4 and this is doubled as this is the greatest part of the work towards the end result or outcome.

Criteria 3: Leader is given a score from 0 - 4

Criteria 4: Leader is given a score from 0 - 4

## **How do I determine the score? Which area of the rubric best represents the preponderance of evidence?**

Score of 0 = NO EVIDENCE

Score of 1 = Little/Inappropriate Evidence

Score of 2 = Some/Insufficient Evidence

Score of 3 = Frequent/Appropriate Evidence

Score of 4 = Continual/Seamless Evidence

***\*\*An evaluator uses evidence informed professional judgement to align evidence to the rubric.\*\****

## **Example 1:**

Criteria 1: 3

Criteria 2: 3 (multiple times 2) = 6

Criteria 3: 3

Criteria 4: 3

Total of 15 points = Effective

## **Example 2:**

Criteria 1: 4

Criteria 2: 4 (multiple times 2) = 8

Criteria 3: 3

Criteria 4: 3

Total of 18 points = Highly Effective



## Summary of HEDI Score

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Rubric Score (0-4)</u>
<b>Criteria 1: Context Analysis/Needs Assessment</b>	____/4
<b>Criteria 2: Planning and Input (counts double)</b>	____/8
<b>Criteria 3: Outcomes/Criteria for Success</b>	____/4
<b>Criteria 4: Process Analysis/ Articulate professional learning that supports these actions/expectations</b>	____/4

Total Score \_\_\_\_/20 = \_\_\_\_\_ (HEDI)

	Minimum	Maximum
<b>H</b>	18	20
<b>E</b>	15	17
<b>D</b>	13	14
<b>I</b>	0	12