Both an Administrator and his/her Evaluator (usually a superintendent, assistant superintendent, or director) will be responsible for collecting evidence (artifacts of practice) to support proficiency in the five domains of the School ADvance™ rubrics. Administrators will demonstrate proficiency by collecting, organizing, and reflecting on evidence throughout the year. The evidence should be in direct support of the characteristics in the rubric. When posting evidence to the Formative Rubrics, administrators and their supervisors should focus on those areas designated by the district as priority performance areas for that position (based on district and school goals) and any designated growth areas for that administrator.

Administrators may start the process of building the evidence base for each domain by identifying exemplars of work in the priority areas identified for his/her position from the previous 1-2 years in the position. This can be done in combination with completing an initial self-assessment to create a performance base line (see Section 1: School ADvance Principal or Central Office Performance Growth Assessment). After the initial self-assessment and first cycle of summative evaluation, administrators should focus on adding evidence that relates to progress toward and/or achievement of the administrator’s professional growth plan (which should be aligned to district, school, and performance growth goals). All evidence offered should be linked to one or more performance characteristics in the administrator evaluation rubrics (Formative and/or Summative Rubrics) with annotations indicating how that piece of evidence reflects the characteristics.

The administrator’s evaluator is also responsible for submitting evidence to the administrator’s performance documentation throughout the year. This evidence can come from observation and/or collection of artifacts. The administrator and evaluator will review all information collected and attempt to reach agreement as to which characteristics in the evaluation rubric the evidence supports. The supervisor must give final approval for determining what sources of evidence to accept to support the performance criteria in the summative evaluation.

Administrators and Evaluators should be cautious about the quality, alignment, and the purpose of all evidence collected. Enough evidence should be collected to support judgments on the summative evaluation. Additionally, evidence offered in support should be of high quality, current, and well aligned with the areas designated for inclusion in the summative evaluation. Administrators should be strategic in selecting evidence that represents best work and avoid over packing the evidence portfolio with redundant, trivial, obscure, outdated, or poorly aligned materials. Being strategic and aiming for quality and clarity rather than volume will keep the documentation process from becoming cumbersome for both the administrator and the evaluator.
Examples of Evidence:

1. **Observations** –
   - Observing the administrator directly in a large range of circumstances (e.g., leading staff or administrative team meetings; professional learning communities; data team meetings; meeting with parents; presenting to the Board of Education or Parent Organization; meeting with individual teachers; etc.)
   - Observing systems and processes that the administrator has established (e.g., professional learning communities; data teams; professional development programs; communications, data collection and analysis; performance evaluations; parent/student/community engagement, etc.).

2. **Artifacts of Practice**–
   Products resulting from an administrator’s work that may be used as exemplars of their work (e.g., school or district improvement plans; performance evaluation documents; parent, staff, and community newsletters; agendas from meetings and work sessions; etc.)

3. **Feedback Data** –
   - Teacher Feedback Data (e.g., multi-rater assessments of the administrator’s work; school culture and climate assessments; etc.)
   - Student Feedback Data (e.g., exit surveys, culture and climate assessments; school program and process assessments; etc.)
   - Parent and Community Feedback (e.g., parent engagement surveys; school satisfaction surveys; etc.)

4. **Student Results Data**
   - Student Achievement Evidence (e.g., national, state, and/or local student assessment results; sub-group and sub-test data; pre-post gains/losses; actual vs. projected growth; etc.)
   - Student Engagement Evidence (e.g., attendance, behavior, and participation data, etc.).
   - Student Accomplishments (e.g., completion of advanced or specialized courses; dual enrollment; awards and recognitions; matriculation and graduation; etc.)

A single artifact and/or data set may provide evidence of an administrator’s practice across a range of factors and characteristics in the rubric.
Collection, management, and sharing of performance evidence are best facilitated through an on-line management system that:

a. Provides each administrator with a password protected personal evaluation workspace that contains the Formative Rubrics, Summative Rubrics, and space to upload and link artifacts/data sets to one or more items in the rubrics.

b. Provides each supervisor with access to the evaluation files of persons assigned to him or her for evaluation input and feedback.

c. Provides each supervisor the means to upload observation notes and performance evidence to the evaluation files of the persons they evaluate.

d. Provides both the person being evaluated and the evaluator access to the same body of evidence to support performance dialogue.