

Learning Sciences International

The Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model

Learning Sciences International
1400 Centrepark Boulevard, Suite 1000
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
717.845.6300

Table of Contents

<u>1. THE RESEARCH BASE FOR THE MARZANO DISTRICT LEADER EVALUATION MODEL</u>	3
RESEARCH BACKGROUND	3
THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
THE WALLACE STUDY	4
WHAT WORKS IN OKLAHOMA SCHOOLS	5
MARZANO, WATERS, AND McNULTY META-ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL LEADERSHIP	6
THE MARZANO STUDY OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS	6
DISTRICT LEADERSHIP THAT WORKS: STRIKING THE RIGHT BALANCE	6
<u>2. ABOUT ROBERT MARZANO AND LEARNING SCIENCES INTERNATIONAL</u>	7
<u>3. EVIDENCE OF RELIABILITY, VALIDITY, AND EFFICACY OF THE MARZANO DISTRICT LEADER EVALUATION MODEL</u>	8
RECENT RESEARCH VALIDATING THE MARZANO SCHOOL LEADER EVALUATION MODEL	8
THE MARZANO STUDY OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS	9
MARZANO, WATERS, AND McNULTY META-ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL LEADERSHIP	10
THE WALLACE STUDY	10
WHAT WORKS IN OKLAHOMA SCHOOLS	12
<u>4. OVERVIEW OF THE MARZANO DISTRICT LEADER EVALUATION MODEL AND RUBRICS</u>	13
DOMAIN I. A DATA-DRIVEN FOCUS TO SUPPORT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	14
DOMAIN II. CONTINUOUS SUPPORT FOR IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION	14
DOMAIN III. CONTINUOUS SUPPORT FOR A GUARANTEED AND VIABLE CURRICULUM	15
DOMAIN IV. COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION	15
DOMAIN V. DISTRICT CLIMATE	15
DOMAIN VI. RESOURCE ALLOCATION	16
SCALES	16
CONCLUSION	18
<u>5. PROCESS FOR OBSERVATIONS</u>	18
PLANNING SUPPORT FOR IMPLEMENTATION	19
THE FIVE STEPS OF THE EVALUATION CYCLE	20
<u>6. TRAINING PLAN FOR EVALUATORS AND OBSERVERS</u>	20
<u>7. APPENDIX</u>	20
THE DISTRICT LEADER EVALUATION LEARNING MAP	21

1. The Research Base for the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model

(For an in-depth examination of the research base of the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model, please see: Marzano, Carbaugh, Toth: "Marzano District Leader Evaluation System", 2013 .

Research Background

This report is a description of the Marzano District Leader Evaluation System designed by Dr. Robert J. Marzano in partnership with Learning Sciences International for the Marzano Center. The model is based on an extensive review of the extant literature about district leader/administrator leadership. While it can be used independently, the Marzano District Leader Evaluation System is designed to be used in close conjunction with the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model and the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model. The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is based on the comprehensive instructional model detailed in the *Art and Science of Teaching* (see Marzano, 2007; Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011).

The Marzano evaluation models are integrated, cascading evaluation systems designed with improved student learning as the ultimate goal. In *Teacher Evaluation that Makes a Difference* (in press), Marzano and Toth suggest

that the effectiveness of teacher evaluation is influenced by the effectiveness of school leader evaluation, which, in turn, is influenced by the effectiveness of district leader evaluation. . . . Student learning is not influenced by teacher effectiveness alone; rather, a chain of influences -- beginning with an effective district evaluation system, which influences the quality of district, school, and teacher leaders, which are themselves influenced by their respective evaluation systems -- combined to affect the quality of student learning.
(p.136)

Based on research that indicates that the actions and behavior of district administrators do have an influence on student learning, the design of the district leader evaluation model began with a survey of the research on district administrator competence. From this review of the research literature, specific district leader actions and behaviors were identified that, historically, have had a relationship with student achievement.

The Review of Literature

Five primary documents were used in the review of literature: (1) the Wallace Foundation Study, *Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning: Final Report of Research Findings* (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010); (2) the study *What Works in Oklahoma Schools* (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2011); (3) *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*, the Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) meta-analysis of school leadership; (4) *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action*, the Marzano (2003) study of school effectiveness; and (5) *District Leadership that Works: Striking the Right Balance*, Marzano and Waters (2009).

The Wallace Study

The most current and comprehensive study on the relationship between school administrator behaviors and actions and student academic achievement is the report funded by the Wallace Foundation and cooperatively conducted by the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) at the University of Minnesota and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at The University of Toronto (Louis et al., 2010). This multiyear study, titled *Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning*, involved survey data from 8,391 teachers and 471 school administrators; interview data from 581 teachers and administrators, 304 district level educators, and 124 state personnel; and observational data from 312 classrooms. Student achievement data for literacy and mathematics in elementary and secondary schools were also obtained using scores on state tests designed to measure Adequate Yearly Progress as mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002. To date, this study stands as the seminal examination of the relationship between school leader actions and behaviors and student academic achievement.

Marzano and Toth (in press) write, “to a great extent, the Wallace Foundation study corroborated the findings of previous research showing that both school and district leadership can influence student achievement (albeit indirectly).”

At the district level, the authors [Louis, et al., (2010)] found that district leaders “should consider school leaders’ collective sense of efficacy for school improvement to be among the most important resources available to them for increasing student achievement” (p. 147). The study found that district leadership, school leadership, teacher actions, and student achievement represent a complex system of interacting influences. When all elements within this system are operating in concert, the effectiveness of K–12 schooling is maximized (p.140).

The Wallace study identified necessary leadership factors that impact student learning and offered recommendations which included:

- Empowering principals regarding their efforts and abilities to improve their schools
- Focusing on instruction
- Using data to guide decisions
- Assigning emphasis to the improvement of student achievement
- Emphasizing teamwork and professionalism
- Ensuring that teachers and school administrators have access to resources that strengthen their professional skills (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010)

What Works in Oklahoma Schools

The study of what works in Oklahoma schools was conducted by Marzano Research Laboratory for the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) over the 2009/2010 school year and the 2010/2011 school year. This study was conducted to determine those elements that are related to being classified as an *improvement school* (i.e., a school that needs improvement) as opposed to a school that is not classified as needing improvement (i.e., schools not on improvement status). Fifty-nine matched elementary, middle, and high schools were involved in the study. Of those 59 schools, 32 were classified as needing improvement and 27 were not. Survey data from teachers, administrators, students, and parents were used in the study along with on-site observations of teachers, interviews with administrators, and videotapes of classroom activities. State test data in mathematics and English language arts were the primary dependent variable when examining the effects of specific elements. From the 59 matched schools, 1,117 teachers, 13,373 students, and 516 parents were involved. General results indicated that specific actions on the part of administrators are statistically related to student academic achievement.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty Meta-Analysis of School Leadership

Published in *School Leadership that Works* (Marzano et al., 2005), the purpose of the meta-analysis was to examine the research literature from 1978 to 2001 on those school leadership factors that have a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. More than 300 studies were examined, and 69 met the criteria for inclusion, one of which was that student achievement data were correlated with school administrator actions, or that correlations could be computed from the data available. In all, 2,802 K–12 schools were involved in the studies synthesized, with an estimated 14,000 teachers and 1,400,000 students. The overall finding was that school leadership has a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. Such leadership can be explained as 21 specific types of actions and behaviors enacted by school leaders.

The Marzano Study of School Effectiveness

The Marzano study of effective schools was published in *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003). Although it did not focus specifically on school leadership, the study did specify 11 factors that schools must attend to if they are to enhance student achievement and the school leadership implications regarding those 11 factors:

- School-level Factors
- A Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum
- Challenging Goals and Effective Feedback
- Parent and Community Involvement
- Safe and Orderly Environment
- Teacher-Level Factors
- Instructional Strategies
- Classroom Management
- Classroom Curriculum Design

While these eleven factors have been identified as influential for student achievement, leadership for these factors is also a necessary condition for effective reform relative to the school-level, the teacher-level, and the student-level factors. In *What Works in Schools*, Marzano writes that “leadership could be considered the single most important aspect of effective school reform” (2003, p. 172).

District Leadership that Works: Striking the Right Balance

In their meta-analysis of 27 studies completed or reported between 1970 and 2003, Marzano and Waters (2009) conclude that district leadership has a mea-

Scales for the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model copyright Robert J. Marzano, 2013. Report copyright Learning Sciences Marzano Center, 2013. All Rights Reserved. The Marzano District Leadership Evaluation domains, elements, scales and evidences may only be digitized in iObservation.

Updated 1/29/14

asurable and definable relationship with student achievement. The authors note that their findings stand “in sharp contrast to the notion that district administration is a part of an amorphous blob that soaks up valuable resources without adding value to a district’s effectiveness. To the contrary, these findings suggest that when district leaders are carrying out their leadership responsibilities effectively, student achievement across the district is positively affected” (p. 5).

Marzano and Toth (in press) cite further district research findings *in Teacher Evaluation that Makes a Difference* (p. 139):

- Problem-solving orientations and actions at the district level are associated with higher degrees of program implementation and continuation at the school level (Louis, Rosenblum, & Molitor, 1981)
- Effective schools are often located in districts where improving teaching and learning is a high priority (Berman et al., 1981; Rosenholtz, 1989)
- District leadership can be a positive force for change in schools (Elmore & Burney, 1997)
- Districts can play a positive role in leveraging policies and resources to support local reforms Fuhrman & Elmore, 1990; Spillane, 1996; Togneri & Anderson, 2003)

2. About Robert Marzano and Learning Sciences International

Robert J. Marzano, PhD, is a nationally recognized researcher in education, speaker, trainer, and author of more than 30 books and 150 articles on topics such as instruction, assessment, writing and implementing standards, cognition, effective leadership, and school intervention. His books include *District Leadership That Works*, *School Leadership that Works*, *Making Standards Useful in the Classroom*, *The Art and Science of Teaching*, and *Effective Supervision*.

His practical translations of the most current research and theory into classroom strategies are internationally known and widely practiced by both teachers and administrators. He received a bachelor’s degree from Iona College in New York, a master’s degree from Seattle University, and a doctorate from the University of Washington. He is also Executive Director of the Learning Sciences Marzano Center located in West Palm Beach, Florida, and of Marzano Research in Colorado.

Dr. Marzano believes that great teachers make great students: His Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model has been adopted by school districts in all 50 states because it doesn’t just measure teacher ability, it helps teachers get better, improving their

Scales for the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model copyright Robert J. Marzano, 2013. Report copyright Learning Sciences Marzano Center, 2013. All Rights Reserved. The Marzano District Leadership Evaluation domains, elements, scales and evidences may only be digitized in iObservation.

Updated 1/29/14

instruction over time. Dr. Marzano has partnered with Learning Sciences International to develop and implement the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, the School Leader and District Leader Evaluation Models, and the Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation model, four complimentary evaluation systems that may be used with the iObservation technology platform.

Founded in 2002, **Learning Sciences International** partners with schools and districts to develop custom solutions for school improvement and professional development. With Robert Marzano, Learning Sciences co-developed the Marzano Evaluation Models and was selected as the statewide technical assistance provider for teacher evaluation implementation throughout the state of Florida. Learning Sciences was selected by the Michigan Department of Education's School Reform Office to provide monitoring and technical assistance to Priority Schools. Learning Sciences offers innovative technology, data analysis, research, consultation, and the tools and training to help schools meet their challenges and reach their greatest potential in today's high-stakes educational environment. For further information, visit www.LearningSciences.com.

3. Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy of the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model

For full scales and evidences in the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model, see Carbaugh, Marzano, Toth: School Leadership for Results, LSI: 2015.

Recent Research Validating the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model

Four primary research efforts formed the basis for the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model and the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model. The two models complement and support each other through "cascading domains of influence" (see page 17). The desired outcome of the School Leader model is support for the teachers within the school; the desired outcome for the District Leader model is support for schools as a whole.

The Marzano Study of School Effectiveness

The original basis of the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model was a synthesis of the research on effective schooling published in the book *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003). Although this study was reported as a review of the literature on school reform, it did so with an eye toward school leadership. The study was a synthesis of a number of previous syntheses of the research (Bosker, 1992; Bosker & Witziers, 1995, 1996; Edmonds, 1979a, 1979b, 1979c, 1981a, 1981b; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Marzano, 2000; Sammons, 1999; Sammons, Hillman, & Mortimore, 1995; Scheerens, 1992; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997). The study identified five school-level factors (as well as six other teacher- and student-level factors) that were well-established correlates of effective schools. Those five school-level correlates formed the basis of early versions of the Marzano School Leader Model. In order of their correlation with student achievement at the school level, these elements were: a guaranteed and viable curriculum, challenging goals and effective feedback, parent and community involvement, a safe and orderly environment, and collegiality and professionalism.

A sixty-eight-item survey was constructed for the model and ASCD distributed it. An initial reliability and validity study was conducted in 2004 (Marzano, 2004). Using a sample of more than 2,400 teachers who were asked to rate their principals' behaviors relative to the elements of the model, alpha coefficients were computed that ranged from .56 to .75, along with a split-half reliability of .91 for the entire instrument. To establish construct validity, a factor analysis was conducted indicating support for the various factors in the model.

In 2007, the Marzano School Leader Model was adapted specifically for the Michigan Coalition of Educational Leadership to give feedback to principals (Shen et al., 2007). This effort might be considered the first third-party application and study of the model as a tool for feedback to school leaders and was a joint effort of the Michigan Department of Education, Western Michigan University, the Michigan Association of School Administrators, the Michigan Association of School Boards, the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association. The effort was funded in part by the Wallace Foundation. Based on a sample of 258 principals, the researchers concluded that "data indicate the instrument has a high level of reliability for all the subscales as well as for the whole instrument" (p. 2). The researchers also concluded that "confirmatory factor analyses through structural equation modeling indicate that the instrument has a high level of validity" (p. 2).

Since that study, the original sixty-eight-item survey has been administered to more than 66,000 teachers and administrators.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty Meta-Analysis of School Leadership

To add perspective to the evaluation model, the original Marzano framework was cross-referenced with the research on general characteristics of effective school leaders. Specifically, a meta-analysis of school leadership research was published in the book *School Leadership That Works* (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). The purpose of the study was to examine the research literature from 1978 to 2001 on those general school leadership factors that have a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. More than 300 studies were examined and sixty-nine met the criteria for inclusion, one of which was that student achievement data were correlated with school administrator characteristics, or correlations could be computed from the data available. In all, 2,802 K–12 schools were involved in the studies synthesized, with an estimated 14,000 teachers and 1.4 million students. The overall finding was that the characteristics of school leaders have a statistically significant relationship with student achievement. Additionally, twenty-one specific types of school leader characteristics (referred to as “responsibilities”) were found to correlate with student achievement.

The twenty-four elements of the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model integrate quite well with the twenty-one responsibilities from the school leader research articulated in the literature between 1978 and 2001, and the elements of the model add detail to many of the twenty-one responsibilities.

Based on the cross-referencing with the twenty-one responsibilities from the Marzano et al. (2005) study, adaptations were made to the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model to better incorporate the research on general school leadership characteristics.

The Wallace Study

A final cross-referencing was conducted on the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model using the findings from a study The Wallace Foundation funded and was cooperatively conducted by the Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) at the University of Minnesota and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). This multiyear study, *Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning*, is perhaps the most current and comprehensive study on the relationship between school administrator behaviors and actions and student academic achievement. The study involved survey data from 8,391 teachers and 471 school

Scales for the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model copyright Robert J. Marzano, 2013. Report copyright Learning Sciences Marzano Center, 2013. All Rights Reserved. The Marzano District Leadership Evaluation domains, elements, scales and evidences may only be digitized in iObservation.

Updated 1/29/14

administrators; interview data from 581 teachers and administrators, 304 district-level educators, and 124 state personnel; and observational data from 312 classrooms. Student achievement data for literacy and mathematics in elementary and secondary schools were also obtained using scores on state tests designed to measure Adequate Yearly Progress as mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The findings of this study as they relate specifically to school leadership were summarized in the report *The School Principal as Leader: Guiding Schools to Better Teaching and Learning (The Wallace Foundation, 2012)*. The report identified five key functions of school leaders: shaping a vision of academic success for all students; creating a climate hospitable to education; cultivating leadership in others; improving instruction; and managing people, data, and processes to foster school improvement.

As with the twenty-one responsibilities from the Marzano et al. (2005) study, the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model was cross-referenced with the findings of the Wallace study. Table 1 provides a very general cross-referencing of the Wallace 2012 report and Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model.

Based on a more specific analysis of the findings in an earlier, 2010 technical report from The Wallace Foundation (Louis et al., 2010), minor adaptations were made to the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model in an attempt to keep the model as current as possible.

Table 1. Cross-Referencing of the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model with the Wallace Study

The Wallace Perspective: The five key functions that effective principals perform well	The Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model: Domains and Elements
1. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students	1(1), 1(2), 1(3), 1(4), 3(3), 4(3), 5(1), 5(2)
2. Creating a climate hospitable to education	2(1), 4(1), 5(3), 5(4)
3. Cultivating leadership in others	4(1), 4(2), 4(3), 4(4), 4(5)
4. Improving instruction	1(5), 2(2), 2(3), 2(4), 2(5), 4(3)
5. Managing people, data, and processes to foster school improvement	1(5), 2(4), 5(5)

What Works in Oklahoma Schools

The final research effort (to date) that underpins the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model was a study of what works in Oklahoma schools that was conducted by Marzano Research Laboratory for the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) over the 2009–2010 and 2010–2011 school years (Marzano Research Laboratory, 2011). This study was conducted to determine those elements that are related to being classified as an improvement school (i.e., a school that needs improvement) as opposed to a school that is not classified as needing improvement (i.e., schools not on improvement status). Fifty-nine matched elementary, middle, and high schools were involved in the study. Of those fifty-nine schools, thirty-two were classified as needing improvement and twenty-seven were not. Survey data from teachers, administrators, students, and parents were used in the study along with on-site observations of teachers, interviews with administrators, and videotapes of classroom activities. State test data in mathematics and the English language arts were the primary dependent measures when examining the effects of specific elements. From the fifty-nine matched schools, 1,117 teachers, 13,373 students, and 516 parents were involved.

The first phase of the study (see Marzano Research Laboratory, 2011) examined the relationship between nine general factors (referred to as the nine essential elements by the Oklahoma State Department of Education) and average student achievement in schools:

1. Curriculum
2. Classroom Evaluation/Assessment
3. Instruction
4. School Culture
5. Student, Family, and Community Support
6. Professional Growth, Development, and Evaluation
7. Leadership
8. Organizational Structure and Resources
9. Comprehensive and Effective Planning

For each of these nine elements, surveys were constructed of teachers and administrators using the twenty-four elements of the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model to provide specificity. In effect, while the nine categories the Oklahoma State Department of Education specified were not derived from the evaluation model, the items used in the surveys pertaining to those categories were


either directly taken or adapted from the evaluation model. Survey results were then analyzed in terms of how well they discriminated between schools that were classified as needing improvement or not.

For the teacher surveys, average scores for schools that were not classified as needing improvement were higher than average for schools needing improvement. All differences were statistically significant. For the administrator surveys, average scores for schools that were not classified as needing improvement were again higher than average for schools needing improvement, and six out of nine differences were statistically significant.

Average scores for each school were also correlated with average student achievement on the state's mathematics and reading tests. For the teacher survey, all correlations were positive and ranged from .08 to .39 in mathematics and .12 to .53 in reading. For the administrator survey, all correlations were positive and ranged from .28 to .58 in mathematics and .16 to .54 in reading.

4. Overview of the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model and Rubrics

Based on the review of the research literature briefly outlined above, 21 categories of district leader actions and behaviors were identified. These 21 categories were organized into six domains: (1) a data-driven focus to support student achievement, (2) continuous support for improvement of instruction, (3) continuous support for a guaranteed and viable curriculum, (4) cooperation and collaboration, (5) district climate, and (6) resource allocation.



Domain I. A Data-Driven Focus to Support Student Achievement

(1) The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student level.

(2) The district leader ensures data are analyzed, interpreted, and used to regularly monitor the progress toward district, school, and individual student goals.

(3) The district leader ensures each district goal receives appropriate district, school-level, and classroom-level support to help all students meet individual achievement goals when data indicate interventions are needed.

Domain II. Continuous Support for Improvement of Instruction

(1) The district leader provides a clear vision regarding the district instructional model and how to guide personnel and schools in operationalizing the model.

(2) The district leader effectively supports and retains school and department leaders who continually enhance their leadership skills through reflection and professional growth plans.

(3) The district leader ensures that district and school leaders provide clear ongoing evaluations of performance strengths and weaknesses for personnel in their area of responsibility that are consistent with student achievement and operational data.

(4) The district leader ensures that personnel are provided with job-embedded professional development that is directly related to their growth plans.

Domain III. Continuous Support for a Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum

(1) The district leader ensures that curriculum and assessment initiatives, and supporting operational practices, at the district and school levels adhere to federal, state, and district standards.

(2) The district leader ensures that district level programs, curricular, and operational initiatives are focused enough that they can be adequately addressed in the time available to the district and schools.

(3) The district leader ensures that students are provided with the opportunity to access educational programs and learn critical content.

Domain IV. Cooperation and Collaboration

(1) The district leader establishes clear guidelines regarding the areas for which schools are expected to follow explicit district guidance and the areas for which schools have autonomy of decision making.

(2) The district leader ensures that constituents (e.g. school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) perceive the district as a collaborative and cooperative workplace.

(3) The district leader ensures that constituents (e.g. school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) have effective ways to provide input to the district.

(4) The district leader ensures leadership development and responsibilities are appropriately delegated and shared.

Domain V. District Climate

(1) The district leader is recognized as a leader (in his or her area of responsibility) who continually improves his or her professional practice.

(2) The district leader has the trust of constituents (e.g. school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) that his or her actions are guided by what is best for all student populations and the district.

(3) The district leader ensures constituents (e.g. school board, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) perceive the district as safe and orderly.

(4) The district leader acknowledges the success of the whole district, as well as individual schools and employees within the district.

Domain VI. Resource Allocation

(1) The district leader manages the fiscal resources of the district in a way that focuses on effective instruction and achievement of all students and optimal district operations.

2) The district leader manages the technological resources of the district in such a way that focuses on effective instruction and the achievement of all students and optimal efficiency throughout the district.

(3) The district leader manages the organization, operations, instructional programs and initiatives in ways to maximize the use of resources to promote effective instruction and achievement of all students.

Scales

For each of the 21 elements within the six domains, scales have been developed along with example evidences of success. To illustrate, consider element 1 (“The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student level”) of Domain I (A Data-Driven Focus to Support Student Achievement). Figure 1 provides the scale for this element.

Domain I: A Data-Driven Focus to Support Student Achievement

(1) The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student level.

Innovating	Applying	Developing	Beginning	Not Using
The district leader ensures adjustments are made or new strategies are created so that all personnel know and attend to the achievement and operational goals	The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student level and monitors the extent to which personnel know and attend to these goals	The district leader ensures clear and measurable goals are established for all relevant areas of responsibility that are focused on critical needs for improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student level	The district leader attempts to ensure clear and measurable goals for all relevant areas of responsibility but does not complete the task or does so partially	The district leader does not attempt to ensure clear and measurable goals for all relevant areas of responsibility

To understand the logic of this scale and all others in the system, it is best to begin with “Applying,” which has a score value of 3. A score of “Applying” can be considered the level of performance that indicates proficiency regarding the element. In this case, the district leader ensures that clear and measurable goals are established **for all relevant areas of responsibility** that are focused on critical needs regarding improving student achievement and the needed operational support at the district, school, and individual student level.

In short, the district leader ensures goals have been set for critical needs and that the necessary operations to support student achievement are in place and monitored. Above this level is “Innovating,” which has a score value of 4. Here, in addition to score 3 actions and behaviors, the district leader ensures adjustments are made or new strategies are created. This level is usually associated with exceptional or excellent performance regarding the element. “Developing” is a step below the target of “Applying.” It has a score value of 2 and indicates that the district

Scales for the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model copyright Robert J. Marzano, 2013. Report copyright Learning Sciences Marzano Center, 2013. All Rights Reserved. The Marzano District Leadership Evaluation domains, elements, scales and evidences may only be digitized in iObservation.

leader ensures clear and measurable goals **for all relevant areas of responsibility** are established but does not monitor to ensure goals are understood. This level of performance is usually associated with needing improvement regarding the element. Below this level is “Beginning,” which has a score value of 1. Here the district leader attempts to district leader ensures clear and measurable goals **for all relevant areas of responsibility** are established but does not complete the task or does so only partially. This level of performance is usually considered unsatisfactory. The lowest level on the scale is “Not Using,” which has a score value of 0. Here the district leader does not even attempt to ensure clear and measurable goals **for all relevant areas of responsibility**. This level is also considered unsatisfactory.

Conclusion

The system described here is offered as a comprehensive, cascading approach to district leader evaluation that is coordinated and compatible with the Marzano School Leader Evaluation Model, the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, and the Marzano Center Non-Instructional Support Personnel Evaluation Form. Learning Sciences Marzano Center for Teacher and Leader Evaluation can assist districts in further development and implementation of the model in collaboration with district and school leaders.

It is important to note that the model presented in this report employs scales and parts of scales developed by Robert J. Marzano and Learning Sciences Marzano Center for Teacher and Leader Evaluation. The copyright to these previously developed scales is held exclusively by Dr. Robert J. Marzano. This document in no way signals that Dr. Robert J. Marzano or Learning Sciences International is relinquishing this copyright.

5. Process for Observations

(Note: The process outlined below summarizes LSI recommendations for implementation and are reprinted from Carbaugh, Marzano, Toth, *School Leadership for Results: Shifting the Focus of Leader Evaluation*, LSI: 2015. Please see additional district attachments)

Districts planning implementation of the district leader evaluation model have to take one important preliminary step: achieve consensus on the need to move to an evaluation system focused on growth rather than merely compliance. Districts that have previously implemented growth-based *teacher* evaluation systems will often perceive the clear need to move their district leader evaluation system toward a growth-based model. But the focus on continuous leader professional growth must

Scales for the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model copyright Robert J. Marzano, 2013. Report copyright Learning Sciences Marzano Center, 2013. All Rights Reserved. The Marzano District Leadership Evaluation domains, elements, scales and evidences may only be digitized in iObservation.

Updated 1/29/14

be clearly communicated and understood throughout the district.

Districts may choose to implement all twenty-one elements in their first year, or the implementation team may identify specific domains to focus on in Year 1 and Year 2. We often recommend that districts use a phase-in process, where they identify one or two domains in which district leaders will be evaluated in Year 1. Often these chosen domains will coordinate with an aligned plan for school leaders and teachers. After Year 2 all twenty-one elements should be rated every year.

A second, equally effective option is that the committee selects a few elements from each of the five domains to focus on in Year 1 and adds in the remaining elements in Year 2.

With this evaluation model, the objective is for the district leader's supervisor to collect formative pieces of evidence so that by year's end, the supervisor can compile formative evidence and data for an end-of-year summative evaluation score. We believe the great benefit of this system is that district leaders are empowered to make adjustments and refine their actions throughout the course of the year, effectively taking control of their professional development as they increase their expertise.

Planning Support for Implementation


In planning for implementation, it is critical that both supervisors and district leaders understand that each element in the model has a desired result. During implementation, the implementation team will begin the work of constituting the body of evidence to demonstrate that the district leader is achieving desired results for each element. Creating this body of evidence is a developmental process, requiring a concerted effort from the implementation team and clear communication to district leaders. The sample evidences provided in the Marzano District Leader Evaluation Model are written in generic terms and can be customized to meet the expectations of individual districts.

— — ||

In the absence of agreed-upon bodies of evidence, the implementation will most likely remain at the compliance level. However, when the team, with the buy-in of district leaders, moves into identifying specific evidence of desired effects, the model becomes a true growth model for development of expertise.

The Five Steps of the Evaluation Cycle

Supervisors should plan to meet with each district leader during at least five designated points within the evaluation cycle. Before the initial meeting, it is recommended that district leaders conduct self-assessments on each element in the model.



6. Training Plan for Evaluators and Observers

(Please see district attachment)


7. Appendix

We highly recommend Carbaugh, Marzano, Toth, “Common Language Common Goals: How an Aligned Evaluation and Growth System for District Leaders, School Leaders, Teachers, and Support Personnel Drives Student Achievement.”


<http://www.marzanocenter.com/files/MarzanoCenter-Hierarchical-Evaluation-20130529.pdf>

The District Leader Evaluation Learning Map

District Leadership Evaluation Model Learning Map
Domains 1-3



District Leadership Evaluation Model Learning Map Domains 4-6



For a comprehensive overview of the professional development and implementation services offered by Learning Sciences Marzano Center, visit www.MarzanoCenter.com, or call 1.877.411.7114.

