

LATE

Testimony HB 2070

January 27, 2010

My Name is John P. Sosa and I am Principal of Kaiser High School

I have been in the Department of education for 40 years, 34 of those years as a school, district or state administrator. It saddens me greatly to see the direction that our education system has taken especially in the last 10 years. We have become a reactionary system, one that is trying to improve by legislating change and reform from State House to School House, which is fraught with pitfalls such as the logic that is being applied via this bill. Since the DOE did not implement the portion of Act 51 that dealt with Performance Contracts for Principals this body has decided to simply convert Principals back to 10 month status, cut their pay and have them work for free, as they did in the good old days!

The move to place Principals on 12 month status was an idea that took a long time to implement. It was first discussed in the early 1980's and came to fruition in the 1990's. The idea was simple, pay principals for what they are already doing, working during the summer to make sure the school is ready for teachers, and students when school opens for the school year. If this bill passes it will hamper our ability to be ready, times have changed, demands have increased, workload has increased, and the end result of principals not being on paid status, will harm students.

Let me be clear, I am not at all against performance contracts. In fact I support them. I spent two years in Washington State as Superintendent of a small district. I negotiated the contracts for our Principal and Vice Principal, The entire state of Washington places all principals on contracts. They are for the most part individually negotiated between the principal and the local District Superintendent with final approval by the local Board. Some districts have a range for different levels, elementary, middle and high school. Others negotiate based on experience and background, in essence going after proven administrators and compensating them accordingly. Many include incentive clauses that reward leaders for goals attained. Security is attained by a rollover feature that extends the contract based on the Principals evaluation. The system is fair, it provides incentives for administrators to improve, it allows districts to recruit high quality administrators and it provides an incentive for new leaders to move into the demanding field of school level administration.

Many of our Principals participated in the process that was established to implement Act 51 mandate. They did so on their own time doing extra work and following the direction set forth by the DOE. It is not our fault that the process failed yet we are the ones being "punished".

I have no doubt that if this bill is passed many in the field such as I will retire leaving a void in the field when Quality leadership is needed the most. Worse yet the pool of potential applicants to be trained to fill school leadership positions will diminish, creating a void in the years to come. Sadly our system continues to slide backwards based on ill thought out legislation such as HB 2070.

Again I strongly urge you not to pass this measure.

LATE TESTIMONY

Testimony of Darrel Galera
Principal, Moanalua High School
House Committee on Education
January 27, 2010 2:00 p.m.
H.B. 2070

Testimony of Darrel Galera, Principal, Moanalua High School
January 27, 2010

Imagine ... a school principal who ordered all classroom teachers to implement a new procedure – and when the teachers failed to do so, the principal determined that the solution would be to punish every student in every classroom.

Such a scenario is so incredulous and lacking in logic and reason that it would be almost inconceivable.

My name is Darrel Galera and I am the principal of Moanalua High School. I have been an educator for nearly thirty years and a school administrator for almost twenty years. I am testifying against HB 2070. This bill will harm students.

I urge all members of the House Committee on Education not to pass a bill that is equally as incredulous as the scenario I described above.

The purpose of my testimony is to provide the strongest possible of advocacy for Committee on Education not to harm our students. This bill will harm students. This bill will result in excellent principals, excellent vice principals, and excellent teachers leaving the profession and leaving our public schools at a time when Hawaii public education desperately needs leadership – and at a time when we need to attract and retain the very best of principal leaders and teacher leaders. This bill will harm students.

If the intent of this bill is to have the Principals Performance Contract implemented, then the appropriate solution is to deal with the cause of the problem. Let me be very clear – the Hawaii school principals have gone above and beyond the call of duty – to support and advocate for the implementation of the Principals Performance Contract. School principals are not the cause of this problem.

I am enclosing copies of documents that provide examples of the communications and work completed by the school principals and forwarded to the Hawaii Department of Education.

In 2004, I was asked to serve on the Act 51 Performance Contract Workgroup and I did take on these additional duties for the entire period that the workgroup was formed in 2004. I attended and participated in every meeting of the Performance Contract Workgroup as did all school principals who were members. We dedicated ourselves to many all day meetings to collaborate with all stakeholders – DOE Superintendent, personnel specialists, business leaders, higher education leaders, union representatives, and parent representatives – and we completed our work and submitted our full report and a draft of a proposed performance contract to the Superintendent. However, it was not implemented. (See below – Overview of Act 51 Performance Contract Workgroup dated August 2004). Thereafter, school principals repeatedly questioned the DOE and asked, when and how would the principals performance contract be implemented? In 2007, the issue again was raised. In response, the DOE decided to do a “pilot” of the

performance contract with the principals of the Mililani Complex. The decision not to implement the recommendations of the Workgroup was confusing, as was the decision to implement a pilot totally unrelated to the recommendations approved by the Workgroup. (See below – Memo to Mililani Complex Principals dated October 22, 2007). Again, the principals of the Mililani Complex did all that was asked of them to do. No performance contract was implemented.

It is clear to see from these documents is that as principals, we have done our part to try and ensure that Principals Performance Contracts were implemented in accordance with ACT 51.

School principals have gone above and beyond the call of duty to implement the Principals Performance Contract. Principals should not be blamed and held responsible – nor used as “pawns” in a legislative chess game, for the Department of Education’s failure to implement the Principals Performance Contract.

In spite of all of the distractions and chaos caused by all of the unfunded mandates, ever changing directions, ever moving targets, and the recent budget crisis, the strength of the public school system and the Hawaii DOE has been the leadership provided by school principals and classroom teachers.

This ill conceived bill only serves to do the following things:

- (1) destroys the morale of hard working school principals
- (2) forces exemplary school principals to retire early and leave public education and the service of public school students
- (3) discourages exemplary vice principals and exemplary teacher leaders from continuing in or entering school administration
- (4) punishes principals for the something that the Hawaii DOE did not follow through on

The single most important thing that lawmakers can do to improve public education is to provide the foundation for a education system that attracts, recruits, and retains the most talented, skilled, and visionary school leaders.

HB 2070 does the exact opposite. I strongly urge you not to pass H.B. 2070.

This bill will harm students.

Overview of ACT 51 Performance Contract Workgroup

(Compiled by D. Galera)
August 2004

Below is a brief summary of the activities of the workgroup meeting to report on Performance Contracts for School Principals. This summary is prepared by the representatives on the workgroup who represent school principals. Please review and provide any feedback that can help us to represent the views and perspectives of all school principals. Thank you.

Purpose of the workgroup as stated in ACT 51:

- Act 51 – “The superintendent of education shall select and convene a working group to create a plan for performance contracts for principals to be implemented beginning with the 2006-2007 school year... the working group shall:
- Establish appropriate performance criteria...
- Determine appropriate performance benchmarks...
- Determine appropriate rewards, assistance, & sanctions...
- Address any other issues necessary for implementation”

Overview of activities in July/August:

- Focus Group Meetings Held
- Workgroup Convened
- Meetings held on August 19 & August 26
- Next meeting – September 2
- Members: Superintendent, CAS, OHR, School Principals, HGEA, PTSA, Legislator, UH
- Resources reviewed: feedback from focus groups, articles, research, DOE accountability info, sample from S.F. other

Examples of topics, questions, and issues discussed thus far:

- What should be the definition of “performance contract?”
- Should a performance contract for principals be only for providing incentives (not sanctions) ?
- Should principals have option or choice to participate in a performance contract?
- Should we have two separate evaluations/reviews: (1) PEP-SL and (2) a performance contract?

- How are the following related – School Community Council’s input for evaluating a principal? Whether a school achieves NCLB AYP?
- Should there be an incentive (monetary or other) for a principal who meets the benchmarks of a performance contract? Should there be an incentive for school? Or for both?
- What criteria should be used in a performance contract for principals? If student achievement is a criteria, how should student achievement be defined? By H.S.A. scores? By other measures?
- How can we get feedback from and communicate with all principals?

Questions for principals to discuss, reflect on, and provide feedback:

- What should be included in a “performance contract” for principals?
- Should it be focused only on “incentives?”
- Should principals have an option to be on a “performance contract?”
- Should it be separate from PEP-SL?
- Should PEP-SL and a “performance contract” be combined?
- What are implications of a monetary incentive for principals?
- What should be used for “student achievement” criteria? H.S.A.?
- What are other questions, concerns, recommendations?

SEE FEEDBACK BELOW FROM CENTRAL DISTRICT COMPLEXES

**FEEDBACK FROM PRINCIPALS TO PERFORMANCE
CONTRACT WORKGROUP**

Comments and Responses to Questions on Performance Contracts

Waialua & Leilehua Complexes

(D. Matsukawa, B. Vierra-Chun, A. Coleman, C. Price, D. Arai, S. Watanabe, J. Lee, L. Hasegawa, L. Pea, J. Serikaku, J. Iwase, J. Yoneda, N. Minehira)

PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION:

Those who are participating in the discussion group/ad hoc committee has the responsibility to iron-out recommendations to legislature. A solid plan or design, crafted with input by principals, to a large degree, is the sensible way to approach this task. Giving input also provides a “checks & balance” to the thinking that the representative principals (Darrel G, Norman M, Bruce N) carry with them to the dialogue sessions:

1. What is a performance contract?

- PEP-SL is an evaluation between CAS and principal of how well EO demonstrates indicators of an effective administrator (administrator's standards)
- Performance Contract is a quantitative measure; but should not be purely quantitative
- both should be discussed with the CAS; CAS be the evaluator; not SSC
- avoid using AYP; performance contract should be progress-based and over time (still deciding whether performance contracts will be 3 or 5 yr terms)
- should be tied into school's report card
- performance contract ties principal's roles and responsibilities to school's performance and to student performance (as indicated in the existing definition)

2. Should performance contract be incentive focused?

- must be clear as to the purpose of the incentive-giving; if it is for attracting and/or retaining effective leadership
- possibly the "gauge" will be different for each school; i.e. a principal that "inherits" teaching staff, low scores, etc. at new school vs a principal that opens a new school and can select his/her staff; both are starting at different points on the improvement efforts
- performance contract should be for all EOs
- to award a school with incentives is okay but avoid individual incentives
- incentive could be salary raises, over and beyond basic contractual guidelines
- (will this attract and keep good leaders to the school/retain good leaders at the school? what about schools with low performing students? what kinds of leaders will be motivated to apply?)
- huge difference between private business incentives to CEOs/leaders and educational organization; business will terminate the person or non-renew contracts...

3. Should principals have the option to be on a performance contract?

- Everyone should be under a performance contract; throw out the notion of "voluntarism"

4. Should performance contracts be separate from PEP-SL?

- PEP-SL is management right; performance contract is legislatively driven; very different purposes (PEP-SL is about a continuum toward professionalism and personal growth; performance contract is about school and student achievement)

5. Should PEP-SL and Performance Contract be combined?

- Performance contract will not “go away”; if it is here to stay, then have both measurements to offer a “balanced” view of school leadership (school leader and school)

6. What are the implications of a monetary incentive for principals?

- could cause a wedge between principal and staff, especially those staff members who are non-supportive of principal's vision/guidance or leadership choices to improve the school
- must also examine the other side of the coin: what are the implications or sanctions for principals who don't fulfill their contracts....
- creates a division within our own ranks: the “haves” and “have nots”
- too many factors which are not in the control of principals could easily influence the outcomes of the contract; it takes at least 5 years to show

growth

and the operative word is “AT LEAST....”

7. What should be used for student achievement criteria? HSA?

- school indicators; report card indicators;
- there have been many suggested indicators (graduation rate, attendance, chapter 19 incidents, drop out rate, HSA scores, school climate, etc.)
- the “number” or “quantitative” measures should be a manageable

number

and compose a “core” of indicators or criteria for all performance contracts

- principal should be able to also determine what indicators he/she would also like to be held accountable to
- add a self-assessment piece
- San Francisco model is largely based on student achievement scores

8. Questions?

What is HGEA's position on Performance contracts? (HGEA should be held accountable to principals; currently, HGEA wants to negotiate all the items of performance contract; that's already a

stoppage

to any progress towards a fair and relevant contract; no field input;

practice

in past has been that decisions are made behind closed doors; HGEA must see that we, collectively, will be taking a strong position on this

matter;

that HGEA must give- and- take; all of us must be willing to step up to the plate...and not allow HGEA or any bargaining unit to dictate such important matters like performance contracts for us)

— Does ACT 51 still supercede bargaining unit agreements and prior MOAs

as initially stated in the ACT or has Act 220/238 nixed it?

_ What is the role of the SCC in principals' performance contracts? Who defines that role?

_ Isn't the SCC evaluating principals and participating in the hiring and firing? (the CAS, SUPT, BOE hires and fires; SCC should, if anything, can give input, or conduct a review, or make recommendations/commendations to CAS)

_ If SCC is evaluating the principal, then shouldn't SCC and principal include in by-laws i.e. timetable, procedures, the criteria/indicators for the performance contract?

_ Shouldn't we follow the legislative actions or lack of actions on our recommendations about performance contracts to legislature in January 2005?

(YES; we all share that responsibility; often what goes in at the outset ends up as something else..i.e. 12 month EOs became 12 month SACs; all of us were caught by surprise and no ONE entity could give a clear explanation of how this could have happened)

_ "WHO" is the performance contract with? principal and....?

_ If principals are willing to embrace performance contracts when can we expect

that legislators will introduce teacher performance contracts? Will HSTA or legislators "sit on the fence" on this? Why is the principal solely held accountable when the collaborative process, the development of a "community centered" school as REACH emphasizes, and educational accountability piece of Act 51 all reflect shared responsibility, shared-decision making, ownership

by all shareholders, etc.? (bumping up everyone, including teachers, classified etc.

will help...no guarantee that this will occur)

_ What will be in place when a principal's contract has NOT BEEN MET? Usually supports are provided and gradual steps or process are in place for

professional improvement, termination, transfer, re-assignment. Will a principal, if wishes to transfer or self-select to go back to teaching? At present, a principal

no longer has "teaching certification", is this correct? Is there going to be another/separate category whereby the principal-at-risk is placed in a "holding"

position or status until improvements are evident? How long?

- and
- _ Will the legislature provide a legal definition of "performance contract"
 - _ "stick" with it?
 - _ Do we need both PEP-SL and performance contract?
 - _ Define "contract"?

RADFORD COMPLEX

1. Should be school evaluation instead of performance contract.
2. Performance contract should stipulate the powers a principal has, i.e., contractual powers – HSTA.
3. Incentives should go to whole school as well as principal. Teachers will perform if they too will get something out of it.
4. Student achievement (AYP) should be based on "your baseline" and not the same for all schools.
5. Student achievement should also be based on individual students' achievement.
6. Should have incentives as well as sanctions to have a "balance."
7. If principal is to have sanctions, so should other personnel (teachers).
8. Focus only on principal is very limited – focus should be system wide.
9. Performance contract should be defined:
 - What is required?
 - Rubric (exceeds, meets)
 - Clear targets
10. Who is going to provide the support for the principal?
11. What is the objective of a performance contract? (make principals work harder? Get rid of principals?)
12. PEP-SL and Performance Contract should be separate.
13. You can do good things at your school so it's unfair to be judged on only the HAS.
14. What will be counted? HSA? Report Card? Subjective?

MILILANI COMPLEX

1. PEP-SL and Performance Contract should be separate.
2. Incentives – concern over mismatch use of incentives
 - Across the board compensation
 - Incentives okay if given to the schools
3. What type of support will be given to the principal who is in “need.”
4. Council eval/feedback should impact upon portions of the PEP-SL.
5. Student achievement data should link back to the SID – how well have goals set forth been accomplished?
6. What part does scholarship rates, graduation rates, suspension rates, etc., play into evaluation?
7. Where is the money coming from for the incentives and sanctions?
8. If people are accountable, then are we considering principals looking at merit pay for teachers?

MOANALUA COMPLEX

1. PEP-SL and performance contract should be integrated – not separate.
2. Question and concern of the relationship of the “evaluation” of the SCC to all of this.
3. What will be the value of accreditation and Felix reviews (internal/external) and other reviews if we have performance contracts?
4. Should not be optional – but first year principals should have flexibility – instrument should be flexible and multi-faceted to meet varying needs.
5. concerns about incentives for principals – bar should be set high for all and salary set high and commensurate for all
6. Will there be a rubric of criteria? Should not only be on AYP.
7. A performance contract for principals will only work if there is a way to hold teachers and staff members accountable also.
8. The evaluation of a principal should include a prepared principal reflection and evidence of meta cognition – would be most valuable.
9. All complex area superintendents need to be available and accessible and knowledgeable of all that is happening to evaluate the performance contract of a principal.
10. Can the process include a “peer review” like other fields – three other principals to review and rate the principal on a performance contract?

October 22, 2007

MEMO TO: Mililani Complex Principals
FROM: Darrel Galera, Principal, Moanalua High School
SUBJECT: Performance Contract for Principals

During the recent E.O. Institute, there were concerns stated about the Pilot of the Principals Performance Contract. The concerns stated included whether the pilot was related to the recommendations of the work group and in accordance with the final report. Attached is a copy of the final report of the Performance Contract Workgroup. The report includes the following that was discussed at length by the work group:

- core criteria and optional criteria for 4 professional standards that should be included in principal performance contracts,
- rewards and incentives
- issues relating to implementation
- role of OHR to provide information to principals and other stakeholders, developing performance contract system, putting contract materials together, finalizing the contract and evaluation instrument, etc.
- role of OCISS and how the Hawaii Principals Academy will focus on helping to train CAS, principals and vice principals in the following areas: becoming better leaders, improving student academic achievement, etc.
- Role of the Complex Area Superintendent – to be responsible for the development of performance contracts, selection of specific targets and goals in consultation with the principals
- A draft of a Principals Performance Contract that incorporates the “selection of performance indicators of student achievement as agreed to by CAS and principal”

Some important issues include:

- (1) Whether there will be communication from the DOE about the pilot – will information come only through the HGEA?
- (2) whether the actual implementation of the Principals Performance Contract will mirror the pilot (a pilot that has not shared the recommendations of the workgroup, is using a specific protocol for classroom observations – note that the report states that the training for principals will be done through the Hawaii Principals Academy and OCISS – not through OHR
- (3) whether the actual performance contract will be collectively bargained
- (4) whether principals should serve on work groups if their input and voice is not used by the Department of Education

LATE TESTIMONY

**IMPLEMENTING PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS
IN HAWAII'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

A Report

**Pursuant to Act 51, Session Laws of Hawaii 2004
As amended by Act 221, Session Laws of Hawaii 2004**

**Hawaii Department of Education
January 13, 2005**

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overview of Performance Contracts	1
Working Group Objectives	2
Establishment of Focus Groups	3
General Findings	3
Core and Optional Criteria	4
Rewards, Assistance, and Sanctions	9
Issues Regarding Implementation	11
Implementation Timeline	12
Appendices	
Appendix A: Performance Contract Working Group	14
Appendix B: Issues Addressed by Focus Groups	15
Appendix C: Reaction from Presentations to Principals	20
Appendix D: Draft Performance Contract and Evaluation Form	22

INTRODUCTION

Overview of Performance Contracts

In the business world, executives are typically evaluated and compensated based on performance. They may receive a bonus if their company realizes a significant profit and/or if they meet specific performance objectives. Conversely, they may see reduced remuneration if the company's financial portfolio is weak or if they fail to meet specific targets. This model, known as "performance contracting" or "pay-for-performance," is used in the public sector as well. Several school systems including those in San Francisco, Houston, and Columbus, Ohio have already adopted principal performance contracts or are tying principal pay to performance. This interest in performance contracts for principals, other administrators, and even teachers closely coincides with increasing demands for greater accountability in public education.

A principal performance contract is an agreement between the school administrator and the school system that explicitly links a set of rewards and sanctions to job performance. Despite a growing trend toward contracting, observers report that there is little consensus about what indicators should be used in the evaluation of the performance. While student test scores are the most commonly used indicator, they can be the most controversial of the measures used in the contract. Some advocates of performance contracting assert that using test scores brings a heightened awareness of student achievement and encourages schools to be more effective in helping students achieve standards.

However, other individuals argue that test scores are biased indicators of a school principal's performance, primarily because many factors outside the principal's control influence or account for variation in student achievement. These factors include but are not limited to: teacher quality, the home environment, parental involvement, and class size. There is also serious concern that using student test scores will give the school administrator an additional incentive to pressure teachers to teach to the test and ignore other important academic matters. If student test scores are included as a measure of principal performance, critics argue that such scores should not be the sole indicator. Other potential indicators include but are not limited to demonstrating budgetary acuity, improving school safety, offering staff development opportunities, designing a challenging curriculum, maximizing parent and community involvement in schools, and improving student attendance and graduation rates.

Advocates of performance contracts insist that such contracts help to create a set of clearly defined goals for the principal to achieve and enable the principal to focus efforts on improvement in specific areas. An additional benefit of performance contracts is that they can be an element of a detailed, feedback-oriented evaluation system. Such contracts also provide an objective means of rewarding administrators for accomplishing specific goals. They are also seen as a way to establish a focus on performance as well as a way to reward improvement and innovation.

Commentators caution that the development and implementation of performance contracts need to be carefully planned and that they need to be placed within the context of other initiatives to both guide and stimulate improvement in the schools. For example, it is argued that performance contracts should provide administrators with a support system that gives them a chance to improve before any sanctions are imposed.

Houston is one example of a public school system that has fully implemented principal performance contracts, having established them for administrators in the mid-1990s. In this instance, the principal's supervisor establishes goal criteria, including performance standards for each principal. Each principal's performance standards are specific and include measurable objectives that are connected to the school's improvement plan. These objectives might include the percentage of students passing the student assessments, student attendance rates, teacher/staff attendance rates, a reduction in the number of discipline actions, lower dropout rates and higher rates of parental participation in school activities. The principal can then select from these objectives the specific areas to include in his or her performance review with the district superintendent.

At the end of the appraisal period, the evaluation addresses the administrator's performance in achieving the goals and standards. The supervisor and principal are expected to have periodic discussions to review progress.

The introduction of performance contracts is not limited to school systems in the United States. Recently the Australian state of New South Wales introduced an effort to measure principal performance against a set of performance criteria. Key criteria will include, but not be limited to: students' test results, student enrollment and retention data, planning and budget management, and resource and risk management. Principals will be reviewed at least annually but more often if deemed necessary. Principals who fail to meet targets will be placed on a "performance improvement program."

Working Group Objectives

The Department of Education (Department), in response to Act 51, Session Laws of Hawaii 2004, (Act 51), as amended by Act 221, Session Laws of Hawaii 2004 (Act 221) selected and convened a working group to create a plan for performance contracts for principals to be implemented beginning with the 2006-2007 school year. This progress report contains the findings of the working group and describes a plan and timeline for implementation.

This working group consisted of a variety of key stakeholders, including the Superintendent of Education, complex area superintendents, school principals, and representatives of other agencies, organizations, and groups. A list of the stakeholders is provided in Appendix A. Pursuant to the provisions of Act 51 as amended by Act 221, the working group was charged with the following tasks:

- (1) Establish appropriate performance criteria which shall be used in individual performance contracts for principals, including:
 - a. Core criteria to be incorporated into performance contracts statewide; and
 - b. Criteria that may be used at the discretion of individual schools;
- (2) Determine appropriate performance benchmarks, or methods of devising performance benchmarks, that may be used to assess principal performance relative to expected standards; provided that such performance benchmarks, at a minimum, shall include those elements related to principals in the educational accountability system;
- (3) Determine appropriate rewards, assistance, and sanctions to be included or considered for inclusion in performance contracts; and
- (4) Address any other issues necessary for the implementation of performance contracts.

The working group met from August through December 2004 to deliberate the issues and to address the tasks listed above.

Establishment of Focus Groups

Prior to convening the working group, the Department of Education conducted a series of eight focus groups in July 2004 to gather a broad range of perspectives, views, and concerns. Information gathered from the eight focus groups provided the working group with sufficient foundation and exposure to the key issues that would need to be addressed in the establishment of principal performance contracts. A summary of the major issues and concerns expressed by focus group participants is contained in Appendix B. Selected members of the workgroup also addressed principals across the state to elicit their reaction to the establishment of the performance contracts. A summary of suggestions provided by the principal groups is contained in Appendix C.

Participants in the eight focus groups included but were not limited to: members of the business community, representatives from the Hawaii Government Employees Association and the Parent-Teacher-Student Association, principals and vice-principals, officials and faculty from post-secondary institutions in Hawaii, legislators, Board of Education members, and personnel from the Department of Education. Some of the individuals attending the focus groups were invited to participate in the deliberations of the working group.

GENERAL FINDINGS

The working group deliberated at some length on how to implement principal performance contracts. Their general findings are as follows:

Core and Optional Criteria

The following discussion summarizes the current agreement on the core and optional criteria that should be included in the principal performance contracts. These are listed by four professional standards as articulated in The Professional Evaluation Program for School Leaders (PEP-SL). This is a new evaluation program for school administrators based upon a revised "Profile of an Effective School Leader." The four professional standards are:

- ✓ Provides leadership in school and demonstrates instructional improvement to raise student achievement
- ✓ Promotes a positive climate for learning and an atmosphere of caring and respect for all students and members of the school community
- ✓ Maintains high standards of professionalism
- ✓ Manages the full scope of school administrative responsibilities

The core and optional criteria are discussed under each of the four respective standards below.

Standard 1 -- Provides leadership in school and demonstrates instructional improvement to raise student achievement

Core Criteria

The primary focus of this standard is on raising student achievement. Consistent with the initiatives in other school systems, the Department of Education intends to include student achievement as a fundamental or core element of principal performance contracts. Examples of core student achievement criteria are listed below.

- Increasing the percent of students who are proficient in reading at tested grades
- Increasing the percent of students who are proficient in mathematics at tested grades
- Increasing the percent of students who move from one proficiency level to another (well below to approaches, etc.)
- Increasing the percent of specific subgroups of students who attain reading proficiency at tested grades
- Increasing the percent of third grade students who are proficient

Optional Criteria

In addition to attending to core criteria as listed above, principals are responsible for facilitating, guiding, and improving effective instructional practices in the schools. The following is a list of optional criteria to monitor the degree to which the principal has been successful in enhancing school instructional practices.

- Develops, communicates, and implements a shared vision for achieving standards and an academic plan.
- Advocates high expectations for teaching and learning results.
- Pursues school improvement and demonstrates commitment to attain higher levels of student achievement and performance.
- Utilizes multiple assessment tools and strategies to support the achievement of the performance standards by every student.
- Fosters teachers' reflection on practice, monitors performance, and provides feedback for adjustment of instruction to meet student needs.
- Promotes professional growth of faculty and staff.
- Incorporates best practice and research-based strategies for school and instructional improvement.
- Evaluates current school programs in terms of identified instructional goals and objectives.

Standard 2 -- Promotes a positive climate for learning and an atmosphere of caring and respect for all students and members of the school community

Core Criteria

The Department of Education has three fundamental priorities:

- (1) Ensuring our students' academic achievement;
- (2) Providing for their safety and well-being; and
- (3) Promoting their civic responsibility.

This standard provides for a focused school level attention on promoting civic responsibility. The Department has recently published for the first time a series of annual educational and fiscal accountability trend reports which provide up to three

year's worth of data on indicators covering the three fundamental priorities. Current school-level indicators in the trend reports for civic responsibility include:

- The number of students participating in the Young Voter Registration program
- The number and percent of students participating in the Kids Voting Hawaii program
- The percent of students enrolled in the school who are not suspended from school
- The number of school or community service projects initiated at the school

The core criteria under this standard is the promotion of civic responsibility as demonstrated by data from student activities.

Optional Criteria

Additional optional criteria under standard two include:

- Models and promotes trust, enthusiasm, rapport, respect and openness among faculty, staff, students, parents, and members of the community.
- Seeks input from stakeholders for improvements in student learning and social responsibility.
- Encourages and establishes open, effective communication.
- Utilizes effective strategies in setting performance expectations, planning, decision-making, problem solving, and conflict resolution.
- Encourages the development of school/community partnerships and parent participation.
- Recognizes the contributions of school and community members.

Standard 3 -- Maintains high standards of professionalism
--

A professional is engaged in a calling that typically requires specialized knowledge and skills which have often been gained from long and intensive study. Such study includes a review, understanding, and application of a set of specific scientific, historical, or scholarly principles. The professional is also committed to maintaining high standards of achievement and conduct, continued study, and work whose prime purpose is public service. Principals, as highly trained and esteemed members of their profession, are charged with the responsibility to continually strengthen their leadership skills,

communicate their vision to their colleagues and stakeholders, and model high ethical standards.

Core Criteria

The following core indicator has been proposed but is still being reviewed and discussed.

- Pursues professional improvement activities to strengthen one's own leadership performance. Fully completes a professional development or improvement plan developed collaboratively with the complex area superintendent and may include credit hours or other professional development activities.

Optional Criteria

The following are additional optional criteria:

- Demonstrates and promotes high standards of ethics, honesty, and integrity.
- Manages problems and implements solutions effectively.
- Demonstrates ability to self-assess and to reflect on administrative practices.
- Communicates and interacts effectively with supervisors and colleagues.
- Communicates and interacts effectively with school community.

Standard 4 -- Manages the full scope of school administrative responsibilities

School administrative responsibilities include a combination of leadership and management functions. School administrators are required to effectively manage financial and human resources to ensure students receive the services they need. In addition, principals must closely supervise school personnel and must be attuned to daily operational issues related to safety, law, and public policy. In short, they need to ensure a safe and productive learning and working environment.

Core Criteria

The Department's annual educational and fiscal accountability trend reports contain a set of indicators which are a temperature check on the safety and well-being of the campus. These indicators include but are not limited to:

- Average daily attendance
- Offenses by type of incident

- Results of facilities inspection reports
- Whether a school has been rated as persistently dangerous
- Student and parent perceptions of the safety of the school

Consequently, the core criteria under this standard is:

- Promotes safety and well being of students as demonstrated by data, e.g. attendance, facilities inspections, and parent, student, and teacher perceptions from the School Quality Survey.

Optional Criteria

Additional optional criteria under this standard include the following.

- Complies with applicable statutes, federal laws, regulations, procedures, contractual provisions, and other governance parameters.
- Attends to all required administrative functions such as supervision and evaluation of instruction, teachers and staff; maintenance of a well-functioning school plant; and timely completion of reports.
- Manages financial plan, conducts sound fiscal operations, and accounting of school resources.
- Secures and uses available resources to attain school improvement goals and objectives for optimum benefit to students.
- Maintains standards for a safe, orderly, and effective learning environment.

The set of indicators identified under each of the four standards above clearly demonstrates that while student achievement indicators are core elements of the performance contract, such indicators do not exist in isolation from other indicators which provide information on how well a principal effectively exercises leadership and guides the school and manages its resources. Establishing this array of indicators is consistent with what the Department has learned about the establishment of performance contracts in other public school systems.

The tenor of the No Child Left Behind Act notwithstanding, attempts to measure performance against a one-size fits all or a rigid static model of improvement is counterproductive. Thus, the Department intends that the adoption of indicators of student achievement should be based on a growth or progress model rather than a fixed baseline against which all principals are assessed. In addition, the performance contract and the principal evaluation system will take into account the school as well as the community context.

While the performance contract covers three years, the actual goals or targets are reviewed and discussed and the evaluation is conducted annually. Specific goals established for each principal are based on the discussions between the principal and the complex area superintendent. Core and optional criteria under each of the four standards identified above will be included in the contract. As is the case in Houston, the specific goals are agreed upon by the principal and the complex area superintendent who is the evaluator.

In addition, each principal, regardless of the condition of the school along an indicator's continuum, is expected to demonstrate measurable progress or improvement. Where that principal is expected to "start" and "end" on any given indicator during the contract period will vary from principal to principal.

The implementation of the performance contract is not separate from, but is integrated into the Department's system for monitoring, evaluating, and improving principal performance. It is also consonant with the Department's accountability system.

Rewards, Assistance, and Sanctions

Consistent with the expectations and requirements of Act 51, the Department's plan to implement performance contracts in the public schools rests upon a well-conceived tripod of rewards, assistance, and sanctions. The rewards (or incentives) exist both for the individual and for the school in concert with a well-defined set of sanctions in response to lower than expected performance.

The Department of Education recognizes that student achievement is the result of a team effort at the school. Thus, the rewards reinforce that team effort.

In this report, the Department uses the terms "rewards" and "incentives" synonymously. In some circles, rewards typically recognize one's achievements, while incentives provide encouragement to reach particular goals or objectives. However, these two terms have been used as synonyms in the context of establishing performance contracts in Hawaii.

At this point the amount of the annual incentive has not been determined. Additional discussion on this matter is needed. One suggestion is a reward or incentive of \$10,000 for the school and \$5,000 to the principal. Another suggestion is to base the incentive for large schools with 1,000 or more students at \$10 per pupil according to the official enrollment count data for the school, while retaining the principal's incentive at \$5,000. A third suggestion is to double any incentive for those principals of schools in corrective action or restructuring who meet the targets of the performance contract. ✓

Assistance to school principals may take a variety of forms. One of the most visible of those forms is training for both principals and complex area superintendents. Training on the skills and knowledge that principals need to lead and manage a school is part of the ongoing leadership development system being implemented by the Department.

In October 2004, the Department launched the newly created Hawaii Principals Academy. The academy is the first comprehensive professional development program in Hawaii specifically dedicated to train principals, prospective principals, and complex area superintendents and will focus on helping support and train these individuals in the following areas:

- Becoming better leaders;
- Improving students' academic achievement, safety and well being and civic responsibility;
- Collaborating with school community councils;
- Developing curriculum alignment;
- Managing school budgets; and
- Establishing partnerships with the private sector.

In addition, the Department currently provides an array of assistance and sanctions in accordance with the Department's School Code and collective bargaining agreement. The Department believes that the development and implementation of the performance contract will not be inconsistent with the school code or the spirit of the collective bargaining agreement. Discussion on the sanctions is ongoing.

In order for the principal and the school to reach their incentives, the principal must have an "Excellent" or "Good" overall rating and meet the two "Raises Student Achievement" progress indicators. To qualify for the incentive, the principal must be at the school for the full year and not on any leave that lasts for a semester or more. If a principal transfers during any year, no incentives are issued for that year. The principal is given a new contract at the next school. If the principal leaves the school at the end of the year, the incentive will still be given.

In any year that overall performance rating is marginal; the Department of Education may cancel the contract, extend it for one year, not renew it, or take other employment action. The contract may be extended to allow for further assistance, support, and time for improvement. Employment action may include: application to another site, return to vice-principal or teacher position, leave, resignation, retirement, termination or Department-directed transfer. In any year that the overall performance rating is unsatisfactory, the contract may be cancelled or not renewed and appropriate employment action may be taken.

The following provides a short description of the rating formula for the evaluation.

Annual Overall Rating

5	Excellent:	All Standards exceeded and rated Excellent
4	Good:	All Standards met and rated at least Good
3	Satisfactory:	All Standards met and rated at least Satisfactory
2	Marginal:	Does not meet at least one Standard and rated Marginal
1	Unsatisfactory:	Does not meet two or more Standards and rated Unsatisfactory

A draft of the Performance Contract is contained in Appendix D.

Issues Regarding Implementation

The principal's performance contract is designed to be integrated into the principal's evaluation which shall rate the principal's performance relative to Departmental standards using relevant and appropriate school level data. In other words, implementing performance contracts and evaluating school administrators are not separate and distinct initiatives. They are complementary functions with the same objective – professional and personal improvement.

The Department's implementation of performance contracts shall ensure that principals as well as schools receive rewards (or incentives) as a result of the principal's (and school's) accomplishment of specific agreed-upon goals listed in the contract. The principal as well as the school should receive the rewards because such accomplishment is a mutual achievement.

The Department intends that the performance contract system will apply to all principals in the public schools under the Department's jurisdiction. Under this system, all principals will be accountable for addressing the Department's standards for school leadership.

The Department also expects principals entering into those contracts to make a three-year commitment to a school site in order to reach improvement goals. While recognizing that a principal may choose to transfer to another site, the Department believes that continuous improvement across the system and in each of our schools requires a degree of commitment and time on the part of the principal as well as each of the school staff. Thus, the Department will strongly encourage administrators and staff to make every effort to remain for extended periods at their sites.

The criteria specified in the contract will be expressed as annual targets within the context a three-year plan for improvement. The Department will measure the extent to which each principal meets the annual targets and will provide incentives on an annual basis to those principals and schools which meet their targets.

The Department recognizes that a number of factors influence student achievement. Schools are also at various stages in the path of continuous improvement. For these as well as other reasons, the actual targets for the performance contracts should reflect the unique conditions of the school and the context in which the principal works. The complex area superintendents will consider such contextual factors as they work with the principals to determine each principal's respective targets.

While a number of the specific details regarding the implementation of the system remain to be worked out, the Department is confident that a major step has already been taken in outlining the key essentials of a performance contract system. The continued involvement of all stakeholders, including bargaining unit representatives, will help to ensure that a balanced, fair, and effective system is implemented.

Implementation Timeline

School Year 2005-06 will be considered a transition year in which materials will be developed and training will be provided to principals and complex area superintendents. While some of the final details on the system may need to be finalized during the 2005-06 school year, the bulk of the initiative during this school year will be on providing the principals with the skills they need to be effective school leaders, and the complex area superintendents with the tools to fairly and comprehensively evaluate the principals under the terms of the contract.

In School Year 2006-07, statewide implementation of the performance contract system will begin. There will be no field test, pilot test, or phasing in of the system. All principals will be evaluated under the terms of the contract.

The following offices/entities in the Department of Education will be intimately involved in the implementation of the performance contract. The following lists the office or entity and its primary role in the development and implementation of the performance contract.

Office of Human Resources

This office will be responsible for program development and implementation. Specific duties and activities will include but not be limited to: providing information to principals and other stakeholders about the performance contract and evaluation system, developing that system, putting the contract materials together, finalizing the contract and evaluation instrument, ensuring the contract instrument is available online for use by the complex area superintendents and principals, and providing relevant data and other background to the complex area superintendents. In addition, this office will

provide training to the complex area superintendents on their roles and responsibilities under this initiative, as well as how to handle the contract and evaluation. The Office of Human Resources will also develop all applicable policies, procedures, and regulations. Finally, the office will be responsible for the dissemination of the rewards and incentives to schools and principals.

Office of Curriculum, Instruction, and Student Support

As noted above, the Hawaii Principals Academy will focus on helping to train complex area superintendents, principals, and vice-principals in the following areas:

- Becoming better leaders;
- Improving students' academic achievement, safety and well being and civic responsibility;
- Collaborating with school community councils;
- Developing curriculum alignment;
- Managing school budgets; and
- Establishing partnerships with the private sector.

Training in additional areas may also be necessary.

Planning and Evaluation Office

The Planning and Evaluation Office will be responsible for the collection and dissemination of data for the indicators chosen in the performance contracts. This office will also ensure that the implementation of the performance contract and monitoring system are consistent with the Department's accountability system. Finally the office will provide training on data analysis and evaluation.

Complex Area Superintendents

These individuals will be responsible for development of the performance contracts, selection of the specific targets and goals in consultation with the principals, and the determination of the degree to which the targets and goals have been met. They will also complete the performance contract and evaluation form and work with the Department of Human Resources in determining how any potential sanctions are to be applied.

Appendix A
Performance Contract Working Group

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position or Organization</u>
Patricia Hamamoto	Superintendent of Education
Dr. Claudia Chun	Assistant Superintendent, Office of Human Resources
Betty Mow	Central Oahu Complex Area Superintendent
Ken Nomura	Maui Complex Area Superintendent
Dr. Louise Wolcott	Windward Oahu Complex Area Superintendent
Randy Moore	Office of the Superintendent
Frank Fernandes	Kaimuki Middle School Principal
Darrel Galera	Moanalua High School Principal
Norman Minehira	Leilehua High School Principal
Bruce Naguwa	Kipapa Elementary School Principal
Lei Desha	Hawaii Government Employees Association HGEA
Milton Shishido	HGEA and McKinley High School Principal
Gwen Ueoka	HGEA and Maui Community School for Adults
Mitch D'Olier	Business Roundtable
Don Hayman	Parent Teacher Student Association PTSA
Dr. Ron Heck	University of Hawaii, College of Education
Norman Sakamoto	State Senator

Appendix B
Issues Addressed by Focus Groups

ASSUMPTIONS/GUIDING PRINCIPLES/CONTRACT PURPOSE

Performance contracts help to stimulate employee performance, while at the same time the evaluation identifies low performing employees, who, if they do not improve, are faced with a set of sanctions. Contracts enable the employer to judge employee performance by the results of that performance. Such contracts should be incentive driven rather than punitive in nature.

This initiative should acknowledge the efforts of principals to improve public schools and should validate and build relationships between the complex area superintendent and the principal being evaluated. In addition, the performance contract is a way for the complex area superintendent and the principal to establish goals for improvement.

Several participants suggested merging the evaluation of the principal with the performance contract to ensure that the contract and the evaluation instrument are aligned in order to present a single target for performance.

There was general consensus/agreement that the criteria for judging performance should focus on the assumptions underlying progress and growth models of accountability and not rely on static models of measurement. There was additional acknowledgment that performance indicators must be fair, clear, measurable, research based, and sustainable.

While acknowledging that the principal plays a vital role in stimulating improvement in student achievement, some respondents noted that the principal shares that responsibility with other staff members who also are instrumental in this regard. On the other hand, some administrators expressed concerns that simply relying on test scores will make it hard for the Department to find principals for disadvantaged schools.

There appeared to be a general agreement that the criteria in the performance contract must be attainable, be fair to the principal, and reflect the context of the school. An individual cautioned that it takes three to four years to truly measure or gauge progress.

Principals need the requisite tools, resources, and assistance to meet the criteria specified in performance contracts. In addition, the employer has a responsibility to provide the principal with such tools, resources and assistance. Thus, the performance contract should clearly identify what the employer is responsible for. The contract stipulates a set of responsibilities for both signatories.

It was also suggested that the expectations need to be agreed upon between the complex area superintendent and principal up front. One member asserted that compensation also needs to be addressed through negotiations.

The issue of flexibility and customizations was also reviewed. For example, it was suggested that the context and dynamics of the school be considered in determining the criteria to be used.

POSSIBLE CRITERIA

The focus groups discussed potential criteria for the performance contracts. Such criteria of necessity centered around student achievement indicators but also include but are not limited to maintaining a positive learning environment, participation in professional development activities, school operations, promotion of the Vision of the High School Graduate and General Learner Outcomes, positive communication to the community and parents, positive relationships with parents, and the ability to share leadership with school stakeholders.

MEASUREMENT

The issue of how principal performance would be adequately measured was a core topic of the focus groups. It was noted that a number of variables affecting student performance are external to the school and the school administrator. Another concern is how to measure growth in performance. Proficiency levels for various criteria may need to be defined and the Department of Education may wish to review growth in a formative as well as a summative viewpoint.

To ensure consistency with various other Department initiatives designed to stimulate and measure student, school, and system performance, it may be necessary to explicitly link the criteria and methods of measurement to the School Improvement Design. Such direct and explicit linking helps to align various improvement methods and results in the creation of one plan rather than a series of disconnected plans.

Other concerns regarding measurement included but were not limited to a potential unreliability of the results from surveys of teachers, students, and parents when a principal is pushing for change but such stakeholders are resistant to that change. Potential indicators to measure include business plans, PTSA surveys, and accreditation results.

The measurement should to be sensitive enough to track progress towards meeting a goal as well as whether the goal was accomplished. Student performance should be measured annually and principal performance should be based on the academic performance of the same cohort of students over a given period of time, rather than separate cohorts of students each year.

REWARDS, ASSISTANCE, SANCTIONS

Rewards

The issue of whether the performance contract should apply to all principals was raised with one individual suggesting that the Department consider allowing principals to choose whether to participate in the performance contract or maintain the status quo. Some principals noted that they need authority over personnel and other tools for improving schools as much or more than they need monetary incentives.

It was suggested that the rewards might include allowing administrators to go to professional development seminars that would enable them to be more productive and effective.

Other potential rewards that were suggested included but were not limited to: advanced degree compensation, payment for participating in professional development, a stability bonus, an incentive bonus, a signing bonus for working in "need areas," and lower mortgage interest rates. It was suggested that rewards are recognition for good work and that the incentives should be significant. It was also suggested that the complex area superintendents and principals have the flexibility to develop individualized incentives.

To help ensure that the schools are not pitted against one another it was suggested to set aside monies for performance contracts and have a panel decide the bonus. The incentives should not be competitive in nature but should at the same time recognize individual effort. In addition, there are other types of recognition besides money. Rewards could include the ability to bring in one's own team.

In addition it was suggested that the reward should be for the school and not for individuals in the school. Others felt that there is room for both school and individual bonuses.

It was also noted that the State faces a crisis in attracting principals, so there may be a need to adjust the salary schedule, in addition to providing an incentive or bonus.

Assistance

Assistance can be provided to all principals regardless of status and could be systemic as well as system-wide in nature. In other words, the assistance could be proactive as well as reactive in nature. Proactive assistance provides all principals with a set of knowledge and skills to function as effective educational leaders. Reactive assistance provides those principals who do not meet targets on the performance targets with the means and help to come up to standard. If sanctions are needed then a personalized professional growth plan would be necessary.

One participant noted that while it is the responsibility of the principal to identify the specific type of assistance that he or she needs, the complex area superintendent should have the final say as to what should be provided.

The relationship between the goals and functions of the Hawaii Principals Academy and the development and implementation of performance contracts was discussed. It was suggested that the Hawaii Principals Academy should assume responsibility for providing all principals with the ability to meet the specific expectations under their performance contracts. It was also noted that vice-principals also require assistance from the academy as the individuals in those positions are future principals. Other participants noted that complex area superintendents would also require training to effectively facilitate performance contracts.

It was argued that principals need adequate support, flexibility, and resources if they are to be asked to operate under the conditions of a performance contract. Such flexibility would include the need to hire and control personnel at the school level. Additional support might lie in the re-training of teachers and peer mentoring programs for principals. Another respondent succinctly argued that principals need to be provided with the tools in order to perform well.

Sanctions

Some focus group participants argued that the specific sanctions to be adopted will need to be worked out between the Department and the bargaining unit. Others also noted that it was possible for the Department to incorporate existing sanctions for principals into the performance contract system.

ISSUES

Some participants questioned how principals who move into schools that are already in corrective action would be evaluated under the performance contract. If there is no possibility of factoring in the conditions that exist at the school level, such as the status of the school, then there will be problems in fairly implementing the performance contract and in finding principals who are willing to move to schools that are in status. ✓

As the Department implements the performance contracts it will need to ensure that the complex area superintendents are consistent and equitable in the ratings of the principals. Whether a principal meets the criteria set forth in the performance contract should not depend upon which complex area superintendent conducts the review.

Several participants argued that the length of contract should be in the three to five year range with an annual evaluation. A one-year contract may be too short to provide the resources and incentives to improve school improvement.

There were some concerns about how long principals could stay at any one school, especially when those schools face restructuring under the accountability provisions of

the No Child Left Behind Act. The Department would need to address the degree to which schools are restructured aligns with the initiatives undertaken to adopt performance contracts system-wide.

Some participants felt that the collective bargaining process would need to be honored as the Department develops the performance contracts. Some participants believed that a performance contract model in the business sector may or may not be applicable in a public school setting. A chief executive officer may have different types and levels of authority than does a school principal. They also assert that principals are typically held accountable for results but have little or no control over the resources necessary to achieve those results.

Act 51 stipulates that performance contracts be developed for principals. It is silent on whether vice-principals should also be held accountable under performance contracts.

The importance of teachers in improving student achievement was also identified. Some respondents argued that teachers should also be accountable for student performance and suggested that teachers also be required to have performance contracts.

Another concern was with regard to middle schools which typically have students for only two to three years. Given the short time that students are in such schools, how can it be expected that principals and their schools can positively influence their students?

It was noted that in other school systems such as San Francisco and Boston, a high principal turnover rate may affect the ability of the public school system to benefit from performance contracts.

Some participants noted that Act 51 did not define a performance contract. It was left to the work group to compile a definition.

Some principals noted that the implementation of performance contracts may be counterproductive or ineffective if students are not also held accountable for their own learning. It was argued that unless there is some type of high stakes for students who take a mandated test, they have no incentive to perform well on that test.

Implementing performance contracts may discourage some teachers and vice-principals from becoming principals.

Some participants suggested staggering implementation of the performance contract and developing a pilot to ensure training and other resources are found before full implementation.

Appendix C
Reaction from Presentations to Principals
September and October 2004

Implementation of Performance Contract

Twelve (12) out of thirteen (13) responding principal groups suggested that the Department first pilot the implementation of the performance contract and that participation in the pilot be on a voluntary basis.

Performance Contract and Evaluation

Participating principals were almost evenly split with regard to whether the performance contract and the principal's evaluation be separate initiatives or should be merged into one system.

Incentives

Approximately three-fourths of the responding groups wanted incentives for both the school and the principal. Two groups felt that only the principal should receive the incentive while another two groups believed only the school should be the recipient. One group suggested a non-monetary incentive such as additional teacher positions.

Student Achievement

Overwhelmingly, the principals stated that the Hawaii State Assessment should not be the only measurement. They believed that alternatives to the Hawaii State Assessment could be decided between the complex area superintendent and the principal. Other suggested measures included graduation rates, formative student assessment results, school-level assessment, Adequate Yearly Progress results, and accreditation.

Other Issues and Concerns

Several groups questioned the role and impact of the School Community Councils in the implementation of the performance contract system.

Three groups wondered whether the core and optional indicators would be weighted (some indicators having more importance or impact than others).

It was suggested by nine groups that other personnel such as vice-principals, teachers, complex area superintendents, and the Superintendent should be on performance contracts and that the criteria for all contracts be aligned.

Almost all principal groups felt that principals need more control and authority over those factors that affect student achievement, such as the ability to hire teachers the principals want in the schools.

Six groups pointed to the need to establish accountability for students, teachers, and parents.

Four groups noted that longitudinal data on the same cohorts of students was necessary for measuring student progress.

Eight groups identified the need for principals to have access to the support and right resources to do the job. They also noted that monetary incentives help to improve the school. Some principals were concerned that providing incentives would cause friction in the school.

One group suggested a 5-year performance contract cycle instead of 3 years.

Two groups reported the need for clear indicators.

Six principal groups questioned the role of the complex area superintendent and wondered how the evaluation could be done objectively. The principals suggested that a panel rather than an individual complex area superintendent conduct the evaluation.

Four groups were concerned about recruiting principals to non-performing schools.

Appendix D
Draft Performance Contract and Evaluation Form

**STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES**

**(DRAFT - STILL BEING DEVELOPED)
PERFORMANCE CONTRACT AND
EVALUATION FOR PRINCIPALS**

Name _____
School _____
Evaluated by _____

Position _____
Rating Period _____
Position _____

OBJECTIVES:

- 1) TO COMMUNICATE LEADERSHIP EXPECTATIONS.
- 2) TO IMPROVE LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE.
- 3) TO IMPROVE TEACHER PERFORMANCE.
- 4) TO RAISE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

RATING SCALE:

- | | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| 5 = EXCELLENT | 2 = MARGINAL |
| 4 = GOOD | 1 = UNSATISFACTORY |
| 3 = SATISFACTORY | |

STANDARD 1 PROVIDES LEADERSHIP IN SCHOOL AND DEMONSTRATES.....
INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT TO RAISE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

☐

**Raises Student Achievement
(Core Performance Indicator)**

	Both Met	Not Met
1st Year	_____	_____
2nd Year	_____	_____
3rd Year	_____	_____

a. Select one from the following:

- _____ % increase of students who are proficient in reading at tested grades
- _____ % increase of students who are proficient in mathematics at tested grades
- _____ % increase of students who move from one proficiency level to another (well below to approaches)
- _____ % increase of subgroup of students who attain reading proficiency at tested grade
- _____ % increase of third grade students who are proficient

b. Determine a second indicator of student achievement as agreed to by CAS and principal.

Select Four Optional Performance Indicators from the following:

Develops, communicates and implements a shared vision for achieving standards and an academic plan.

Advocates high expectations for teaching and learning results.

Pursues school improvement and demonstrates commitment to attain higher levels of student achievement and performance.

Utilizes multiple assessment tools and strategies to support the achievement of the performance standards by every student.

Foster teachers' reflection on practice, monitors performance, and provides feedback for adjustment of instruction to meet student needs, e.g. PEP-T.

Promotes professional growth of faculty and staff.

Incorporates best practice and research-based strategies for school and instructional improvement.

Evaluates current school programs in terms of identified instructional goals and objectives.

COMMENDATIONS:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

STANDARD 2 PROMOTES A POSITIVE CLIMATE FOR LEARNING AND AN ATMOSPHERE.....
OF CARING AND RESPECT FOR ALL STUDENTS AND MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL
COMMUNITY

☐

Promotes civic responsibility as demonstrated by data from student activities. (Core Performance Indicator)

Select Four Optional Performance Indicators from the following:

Models and promotes trust, enthusiasm, rapport, respect and openness among faculty, staff, students, parents and members of the community.

Seeks input from stakeholders for improvements in student learning and social responsibility.

Encourages and establishes open, effective communication.

Utilizes effective strategies in setting performance expectations, planning, decision-making problem solving and conflict resolution.

Encourages the development of school/community partnerships and parent participation.

Recognizes the contributions of school and community members.

COMMENDATIONS:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

STANDARD 3 MAINTAINS HIGH STANDARDS OF PROFESSIONALISM.....

☐

Pursues professional improvement activities to strengthen own leadership performance. Fully completes a professional development or improvement plan developed collaboratively with the CAS and may include credit hours or other professional development activities. (Core Performance Indicator - Still Under Discussion)

Select Four Optional Performance Indicators from the following:

Demonstrates and promotes high standards of ethics, honesty, and integrity.

Manages problems and implements solutions effectively.

Demonstrates ability to self-assess and to reflect on administrative practices.

Communicates and interacts effectively with supervisors and colleagues.

Communicates and interacts effectively with school community.

COMMENDATIONS:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

STANDARD 4 MANAGES THE FULL SCOPE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES.....

☐

Promotes safety and well being of students as demonstrated by data, e.g. attendance, facilities inspection, and parent, student and teacher perceptions from SQS. (Core Performance Indicator)

Select Four Optional Performance Indicators from the following:

Complies with applicable statutes, federal laws, regulations, procedures, contractual provisions and other governance parameters.

Attends to all required administrative functions such as supervision and evaluation of instruction, teachers and staff; maintenance of a well-functioning school plant; and timely completion of reports.

Manages financial plan, conducts sound fiscal operations and accounting of school resources.

Secures and uses available resources to attain school improvement goals and objectives for optimum benefit to students.

Maintains standards for a safe, orderly, effective learning environment.

COMMENDATIONS:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

ANNUAL OVERALL RATING OF PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP PERFORMANCE.....

☐

DESCRIPTION:

OBTAINS WIDESPREAD SUPPORT AND DEVELOPS A UNIFIED SENSE OF PURPOSE AMONG FACULTY, STAFF, STUDENTS AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY TO SYSTEMATICALLY ATTAIN HIGHER LEVELS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE AND PROPER ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS:

COMMENDATIONS:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

PRINCIPAL COMMENTS:

(Principal's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence but merely that he/she is aware of rating.)

Signature of Principal_____

Date_____

Signature of Evaluator_____

Date_____

Distribution: WHITE - OHR; GOLDENROD - School; PINK - CAS; BLUE - Principal