MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Administrative and
Supervisory Professional Growth System: 2006–2007

Office of Shared Accountability

April 2008

Suzanne Merchlinsky, M.A.

Montgomery County Public Schools

OFFICE OF SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY

Dr. Stacy L. Scott, Associate Superintendent
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850
301-279-3925

Dr. Jerry D. Weast   **Dr. Frieda K. Lacey**
Superintendent of Schools   *Deputy Superintendent*
                                                                         of Schools

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Executive Summary

The Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) began implementation of the Administrative and Supervisory Professional Growth System (A&S PGS) in the 2003–2004 school year, with 50 principals. Implementation was expanded to all principals and other school-based and central services administrators during the 2004–2005 school year. The vision of the A&S PGS is an effective learning community for students and adults, which requires highly skilled administrators, teachers, support staff, and others working collaboratively toward the achievement of all students. The A&S PGS is designed to provide —

- a comprehensive system for attracting, recruiting, mentoring, developing, evaluating, and recognizing administrators; and
- a dynamic structure for critical reflection, continuous improvement, and lifelong learning (MCPS, 2005).

In addition to the evaluation component, the following additional components of the A&S PGS were implemented to various degrees: professional development, recognition, and leadership standards. As part of the A&S PGS, six leadership standards and supporting performance criteria define a range of behaviors for A&S employees and are designed to reflect a high standard of performance. The components of attracting/recruiting and mentoring are currently being developed with input from the Leadership Development Advisory Committee and the A&S PGS Implementation Team. For the past two years (2006–2007 and 2007–2008) a pilot mentoring program has been implemented and an evaluation of the pilot will be implemented in the spring of 2008.

The former Department of Shared Accountability (DSA) conducted a formative evaluation of the implementation of the A&S PGS. Although implementation of the A&S PGS has been extended to all A&S employees, not all components of the A&S PGS have been fully implemented at this time. Therefore, the task of the current study was to gather information from all stakeholder groups (principals, other school-based administrators [i.e., assistant principals, assistant school administrators—formerly "student support specialists"—and coordinators of school-based programs], central office administrators, community superintendents, directors, and associate superintendents) about the components that are currently being implemented (professional development, recognition, leadership standards, and evaluation). The purposes of the formative evaluation were to determine the following:

- The extent to which the A&S PGS has been implemented consistently and as intended

- Stakeholders' experiences with the implementation and outcomes of the A&S PGS

- The impact of the A&S PGS on communication about professional growth of A&S employees

- Revisions that should be made to currently implemented components, or considered while implementing new components

The following data collection activities were used in the evaluation:

- Focus groups with school-based and central services administrators

- Survey of A&S employees

- Review of data from the Office of Human Resources (OHR), Office of Organizational Development (OOD), and Research for Better Teaching (RBT)

An evaluation advisory group provided consultation to improve the validity of the data collection instruments.

Major findings from the data collection activities indicate the following:

- All administrators are most familiar with the evaluation and professional development components of the A&S PGS.

- The greatest number of principals and central services administrators attended A&S meetings for training about the components and procedures of the A&S PGS, followed by training about how to conduct evaluations of other administrators. Other school-based administrators most frequently attended evaluation training, followed by training at A&S meetings. Among those who attended, evaluation training was most helpful to principals and central services administrators, while presentations at A&S meetings were most helpful to other school-based administrators. Professional Development Plan (PDP) training was the least helpful to principals (though still considered helpful by a majority), and portfolio training was least helpful to other school-based administrators and central services administrators (though still considered helpful by a majority who attended the training).

- More than half of the survey respondents in each group indicated that training on the A&S PGS has been directly relevant to their positions, and most administrators expressed a thorough understanding of the evaluation process as it applies to both supervisors and their evaluatees. However, some confusion was expressed about the requirements during professional growth years.

- Approximately one third of each group of survey respondents also agreed that they needed clarification about requirements during various cycles of the evaluation process (evaluation vs. professional growth years).

- Nearly all of the professional development (PD) activities listed on the survey were very well received by all three groups of administrators responding to the survey. The exception was the online learning modules for leadership standards.

- Central services administrators perceive that the PD offerings mostly target school-based administrators and that more PD activities are needed for central services administrators.

- Priority given to the Professional Development Plan (PDP) varies among administrators. For example, some receive little or no feedback from their supervisors, while others report helpful feedback about their PDP.

- A majority of principals and central services administrators did not agree that developing a PDP was a helpful tool for professional growth. A majority of principals and other school-based administrators indicated that the PDP does not support their personal professional growth because it is linked to school-level goals.

- Principals and other school-based administrators (who are assigned a consulting principal [CP] because they are new principals or have underperformed) reported very positive interactions with their CP. Central services administrators (who only receive services for underperformance) indicated a lack of knowledge that consultant services are available to them, if needed.

- Findings reveal that the recognition component of the A&S PGS is not well implemented, with method and frequency of recognition varying by supervisor. Administrators indicated that letters of recognition and travel opportunities for professional growth most frequently were effective methods of recognition. However, they also indicated inconsistency in recognizing accomplishments.

- Analysis of the data suggests that requirements for the number of meetings, observations, and post-observation conferences, as well as the timeliness of completing evaluation reports, are implemented inconsistently.

- More than half of the survey respondents indicated that the evaluation process provides a framework for conversations about professional growth, and they consider the A&S PGS consistent and formalized framework for discussions with administrators as a strength of the system. Additionally, approximately half agreed that the process encourages reflective conversations among employees and their supervisors.

- Administrators indicated that they were thoroughly prepared to meet the leadership standards. However, Standard VI (*…understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context*) was most frequently indicated as needing additional professional development.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

- Review individual training sessions on developing portfolios and PDPs. While the majority of respondents who participated in these training sessions rated them positively, they were consistently rated behind other training related to the A&S PGS.

- Review the online learning modules for leadership standards to determine what aspects are not helpful to administrators and what refinements could improve their utility.

- Conduct an assessment of the professional development needs of central services administrators. Also, determine what professional development activities have been created and delivered within central services offices. It is possible that activities in one office would be appropriate for other offices, potentially creating a "catalog" of central services PD opportunities.

- Continue to provide consistent information about the expectations for the process and outcomes of the PDP process. Consider auditing a sample of PDPs from school-based and central services administrators to determine areas in which implementation may be inconsistent.

- Consider providing consultant services to central services administrators for purposes other than underperformance. An option might be to provide a consultant when a school-based administrator moves to a central services position or changes to a new central services position, or at the request of a central services administrator.

- Develop a system of recognition with input from school-based and central services administrators. Such a system might include guidelines for the types of accomplishments that would be recognized, and meaningful forms of recognition indicated by administrators.

- Develop opportunities for administrators to increase mastery of Standard VI. For example, consider providing forums for administrators to discuss and investigate the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts of their communities and the school system as a whole.

- Monitor and support administrators who are not fulfilling the requirements of the evaluation process, such as conducting the required number of meetings, observations, and post-observation conferences, as well as the timely completion of evaluation reports.

- Disaggregate the OHR data regarding timely completion of evaluations to determine which groups of administrators need additional support in conducting or writing evaluation reports.

Background

The Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) recognizes the key role of administrators in building a learning community that promotes the achievement of all students. Therefore, MCPS has developed a comprehensive professional growth system for attracting, recruiting, mentoring, developing, evaluating, and recognizing administrators; and a dynamic structure for critical reflection, continuous improvement, and lifelong learning (MCPS, 2005). This is in alignment with the MCPS strategic plan, Goal 4: Creating a Positive Work Environment in a Self-renewing Organization.

The vision of the Administrative and Supervisory Professional Growth System (A&S PGS) is to create an effective learning community for students and adults, which requires highly skilled administrators, teachers, support staff, and others working collaboratively toward the achievement of all students. Administrators play a key role in creating, guiding, managing, and inspiring that learning community.

Phase 1 of the A&S PGS was implemented in the 2003–2004 school year for 50 principals. During the 2005–2006 school year, the A&S PGS was implemented for all principals and other school-based and central services A&S employees. In addition to the evaluation component, the following components of the A&S PGS were implemented to various degrees: professional development, recognition, and leadership standards. The components of attracting/recruiting and mentoring are currently being developed with input from the Leadership Development Advisory Committee and the A&S PGS Implementation Team. A pilot mentoring program has been implemented for the past two years (2006–2007 and 2007–2008), and an evaluation of the pilot will be implemented in the spring of 2008.   Each of the components is described below.

- **Attracting** is the process by which personnel are given opportunities to learn about the benefits and responsibilities of being an administrator or supervisor. **Recruiting** is the process by which individuals are sought to apply for specific positions.

- **Professional development** is a set of opportunities to provide a variety of leadership experiences for A&S staff to expand their knowledge, skills, strategies, practices, and belief in each of the six leadership standards. Examples of professional development activities include, but are not limited to training, state and national conference attendance, peer coaching and mentoring, action research, advanced professional study, school and office visitations, research and study of best practices, and study groups. Additionally, each A&S employee will create a Professional Development Plan (PDP) that includes areas of growth, expected outcomes, plans for meeting goals, identification of needed resources, and evidence of attainment.

- **Mentoring** is a collegial support system for novice administrators, administrators new to MCPS, aspiring principals, administrators who seek mentoring through the PDP process, and administrators who receive mentors through the evaluation and supervision process. Mentoring activities may include coaching, modeling, peer observation with reflection,

and constructive feedback. The mentoring component is in the very preliminary stages of implementation.

- **Recognition** is a process to identify and distinguish practices, performance, and achievement attained by individual A&S employees. In highlighting these accomplishments formally and informally, MCPS sets the standard for excellence.

- The six **leadership standards** and supporting performance criteria define a range of behaviors for A&S employees and are designed to reflect a high standard of performance. (For a complete description of the performance criteria and examples of behaviors that meet and do not meet standard, please see MCPS, 2005.)   The leadership standards for principals, other school-based administrators, and central services administrators are listed in Table A1 in the appendix.

- The **evaluation process** is based on the expectations and measures included in the six leadership standards. The process includes at least two formal observations by a community superintendent, associate superintendent, principal, or director, and a process of gathering information and reviewing data sources with the A&S employee. If the A&S employee meets standard, he/she continues in the professional growth cycle. If concerns are identified during the formal evaluation, a consulting principal (or consultant for central services staff) is assigned for support and an improvement plan is developed.

Review of Literature

A review of literature on evaluations or studies of principals' professional growth revealed systems that are heavily inclined toward evaluation processes, rather than including a comprehensive system of components to promote professional growth. For example, Davis and Hensley (1999) found principal evaluation procedures to be inconsistent and unsystematic, both in process and in utilization of results. The quality and depth of supervisors' feedback varied and was often provided only annually unless otherwise requested by the principal. They also found that both superintendents and principals believe that political factors, and not just performance, often influence a principal's formal evaluation.   Similarly, Russo (2004) determined that principal evaluation systems typically consist of checklists, single interviews, and little face-to-face contact, resulting in little impact on improved leadership.

Lashway (2003) agreed that the evaluation process has little impact on principals' professional growth and performance, and advocated the importance of involving principals in developing a challenging professional growth plan, rather than conducting evaluation in isolation. He discussed that comprehensive national standards such as Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) reflect professional consensus on leadership skills, but few data exist on their effectiveness as change agents. Additionally, as process-oriented standards they do not reflect school-based results that may be of interest to evaluators.

The A&S PGS in MCPS is a system not solely for evaluating principals, but a process for providing professional growth to principals and other school-based and central services

administrators and supervisors. While the literature contains recommendations for such a system, the evaluation of such a system is not covered. Therefore, the current study could be a contribution to the literature on evaluating the implementation of professional growth systems for administrative and supervisory employees.

Scope of the Evaluation

The implementation of the A&S PGS has been extended to all A&S employees in MCPS. However, not all components are fully implemented at this time. As a result, this study gathers information from all stakeholder groups (principals, other school-based administrators, central service administrators, community superintendents, directors, and associate superintendents), about the components implemented during the 2006–2007 school year (professional development, recognition, leadership standards, and evaluation). The purpose of the current study is to determine the following:

- The extent to which the A&S PGS has been implemented consistently and as intended

- Stakeholders' experiences with the implementation and outcomes of the A&S PGS

- The impact of the A&S PGS on communication about the professional growth of A&S employees

- Revisions that should be made to currently implemented components, or considered while implementing new components

Methodology

A multi-method evaluation design was used to collect and analyze the evaluation data. The purpose of employing mixed methods was for triangulation of data (Green, et al., 1989), in which a researcher collects information from multiple sources to corroborate the same fact or phenomenon (Yin, 1994).

The program evaluation standards (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994) are built into the evaluation activities; in particular, the utility standard is assured through the involvement of a stakeholder advisory group. An evaluation advisory group was convened to provide input on the evaluation questions and data collection instruments. Members of the evaluation advisory group included representatives of elementary and secondary school-based A&S employees, the Office of School Performance (OSP), Office of Human Resources (OHR), Office of Organizational Development (OOD), and Montgomery County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel (MCAASP).

Evaluation Questions

The following questions guided the evaluation:

1. Do A&S employees understand the components of the PGS?

2. To what extent and with what quality has the A&S PGS been implemented as intended?

3. What impact has the A&S PGS had on communication about the professional growth of A&S staff?

4. What changes should be made to improve the clarity, implementation, and outcomes of the A&S PGS?

Data Sources

Focus Groups of A&S Employees. DSA staff conducted five focus groups with 33 school-based and central services A&S employees during December 2006 and January 2007. The participants included 11 central services and 22 school-based administrators. The central services employees had a range of 2 to 31 years' experience in A&S positions in MCPS. The school-based administrators had a range of 2 to 24 years' experience in A&S positions in MCPS. A structured protocol with a series of open-ended questions about experiences with each of the components of the A&S PGS was used to guide the group discussion. Each focus group lasted approximately one hour. The information obtained from the focus groups was used to design appropriate survey questions and response choices. The findings from the focus groups are also included in this report, where appropriate.

Surveys of A&S Employees. The surveys were developed with advice from the Evaluation Advisory Group, based on issues raised in the focus groups as a process to improve the validity of the survey items. The questions on the survey focused on the major components of the A&S PGS. Similar surveys were developed for three groups of A&S employees: principals and interns; other school-based A&S employees; and central services A&S employees. The surveys were administered anonymously online, with links sent out by MCAASP. It was determined that MCAASP had the most accurate roster of A&S employees and individual rosters for each group of A&S employees to calculate response rate for each group. The initial survey links were sent at the end of August. Due to a low response rate, the deadline was extended to late September.

Review of Data from OHR and OOD. Data were obtained from OHR regarding the timeliness of the completion of evaluation reports for administrators. Additionally, OOD provided data on the outcomes for administrators who received services from consulting principals (CPs) or consultants.

Data analysis procedures included—

- Content analysis of focus group data to determine trends within and across groups of participants,

- Descriptive statistical analysis of survey data to determine frequencies of responses across groups of administrators, and

- Qualitative document review of information from OHR and OOD.

Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents

Completed surveys were received from 138 principals and interns (66% response rate); 106 other school-based A&S employees (37% response rate); and 116 central services A&S employees (68% response rate). Due to a low response rate, findings from other school-based (i.e., assistant principals, assistant school administrators, and coordinators of school-based programs) administrators should be interpreted with caution. Among principals and interns, 2% were in their first year in an A&S position, and approximately one third each had been in an A&S position for 2 to 5 years (35%), 6 to 10 years (31%), or more than 10 years (30%). Among other school-based administrators, 4% were in their first year in an A&S position, more than half had been in an A&S position for 2 to 5 years (60%), more than one fourth for 6 to 10 years (27%), and 9% for more than 10 years. Among central services administrators, 6% were in their first year in an A&S position, nearly half (48%) had been in an A&S position for 2 to 5 years, and approximately one fourth each had been in an A&S position for 6 to 10 years (25%), or more than 10 years (21%) (Table A2 in the appendix). The majority of principals and interns (73%) and central services administrators (60%) and approximately one third of other school-based A&S employees (36%) had been administrators in MCPS prior to implementation of the A&S PGS (Table A3 in the appendix). Approximately two thirds (63%) of the responding principals, 9% of the other school-based administrators, and nearly one third (32%) of the central services administrators indicated that they supervise other administrators (Table A4 in the appendix).

Findings

Familiarity With and Perceived Importance of the Components of the A&S PGS

A goal of the implementation of the A&S PGS is for all A&S employees to become familiar with the components. Overall, the data show that principals have greater familiarity than other school-based administrators or central services administrators with each of the components. Additionally, all A&S employees show the greatest familiarity with the evaluation component (rated "very familiar" by 85% of principals, 67% of other school-based A&S employees, and 64% of central services A&S employees), followed by the professional development component (rated "very familiar" by 60% of principals, 65% of other school-based A&S employees, and 45% of central services A&S employees). Recognition is the implemented component least familiar to A&S employees (Table 1; Tables A5 and A6 in the appendix).

Across all three groups, nearly all A&S employees indicated the importance of the professional development component (rated "very important" by 91% of principals, 96% of other school-based A&S employees, and 88% of central services A&S employees), followed closely by the evaluation component (rated "very important" by 91% of principals, 86% of other school-based A&S employees, and 87% of central services A&S employees). Only about half of each group considered the attracting component (which has not yet been implemented) as "very important" (58% of principals, 52% of other school-based A&S employees, and 58% of central services A&S employees) (Table 1; Tables A5 and A6 in the appendix).

Table 1
Survey Respondents' Familiarity With and
Perceived Importance of the Components of the A&S PGS

Components*	% of Principals *N*=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators *N*=106	% of Central Services Administrators *N*=116
Professional Development			
Very familiar	60.2	65.1	44.8
Very important	91.2	96.2	88.4
Recognition			
Very familiar	26.1	19.0	15.5
Very important	69.9	72.3	72.7
Evaluation			
Very familiar	84.8	67.0	64.3
Very important	91.2	86.4	86.6
Mentoring**			
Very familiar	41.3	35.8	21.7
Very important	83.8	81.2	80.2
Attracting**			
Very familiar	25.4	15.1	16.4
Very important	57.8	52.0	57.8
Recruiting**			
Very familiar	23.2	15.2	16.4
Very important	72.8	67.6	66.4

* Survey response choices were: "very familiar," "somewhat familiar," and "not familiar."
** Components are not yet implemented extensively.

Training for the A&S PGS

Various training opportunities are available to prepare A&S employees to implement the A&S PGS components and processes. For principals and central services A&S employees, the most frequently attended training activity was presentations at A&S meetings (attended by 90% of principals and 77% of central services A&S employees), followed by evaluation training (attended by 73% of principals and 57% of central services A&S employees). Other school-based A&S employees most frequently attended evaluation training (63%) followed by PDP training (56%). Across all three groups, portfolio training was the least attended (38% of principals, 40% of other school-based A&S employees, and 42% of central services A&S employees) (Table 2).

Nearly all administrators who attended evaluation training found it helpful (96% of principals, 92% of other school-based administrators, and 92% of central services administrators who

attended). Additionally, nearly all administrators who attended presentations at A&S meetings found them helpful (91% of principals, 95% of other school-based administrators, and 88% of central services administrators who attended). All other trainings were rated helpful by 75% or more of stakeholders who attended in each group, with the exception of PDP training which was cited as helpful to only 69% of principals who attended (Table 2).

Table 2
Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Helpfulness of
Training for the A&S PGS

Training Activities	Principals *N*=138			Other School-Based Administrators *N*=106			Central Services Administrators *N*=116		
	N Attended	% Attended	% Helpful[a]	N Attended	% Attended	% Helpful[a]	N Attended	% Attended	% Helpful[a]
Presentations at A&S Meetings	123	89.8	91.1	57	54.3	94.7	88	76.5	87.5
Portfolio Training	52	37.7	75.0	42	40.4	85.7	48	41.7	81.3
Professional Development Plan (PDP) Training	71	51.4	69.0	59	55.7	89.8	58	50.0	84.5
Evaluation Training	99	72.8	96.0	65	62.5	92.3	65	57.0	92.3

[a] Percentage of attendees who found the training helpful. The remaining attendees did not find the training helpful.

More than half of the survey respondents in each group (62% of principals, 62% of other school-based A&S employees, and 53% of central services A&S employees) indicated that training for the A&S PGS has been directly relevant to their positions. Approximately half of each (50% of principals, 48% of other school-based A&S employees, and 44% of central services A&S employees) agreed that training would be helpful to include scenarios of "grey area" situations, with role-playing and discussion (Table 3). These requests were echoed by several focus group participants.

Some focus group principals noted that they could use additional training on evaluating assistant principals (APs) and on the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) process. Among survey respondents, 41% of principals, but only about half that number of other school-based A&S employees (22%) agreed that they could use additional training about the process for evaluating APs. Approximately one third (35%) of central services A&S survey respondents agreed that they could use additional information or training about the process used for their evaluations (Table 3).

A few focus-group respondents expressed their confusion about which components of the evaluation are mandatory versus optional, and the requirements during professional growth years. They noted that it would be useful to receive bulleted lists or "cheat sheets" of items to consider when conducting and writing evaluations. Approximately one third of each group of survey respondents also agreed that they needed clarification about requirements during various cycles of the evaluation process (33% of principals, 32% of other school-based A&S employees, and 31% of central services A&S employees) (Table 3).

Several focus-group participants noted that APs received training (such as developing a portfolio) that also would be helpful if offered to principals. This finding was also reflected in the survey data. Approximately one fourth of principals (26%) and APs (24%) agreed on the survey that principals should have the option to receive training offered to APs.

Table 3
Survey Respondents' Agreement With Statements About Training for the A&S PGS

Which of the following represent your experiences, views, and/or needs with training about A&S PGS implementation? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals *N*=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators *N*=106	% of Central Services Administrators *N*=116
Training about the A&S PGS is directly relevant to my A&S position.	61.6	62.3	52.6
Training that includes dialogue, role playing, and discussion of "gray area" situations would be helpful.	50.0	48.1	44.0
Training about the A&S PGS needs additional follow-up (beyond one day of training).	40.6	27.4	31.9
I could use additional information/training about the process for evaluating APs.	40.6	21.7	NA
I could use additional information/training about the process for evaluating central services administrators.	1.4	3.8	35.3
I would like clarification about the requirements during the various stages of the evaluation cycle (e.g., evaluation year vs. professional development year).	33.3	32.1	31.0
I would like additional training about the Review Panel process.	30.4	20.8	20.7
Training about the A&S PGS has not included hands-on applications.	26.8	21.7	15.5
Principals should have the option to receive training presented to APs.	26.1	23.6	NA
I could use additional training on creating a portfolio.	20.3	34.9	31.0
I have not participated in any training for the A&S PGS.	6.5	11.3	13.8

NA: Items not applicable to this group of respondents.

Table A7 in the appendix lists respondents' comments about other training activities in which they have participated, relative to the A&S PGS.

Professional Development and the Professional Development Plan

Numerous professional development opportunities are available for A&S employees to expand their knowledge, skills strategies, practices, and beliefs in each of the six standards. (Examples of professional development activities are listed in Table A8 in the appendix.)

Many focus-group respondents expressed a need for differentiation in MCPS professional development. They indicated that the most effective professional development occurred when they could choose individual components to meet their needs. For example, several commented that the Professional Learning Communities Institute was helpful because it directed training to the specific needs of school teams. Nearly three fourths (73%) of principals responding to the

survey agreed that PD needed more differentiation, but less than half of other school-based administrators (47%) and central services administrators (44%) agreed (Table 4).

Most focus group respondents also commented that it was valuable to attend professional conferences where national experts provide information about practices in other school districts. It was further suggested that exposure to national experts could be provided in a local setting at A&S meetings during breakout sessions. On the survey, 73% of principals, 40% of other school-based administrators, and 61% of central services administrators agreed that breakout sessions with experts during A&S meetings would be a helpful form of PD (Table 4).

Central services administrators in the focus groups noted that MCPS professional development is more suited to school-based administrators. Therefore, individual departments within central office sometimes generate their own professional development experiences. For example, one central services administrator commented, "Our office is unique and we have had our own management training, but not much outside of our office." Another stated, "Many offices develop and deliver their own professional development." More than two thirds of central services administrators (69%) responding to the survey agreed that more PD opportunities for them would be helpful. Additionally, more than half of principals (58%), other school-based administrators (60%), and central services administrators (58%) indicated on the survey that PD is directly related to their positions (Table 4).

Table 4

Survey Respondents' Agreement With Statements About Professional Development

Which of the following represent your experiences, views, and/or needs with professional development? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
Professional development needs more differentiation.	73.2	47.2	44.0
Breakout sessions with experts during A&S meetings would be helpful.	72.5	39.6	61.2
More professional development opportunities for central services administrators would be helpful.	2.2	3.8	69.0
Professional development is directly relevant to my A&S position.	58.0	60.4	57.8
Professional development on financial management issues would be helpful.	55.8	54.7	39.7
Professional development needs additional follow-up (beyond one day of training).	47.1	29.2	43.1
I have not participated in any professional development activities.	1.4	1.9	5.2

Table A8 in the appendix presents survey data about administrators' perceived helpfulness of various PD activities they attended. Nearly all of the listed activities were very well-received by all three groups of administrators responding to the survey (rated helpful by at least 80% of those who participated). The exception was the on-line learning modules for leadership standards, which was indicated as helpful by less than half of the principals (43%) and other school-based administrators who participated (48%), and slightly more than half of the central services administrators who participated (52%).

Tables A9 and A10 in the appendix include comments from survey respondents about their experiences with PD activities.

Some focus group respondents felt that Professional Development Plans (PDPs) are an exercise that promotes reflection. However, most expressed a lack of follow-up or feedback from their supervisor. Therefore, they felt that the document was just paperwork and did not contribute meaningfully to their professional growth. One principal's comment reflected this experience, "What is monitored is valued, so a principal's PDP is only as good as what type of feedback they receive from their community superintendent."

Eighty-two percent of principals (113 principals), 76% of other school-based A&S (81 employees), and 64% of central services A&S (74 employees) had completed a PDP at the time they responded to the survey. The information in Table 5 shows the responses of those A&S employees who have completed a PDP, by group of respondent.

Overall, other school-based A&S and central services A&S employees responded more positively to statements about most experiences with the PDP process than principals. Less than one third of principals (30%), more than half of other school-based A&S (53%), and more than one third of central services A&S (38%) agreed that developing a PDP was a helpful tool for their professional growth. Fewer principals (23%) than other school-based A&S (40%) and central services A&S (39%) agreed that they received helpful feedback from their supervisor about their PDP. Similarly, approximately one fourth of principals (26%) and fewer other school-based A&S (9%) and central services A&S (18%) indicated that they had not received feedback on their PDP. On the other hand, fewer principals (25%) than other school-based A&S (33%) indicated that their PDP reflected school-level goals for AYP rather than their own professional growth goals (Table 5). Principals' comments were mixed on the issue of the PDP's relationship to their school's AYP goals. According to an illustrative comment from a principal, "Our PDP should be directly connected to our school goals. We should be able to articulate specifics about what we are doing to reach our goals, but the PDP should not be a separate document unless there (was) a concern." Another indicated a different viewpoint: "My PDP should not be tied to my school's SIP goals for meeting AYP. My professional development should focus on those things that I feel I want to enhance and grow in for my own satisfaction, interest, passions, stimulation, and marketability."

Table 5
Survey Respondents' Agreement With Statements About
Professional Development Plans (PDPs)

Which of the following represent your experiences, views, and/or needs with Professional Development Plans (PDPs)? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals N=113	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=81	% of Central Services Administrators N=74
Developing a PDP has been a helpful tool for my professional growth.	30.1	53.1	37.8
I have received helpful feedback from my supervisor about my PDP.	23.0	39.5	39.2
My PDP reflects school-level goals for meeting AYP, rather than my personal professional growth goals.	24.8	33.3	N/A
I have not received feedback on my PDP.	25.7	8.6	17.6

Table A11 in the appendix includes survey respondents' comments about the PDP.

Consulting Principals and Consultants

A few of the focus group respondents had Consulting Principals (CPs) during their first year as a principal. (The interviewers did not ask if principals received CP services because of underperformance.) Those who had received CP services were overwhelmingly positive in their comments. They felt that their CPs provided valuable feedback and mentoring support, and they were grateful to have someone to ask questions who was not in an evaluative role. One principal's comment illustrated this positive experience: "I could talk candidly to my CP and not have it used against me." A few principals also mentioned that the most valuable resources they received from CPs were concrete examples, such as monthly look-fors throughout the school year. According to another principal, "It was helpful to have letters that were put out by other principals (i.e. back-to-school packet)."

Among survey respondents, 58% of principals (80 principals) and 56% of other school-based administrators (62 employees) reported using the services of a CP or a consultant. (Additionally, 29 central services administrators reported using the services of a consultant, but these data were invalid. Cross-checking with OOD data reveals that only 2 central services administrators have had consultants since the inception of the A&S PGS, and both of those administrators have subsequently retired.) Seven central services A&S employees commented that they did not know consultant services exist for them. The responses did not indicate whether principals or other school-based administrators received CP services because of under-performance or as novices (Table 6).

Three fourths of principals (75%) and nearly two thirds of other school-based administrators (65%) agreed that their CP provided valuable feedback and mentoring (Table 6). More than half of the principals (59%) and other school-based administrators (52%) indicated that they could speak candidly to their CP or consultant without fearing repercussions. Few respondents (4% of principals and 10% of other school-based administrators) indicated a conflict between the evaluative and assistance roles of the CP (Table 6).

Respondents also indicated the types of services provided by their CP. Among principals, the most frequently cited services were formal observations and feedback (63%), followed by assistance with personnel issues and meeting or presentation planning (41% each), then assistance with crisis management. Among other school-based administrators, assistance with meeting or presentation planning was most commonly indicated (42%), followed by personnel issues (31%), formal observations and feedback (26%), and assistance with crisis management (23%) (Table 6).

Table 6
Survey Respondents' Agreement With Statements About
Services From Consulting Principals (CPs)

Which of the following represent your experiences, views, and/or needs with services from Consulting Principals (CP)? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals *N*=80	% of Other School-Based Administrators *N*=62
My CP or Consultant provided valuable feedback and mentoring.	75.0	64.5
My CP or Consultant conducted formal observations and feedback.	62.5	25.8
My CP or Consultant assisted me with crisis management.	31.3	22.6
My CP or Consultant assisted me with personnel issues.	41.3	30.6
My CP or Consultant assisted me with meeting or presentation planning.	41.3	41.9
There is a conflict between the evaluative and assistance roles of the CP or Consultant.	3.8	9.7
I could talk candidly to my CP or Consultant and not fear repercussions.	58.8	51.6

Table A12 in the appendix includes comments from survey respondents about their experiences with their CPs and consultants. The preponderance of comments from principals and other school-based administrators were positive. Among the central services administrators offering comments, many indicated their lack of knowledge about the availability of consultants.

According to data from OOD, during the 2006–2007 school year 37 principals who were novices, new to MCPS, or new to their school level received support from CPs. Thirty five of those principals (95%) met standard, and two (5%) continued in a support cycle the following year. A small number of principals, APs, and central services A&S employees received services due to under-performance. Four under-performing principals received CP support. One of those subsequently met standard, one was reassigned, and two continued in a support cycle the following year. Two APs also received CP services. Of those, one subsequently met standard, and the other continued in a support cycle the following year. Only one central services A&S employee received services from a consultant during the 2006–2007 school year, and subsequently retired.

Methods of Recognition

Focus group respondents noted that the methods and frequency of recognition varied by supervisor, but they agreed that the recognition component of the A&S PGS was not yet well implemented. Some stated that recognition is given in ways that are not meaningful, such as supervisors arranging ways to make everyone feel recognized. Others felt that some administrators "toot their own horns" and are therefore recognized more frequently than those who work quietly but effectively behind the scenes. Focus group respondents suggested the following as appreciated forms of recognition:

- Monetary awards to the school
- Substitute administrators to release principals from their buildings

- Letters of appreciation
- Travel opportunities for professional growth

Additionally, several focus group respondents mentioned professional respect as a form of recognition. A typical principal's comment reflected the opinion of others: "Recognize my profession and expertise. Respect that I can do my job and there's no need to micro-manage." When providing recognition to their staff, one principal advocated for respecting personal time. He stated, "I let them know I don't own them 24/7. They should have time for sick family members, etc."

Survey respondents indicated their experiences and views regarding recognition in MCPS (Table 7). Only 18% of principals, 12% of other school-based administrators, and 10% of central services administrators indicated their opinion that MCPS provides appropriate recognition to A&S employees. At least half in each group (52% of principals, 50% of other school-based administrators, and 63% of central services administrators) agreed that methods and frequency of recognition are inconsistent throughout MCPS. Additionally, 20% of principals and other school-based administrators, and 14% of central services administrators indicated that they had not received recognition from their supervisor.

Table 7

Survey Respondents' Agreement With Statements About Methods of Recognition

Which of the following represent your experiences, views, and/or needs with forms of recognition? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
Letters of appreciation are an effective method of recognition.	73.9	79.2	73.3
Recognition sometimes seems contrived (i.e., made up to make everyone feel good).	35.5	28.3	37.9
Articles in the Bulletin are an effective method of recognition.	60.1	52.8	53.4
Travel opportunities for professional growth are an effective method of recognition.	71.0	62.3	68.1
MCPS provides appropriate recognition to A&S employees.	18.1	12.3	9.5
Methods and frequency of recognition are inconsistent throughout MCPS.	52.2	50.0	62.9
I have not received recognition from my supervisor.	20.3	19.8	13.8
Other (see Table A13 in the Appendix)	6.5	1.9	3.4

Table A13 in the appendix includes comments from survey respondents about their experiences and perceptions about forms of recognition.

Evaluation Process

Understanding of the Evaluation Process

Focus-group and survey respondents were asked about their understanding of the evaluation process (in their roles as either an evaluator or an evaluatee) and the extent to which they felt the

evaluation process impacted the communication among administrators and their supervisors. Most focus group respondents indicated a clear understanding of the process for conducting evaluations. Similarly, a high percentage of survey respondents (75% of principals, 66% of other school-based administrators, and 60% of central services administrators) indicated a clear understanding of how they would be evaluated using the A&S PGS (Table 8). Some focus group members expressed confusion about requirements during a nonevaluation year. This finding was also reflected in the survey data. Analysis of the survey data revealed that 12% of principals, 10% of other school-based administrators, and 17% of central services administrators indicated a lack of clarity about the requirements during their professional growth years.

Table 8

Survey Respondents' Agreement With Statements About
Their Understanding of the Evaluation Process

Which of the following represent your experiences with the evaluation process? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals *N*=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators *N*=106	% of Central Services Administrators *N*=116
I have a clear understanding of how I will be evaluated using the A&S PGS.	75.4	66.0	60.3
I am unclear about the requirements during my professional growth year.	11.6	10.4	17.2
I have a clear understanding of how to evaluate other A&S employees using the A&S PGS.	52.9	13.2	37.1
I am unclear about my role in the professional growth years of A&S employees whom I supervise.	4.3	1.9	4.3

Fewer survey respondents indicated an understanding of how to evaluate other A&S employees, but it should be noted that not all respondents actually supervise or evaluate other A&S employees. Slightly more than half of the responding principals (53%) indicated their understanding of how to evaluate other A&S employees, while 13% of other school-based administrators and 37% of central services administrators indicated their understanding of the process. Additionally, 4% of principals, 2% of other school-based administrators, and 4% of central services administrators indicated a lack of clarity about their role in the professional growth years of administrators they supervise. Therefore, it appears that most principals who supervise other administrators have a clear understanding of how to evaluate other administrators (Table 8). However, the data for other school-based and central services administrators are inconsistent with the percentage who reported that they supervise other administrators.

Implementation of the Evaluation Process

The majority of survey respondents indicated that they had been evaluated using the A&S PGS (92% of principals, 83% of other school-based administrators, and 89% of central services administrators). For those who have been evaluated, the information in Table 9 shows the extent to which the evaluation procedures have been implemented.

Table 9
Survey Respondents' Agreement with Statements About
Their Experiences With the Evaluation Process

Which of the following represent your experiences with the evaluation process? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals who Have Been Evaluated N=122	% of Other School-Based Administrators who Have Been Evaluated N=88	% of Central Services Administrators who Have Been Evaluated N=103
During my evaluation year, my supervisor conducted the required number of meetings to review my performance and goals.	59.8	37.5	45.6
During my AP1 and AP2 year, I received a mid-year progress report.	55.7	70.5	N/A
During my AP1 and AP2 year, I received an end-of-year evaluation.	56.6	71.6	N/A
During my evaluation year, my supervisor conducted at least two formal observations.	61.5	28.4	36.9
At least one of my formal observations was scheduled in advance by my supervisor.	58.2	28.4	43.7
Each of my formal observations was followed by a conference with my supervisor.	51.6	33.0	34.0
I received a post-observation conference report.	57.4	33.0	35.0
The post-observation conference report was completed in a timely manner.	40.2	28.4	30.1

During an evaluation year for principals and central services administrators, supervisors are required to conduct two meetings to review goals and progress in the principal's PDP and the school improvement process. Three meetings are required for other school-based administrators. On the survey, 60% of principals, 38% of other school-based administrators, and 46% of central services administrators indicated that the required number of meetings occurred during their evaluation year. In addition to the meetings, supervisors must conduct at least two formal observations, at least one of which must be scheduled in advance, each followed by a conference. Survey data indicated that these components happen for more than half of the principals, and for one third or fewer of other school-based administrators. That is, 62% of principals indicated that their supervisor conducted at least two formal observations, 58% indicated that at least one observation was scheduled in advance, and 52% agreed that each formal observation was followed by a conference with their supervisor. Fewer other school-based administrators indicated compliance with these procedures by their supervisors. For example, 28% each indicated that their supervisor conducted two observations, one of which was scheduled in advance. One third of the other school-based administrators (33%) had a conference following each observation. Approximately one third of central services administrators indicated that their supervisor conducted at least two formal observations (37%) and that each was followed by a conference (34%). More of them (44%) also indicated that at least one of the formal observations was scheduled in advance (Table 9).

Following the formal observations and conferences, A&S employees should receive a post-observation conference report. More than half of the responding principals (57%) and

approximately one third of the other school-based administrators (33%) and central services administrators (35%) indicated that they received such a report. Fewer (40% of principals, 28% of other school-based administrators, and 30% of central services administrators) agreed that they received the report in a timely manner (Table 9).

According to data from OHR, 28% of A&S evaluations were completed on time (by the June 30, 2007, due date). However, by the end of the summer (as of September 6, 2007), 64% of scheduled A&S evaluations were completed and submitted to OHR. (The data were not available by each group for principals, other school-based administrators, and central services administrators.)

Evaluation Data Sources

As discussed above, supervisors are required to conduct at least two formal observations in evaluation years for A&S employees. The supervisor and the evaluatee have many choices of the types of activities that can be observed as evaluation data. The information in Table 10 indicates the types of activities formally observed in the evaluation year for principals, other school-based administrators, and central services administrators.

Among principals who have been observed for evaluation, the most frequently indicated formal observation was supervisory schools visits (67%), followed by staff meetings (56%) and school improvement team meetings (55%). Other school-based administrators who have been observed for evaluation indicated staff meetings as the most frequent formal observation (67%), followed by parent/community meetings (61%) and leadership meetings (54%). Central services administrators who have been observed for evaluation also indicated staff meetings most frequently (54%), followed by leadership meetings (42%) and interactions with stakeholders, clients, or customers (38%) (Table 10).

Table 10

Types of Formal Observations Used in the Evaluation Process

My supervisor used the following for formal observations. (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals Who Have Been Observed N=122	% of Other School-Based Administrators Who Have Been Observed N=82	% of Central Services Administrators Who Have Been Observed N=94
Staff meetings	55.7	67.1	54.3
Student meetings	18.0	48.8	8.5
Special education meetings	17.2	36.6	17.0
Parent/community meetings	49.2	61.0	25.5
School Improvement Team meetings	54.9	50.0	17.0
Instructional Leadership Council meetings	41.0	52.4	13.8
Staff evaluation conferences	9.8	28.0	10.6
Parent conferences	9.0	37.8	8.5
Supervisory school visits	67.2	9.8	10.6
Strategic planning meetings	17.2	22.0	17.0
Leadership meetings	42.6	53.7	41.5
Interactions with stakeholders/clients/customers	28.7	52.4	38.3
Professional development trainings/presentations	15.6	31.7	33.0
Formal observations in other settings	6.6	8.5	9.6

Table A14 in the appendix includes comments from survey respondents about their experiences with the evaluation process and observations.

In addition to the required observations, supervisors collect, analyze, and discuss with administrators a variety of other data associated with the evaluation process. The information presented in Table 11 shows the data sources reported by principals, other school-based administrators, and central services administrators as part of their evaluations. The majority of respondents (69% of principals, 58% of other school-based administrators, and 62% of central services administrators) indicated that formal observations were used as part of their evaluations. Among principals, School Improvement Plan (SIP) process (57%), state and local student assessment data (43%), and surveys of staff, parents, students, or other stakeholders (37%) were the next most cited types of formal observations. Other school-based administrators specified their PDP (53%), their portfolio (44%), and SIP process (44%) as the next most common data source used for their evaluations. For central services administrators, the most cited data source after formal observations were their portfolio (45%), office or program performance measures (28%), and their PDP (25%) (Table 11).

Table 11
Data Sources Used in the Evaluation Process

My supervisor used the following data sources as part of my evaluation. (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals Who Have Been Evaluated N=122	% of Other School-Based Administrators Who Have Been Evaluated N=85*	% of Central Services Administrators Who Have Been Evaluated N=95*
Formal observations	68.9	57.6	62.1
School Improvement Plan process	57.4	43.5	14.7
Office strategic plan	11.5	2.4	21.1
Quarterly SIP summaries	18.0	10.6	5.3
My PDP	34.4	52.9	25.3
Office or program performance measures	18.9	14.1	28.4
State and local student assessment data	42.6	18.8	9.5
Staff profile	23.0	8.2	8.4
State and local compliance requirements	11.5	8.2	11.6
Surveys of staff, parents, students, or other stakeholders	36.9	36.5	18.9
My portfolio	54.1	43.5	45.3
Use of systemwide data pertinent to my school or office	35.2	16.5	20.0
Other data sources (see Table A15 in the Appendix)	8.2	7.1	7.4

* Some administrators who indicated that they have been evaluated did not answer this question.

Table A15 in the appendix includes comments from survey respondents about additional data sources used in their evaluations.

Impact of the A&S PGS on Communication About Professional Growth

A goal for the A&S PGS is to encourage conversations about professional growth. The evaluation process, specifically, includes post-observation conferences and meetings to discuss professional goals and progress. Focus-group respondents pointed out that the A&S PGS provides a helpful framework for discussing evaluation and performance issues. More than half of the principals (62%), other school-based administrators (60%), and central services administrators (59%) responding to the survey indicated their perception that the process provides a framework for conversations about professional growth (Table 12). Additionally, approximately half of survey respondents (51% each of principals and other school-based administrators, and 47% of central services administrators) agreed that the process encourages reflective conversations among employees and their supervisors.

During the focus groups, many respondents indicated that the complexity of the A&S PGS inhibited the extent of communication among evaluators and evaluatees. The time required for supervisors to conduct and write up observations and evaluation reports hindered the in-depth

communication the implementation was designed to facilitate. However, only less than one fourth of survey respondents (24% of principals, 15% of other school-based administrators, and 21% of central services administrators) agreed that there is not enough time in the process for in-depth conversations (Table 12).

More than one third of principals (36%) indicated that the post-observation conference encourages reflective conversations, but fewer felt the same about the portfolio (20%) or the PDP (18%). Approximately one third of other school-based administrators agreed that the PDP (37%), post-observation conference (32%), and portfolio (30%) encourage reflective conversations. Similarly, nearly one third of central services administrators specified the post-observation conference (30%) as encouraging reflective communication, while fewer agreed that the portfolio (25%) or PDP (14%) did so. Only about 10% each (9% of principals, 10% each of other school-based and central services administrators) indicated their opinion that the A&S PGS has had no impact on communication (Table 12).

Table 12
Survey Respondents' Agreement With Statements About the Impact of the A&S PGS on
Communication Between Employees and Supervisors

In which of the following ways do you think the A&S PGS has impacted communication between A&S employees and supervisors? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
The process provides a framework for conversations about performance and professional growth.	62.3	60.4	58.6
The process encourages reflective conversations among supervisors and employees.	50.7	50.9	47.4
There is not enough time in the process for in-depth conversations.	23.9	15.1	20.7
The portfolio encourages reflective communication.	19.6	30.2	25.0
The PDP encourages reflective communication.	18.1	36.8	13.8
The post-observation conferences encourage reflective communication.	35.5	32.1	30.2
The A&S PGS has had no impact on communication.	9.4	10.4	10.3
Other	5.1	1.0	8.6

Leadership Standards

Focus group and survey respondents (see Table 13) indicated a thorough understanding of each of the six leadership standards. Many indicated, however, that Standard VI *("...understands, responds to, and influences the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context")* was the most difficult for them to master. This was especially true for APs who have come from classroom teacher positions and lack awareness of the big picture in which MCPS or a particular community operates. An illustrative comment from a principal in a focus group was, "Principals have more opportunity to get out into the community than APs do." They felt Standard VI could only be developed through exposure to the community in which they work, and not through training.

The survey data supports the perception of the focus group respondents. Responding principals most frequently cited Standard VI as an area where they needed additional PD (36%), followed by Standard III, which was indicated by 15% as needing additional PD. Less than 10% of principals cited any of the other standards as needing more PD (Table 13). Less than 4% of principals indicated "I don't know" for any of the standards.

Table 13
Percentage of Principals Who Feel Well Prepared or Need Professional Development (PD) to Meet the Leadership Standards (*N*=138)

The principal is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she—	I'm well prepared	I need more PD	I don't know
I. facilitates the development, articulation, and stewardship of a vision of teaching and learning that is shared and supported by the school community.	89.9	8.0	2.2
II. nurtures and sustains a school culture of professional growth, high expectations, and an instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	88.4	8.7	2.9
III. ensures the management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	82.6	15.2	2.2
IV. collaborates with the school staff and other stakeholder groups including students, families, and community members.	89.1	7.2	3.6
V. models professionalism and professional growth in a culture of continuous improvement.	96.4	1.4	2.2
VI. understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, socioeconomic, legal, and cultural context.	62.3	35.5	2.2

Standard VI also was cited most frequently by other school-based administrators (48% of respondents) as needing additional PD, followed by Standard I (22%). Each of the other standards was indicated as needing more PD by less than 20% of other school-based respondents (Table 14). Less than 5% of other school-based administrators indicated "I don't know" for any of the standards.

Table 14

Percentage of Other School-Based Administrators Who Feel Well Prepared or Need Professional Development (PD) to Meet the Leadership Standards (*N*=106)

The assistant principal, student support specialist, and coordinator of a school-based program is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she—	I'm well prepared	I need more PD	I don't know
I. assists in facilitating the development, articulation, implementation and stewardship of a vision of teaching and learning shared and supported by the school community.	73.6	21.7	4.7
II. nurtures and sustains a school culture of high expectations, professional growth, and an instructional program conducive to student learning.	84.0	14.2	1.9
III. shares the responsibility for the management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	82.1	13.2	4.7
IV. collaborates with the school staff and other stakeholder groups including students, families, and community members.	79.2	17.9	2.8
V. models professionalism and professional growth in a culture of continuous improvement.	89.6	5.7	4.7
VI. understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, socioeconomic, legal, and cultural context.	48.1	48.1	3.8

Similarly, central services administrators most frequently indicated Standard VI as needing more PD (32%), followed by Standard III (23%) and Standard I (22%) (Table15). The remaining standards (II, IV, and V) were cited as needing additional PD ranging from 8% to 19% of respondents. Additionally, the range of "I don't know" responses from central services administrators was from 14% to 17%, which is an indication that some of the central services administrators lacked familiarity with some of the standards.

Table 15

Percentage of Central Services Administrators Who Feel Well Prepared or
Need Professional Development (PD) to Meet the Leadership Standards (*N*=116)

The central services administrator is a leader in the organization who promotes success for all students as he/she—	I'm well prepared	I need more PD	I don't know
I. facilitates and supports the development, articulation, and implementation of the school system's strategic plan.	63.8	22.4	13.8
II. creates and sustains a culture of professional growth and high expectations to support the school system's strategic plan.	66.4	19.0	14.7
III. ensures the effective and efficient management of his/her office or program.	60.3	23.3	16.3
IV. collaborates with stakeholder groups including students, staff, families, community members, business partners, and community agencies.	65.5	19.0	15.6
V. models professionalism and professional growth to create a positive work environment.	78.4	7.8	13.8
VI. understands, responds to, and influences the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts of the school system.	50.9	31.9	17.3

Perceived Strengths and Weaknesses of the A&S PGS

Survey respondents indicated from a list those issues they perceived to be strengths and weaknesses of the A&S PGS. Each of the groups most frequently cited the A&S PGS as a consistent and formalized framework for discussions with administrators as a strength (73% of principals, 69% of other school-based administrators, and 55% of central services administrators) (Table 16). More than half of the principals (51%) and other school-based administrators (57%), but less than half of the central services administrators (41%) indicated opportunities for professional growth as a strength of the A&S PGS. No more than half of any group cited other strengths of the A&S PGS. In their additional comments (Table A16 in the appendix) several respondents indicated that the adherence to standards is an important factor in the A&S PGS, but questioned the consistency of that adherence.

Table 16
Survey Respondents' Perceived Strengths of the A&S PGS

Which of the following do you consider to be strengths of the A&S PGS? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
The A&S PGS provides a consistent and formalized framework for discussions with administrators.	73.2	68.9	55.2
The A&S PGS is an effective system for dealing with under-performing administrators.	35.5	41.5	33.6
The A&S PGS provides good supports to improve performance.	42.8	43.4	37.9
The A&S PGS provides opportunities for professional growth.	50.7	56.6	41.4
The A&S PGS puts me in charge of my own growth.	36.2	48.1	34.5
The A&S PGS is a comprehensive process of professional growth – not just evaluation.	40.6	47.2	44.8
Other (please specify)	2.2	3.8	2.6

Approximately half of responding principals (51%) and more than one third of other school-based administrators (35%) and central services administrators (40%) indicated that the belief that the A&S PGS is only an evaluation system is a weakness (Table 17). Nearly half of principals (43%) and other school-based administrators (48%) agreed that the fact that APs and interns are not matched with principals who are effective trainers is a weakness of the A&S PGS. Nearly one third of principals (29%), other school-based administrators (28%) and central services administrators (29%) agreed that the A&S PGS takes too much time to implement. Of those respondents who provided additional comments (Table A17 in the appendix) several mentioned examples of inconsistent implementation of the A&S PGS as a weakness.

Table 17
Survey Respondents' Perceived Weaknesses of the A&S PGS

Which of the following do you consider to be strengths of the A&S PGS? (Check all that apply.)	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
The A&S PGS structure is geared more toward underperforming administrators.	3.6	9.4	10.3
The A&S PGS lacks a mentoring component.	20.3	21.7	29.3
The A&S PGS takes too much time to implement.	29.0	28.3	32.8
APs/interns are not always matched with principals who are effective trainers.	42.8	48.1	NA
MCPS has not made the A&S PGS a high priority.	8.0	10.4	18.1
People believe the A&S PGS is only an evaluation system.	51.4	34.9	39.7
Other	4.3	2.8	6.0

NA: Not applicable to this group of respondents.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings from the multiple data collection activities and are organized by the evaluation questions.

Do A&S employees understand the components of the PGS?

Across all groups, A&S employees are most familiar with the evaluation and professional development components. They are least familiar with the attracting and recruiting components, which have not yet been implemented extensively. The mentoring and recognition components received relatively low marks for familiarity by all groups, which is expected considering that those components are in the preliminary phases of implementation. Additionally, the majority of respondents in each group indicated an understanding of how they would be evaluated using the A&S PGS, as well as the requirements during their professional growth years.

To what extent and with what quality has the A&S PGS been implemented as intended?

Training for the A&S PGS

The majority of respondents from each group who attended various trainings for the A&S PGS found them helpful. They were most positive about the presentations at A&S meetings regarding the A&S PGS and the evaluation training. The trainings on portfolios and PDPs were less positively received by all groups of respondents, most notably principals. From the current data, the reasons for any dissatisfaction are not discernable. Evaluation data from individual training sessions (if available) would be helpful in determining what was lacking for participants.

The majority of administrators reported the training they attended to be helpful. However, attendance rates could be improved. Of the training activities listed on the survey, portfolio training was attended by less than half of all respondents. Additionally, PDP training was attended by approximately half of all respondents.

Professional Development and the PDP

The data on professional development indicate that this component was implemented inconsistently across groups. PD activities are more relevant for school-based than for central services administrators. Of the 20 PD activities listed as choices on the survey, 10 were attended by at least 50% of the principals, 9 by at least 50% of the other school-based administrators, and only 5 by at least 50% of the central services administrators. Although attendance may be low for some of the PD components, nearly every example of PD was rated as helpful by a majority of respondents who attended. Only the online learning modules for leadership standards were considered not helpful by more than half of the participants.

Findings reveal that the PDP component has not yet been implemented as intended. Focus-group and survey respondents indicated questionable utility of the PDP. Some indicated that they

received limited feedback about their PDPs and, therefore, questioned the priority placed on the process. Others perceived that their PDP was not a reflection of their own professional goals.

Consulting Principals and Consultants

While the CP component appears well implemented for school-based administrators, the experiences and awareness of central services administrators is less consistent. Principals and other school-based administrators can receive CP services either as novice administrators or because of underperformance. The vast majority of school-based administrators met standard after having a CP in their novice year. Central services administrators only receive consultant services for underperformance. Due to the different nature and context of receiving services as a novice or because of underperformance, it is possible that the experiences of central services administrators are very different from those of novice school-based administrators. Comments from school-based administrators about their experiences with a CP were overwhelmingly positive. Most of the comments from central services administrators indicated a lack of knowledge that consultant services are available for them.

Methods of Recognition

Recognition appears inconsistent, varied across groups of administrators, and dependent on individual supervisors. Very few administrators perceive that MCPS provides appropriate recognition to its employees, and more than half consider recognition to be inconsistent. Comments indicate perceptions of favoritism among certain groups of administrators, or forms of recognition that are not meaningful to recipients.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process is well understood by school-based and central services administrators, but there are still instances of inconsistent implementation. Survey findings and analysis of data from OHR indicate that some supervisors are not fulfilling the requirements for evaluation years, such as conducting the required number of meetings and observations and post-observation conferences, as well as completing the evaluation write-up on time.

Leadership Standards

For all groups of A&S employees, Standard VI presents the greatest challenge. Principals and APs indicated in the focus groups that this standard is one that can only be mastered through experience, rather than direct training. Some administrative positions present more opportunities than others to interact with their communities. Only 60% of principals and approximately half of other school-based administrators and central services administrators indicated on the survey that they are well prepared to meet Standard VI. Half or less of any group of administrators who participated in the online learning modules for the leadership standards found them helpful. Therefore, another approach to developing understanding about the standards (especially Standard VI) should be considered.

What impact has the A&S PGS had on communication about the professional growth of A&S staff?

One area of impact that the evaluation sought to determine was in the level of communication between administrators and their supervisors about professional growth issues. Approximately half of the respondents agreed that the A&S PGS encourages reflective conversations, while relatively few indicated their perception that the A&S PGS does not impact communication among administrators and their supervisors. Additionally, many expressed their opinion that the A&S PGS provides a framework for conversations about professional growth issues, but it is critical for that framework to be implemented consistently in order for it to be effective.

Recommendations

What changes should be made to improve the clarity, implementation, and outcomes of the A&S PGS?

- Review individual training sessions on developing portfolios and PDPs. While the majority of respondents who participated in these training sessions rated them positively, they were consistently rated behind other training about the A&S PGS. Additionally, the training sessions on developing portfolios and PDPs were the least attended by survey respondents. Improved attendance may help to facilitate implementation of PDPs and portfolios.

- Conduct or review evaluations of online learning modules for leadership standards to determine what aspects are not helpful to administrators and what refinements could improve their utility.

- Provide differentiated professional development activities to meet the needs of central services administrators. Also, determine what professional development activities have been created and delivered within central services offices. It is possible that activities in one office would be appropriate for other offices, potentially creating a "catalog" of central services PD opportunities.

- Continue to provide consistent information about the expectations for the process and outcomes of the PDP process. Consider auditing a sample of PDPs from school-based and central services administrators to determine areas in which implementation may be inconsistent.

- Consider providing consultant services to central services administrators for purposes other than underperformance. An option might be to provide a consultant when a school-based administrator moves to a central services position or changes to a new central services position, or at the request of a central services administrator.

- Develop a system of recognition with input from school-based and central services administrators. A system might include parameters for the types of accomplishments that would be recognized, and meaningful forms of recognition indicated by administrators.

- Develop opportunities for administrators to increase mastery of Standard VI. For example, consider providing forums for administrators to discuss and investigate the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts of their communities and the school system as a whole.

- Monitor and support administrators who are not fulfilling the requirements of the evaluation process, such as conducting the required number of meetings, observations, and post-observation conferences, as well as the timely completion of evaluation reports.

- Disaggregate the OHR data regarding timely completion of evaluations to determine which groups of administrators need additional support in conducting or writing evaluation reports.

References

Davis, S.H., and Hensley, P.A. (1999). The politics of principal evaluation. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 29*(1), 22–26.

Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V.J., and Graham, W.F. (1989), Toward a Conceptual Framework for Mixed Method Evaluation Design. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11*(3), 255–274.

Lashway, L. (2003). Improving principal evaluation. *ERIC Digest*, ED482347.

Montgomery County Public Schools. (2005). *Administrative and Supervisory Professional Growth System Handbook 2005–2006*. Rockville, MD: Author.

Russo, A. (2004). Evaluating administrators with portfolios. *School Administrator, 61*(9), 34–38.

The Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs*, 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case study research design and methods*, 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

THIS PAGE WAS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

Appendix

Table A1
Leadership Standards for Administrators

Principals' Leadership Standards	Other School-Based Administrators' Leadership Standards	Central Services Administrators' Leadership Standards
Standard I: The principal is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she facilitates the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of teaching and learning that is shared and supported by the school community.	Standard I: Each assistant principal, student support specialist, and coordinator of a school-based program is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she assists in facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of teaching and learning shared and supported by the school community.	Standard I: The central services administrator is a leader in the organization who promotes success for all students as he/she facilitates and supports the development, articulation, and implementation of the school system's strategic plan.
Standard II: The principal is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she nurtures and sustains a school culture of professional growth, high expectations, and an instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	Standard II: Each assistant principal, student support specialist, and coordinator of a school-based program is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she nurtures and sustains a school culture of high expectations, professional growth, and an instructional program conducive to student learning.	Standard II: The central services administrator is a leader in the organization who promotes success for all students as he/she creates and sustains a culture of professional growth and high expectations to support the school system's strategic plan.
Standard III: The principal is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she ensures the management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	Standard III: Each assistant principal, student support specialist, and coordinator of a school-based program is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she shares the responsibility for the management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	Standard III: The central services administrator is a leader in the organization who promotes success for all students as he/she ensures the effective and efficient management of his/her office or program.
Standard IV: The principal is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she collaborates with the school staff and other stakeholder groups including students, families, and community members.	Standard IV: Each assistant principal, student support specialist, and coordinator of a school-based program is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she collaborates with the school staff and other stakeholder groups including students, families, and community members.	Standard IV: The central services administrator is a leader in the organization who promotes success for all students as he/she collaborates with stakeholder groups including students, staff, families, community members, business partners, and community agencies.

(Continued)

Table A1 (Continued)

Principals' Leadership Standards	Other School-Based Administrators' Leadership Standards	Central Services Administrators' Leadership Standards
Standard V: The principal is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she models professionalism and professional growth in a culture of continuous improvement.	Standard V: Each assistant principal, student support specialist, and coordinator of a school-based program is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she models professionalism and professional growth in a culture of continuous improvement.	Standard V: The central services administrator is a leader in the organization who promotes success for all students as he/she models professionalism and professional growth to create a positive work environment.
Standard VI: The principal is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she understands, responds to, and influences the larger political social, socioeconomic, legal, and cultural context.	Standard VI: Each assistant principal, student support specialist, and coordinator of a school-based program is an educational leader who promotes success for all students as he/she understands, responds to, and influences the larger political, social, economic, legal and cultural context.	Standard VI: The central services administrator is a leader in the organization who promotes success for all students as he/she understands, responds to, and influences the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts of the school system.

Table A2
Survey Respondents' Number of Years in an A&S Position in MCPS

Number of Years	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
First year	2.2	3.8	6.0
2 to 5 years	34.8	60.4	48.3
6 to 10 years	31.2	27.4	25.0
More than 10 years	30.4	8.5	20.7

Table A3
% of Survey Respondents That Were MCPS Administrators
Prior to the Implementation of the A&S PGS (2003–2004 School Year)

% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
72.5	35.8	59.5

Table A4
% of Survey Respondents That Supervise Other Administrators

% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
63.0	8.5	31.9

Table A5
Survey Respondents' Familiarity With the Components of the A&S PGS

Components	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
Professional Development			
Very familiar	60.2	65.1	44.8
Somewhat familiar	37.3	33.0	47.4
Not familiar	2.2	1.9	7.8
Mentoring			
Very familiar	41.3	35.8	21.7
Somewhat familiar	47.8	53.8	53.9
Not familiar	10.1	10.4	24.3
Recognition			
Very familiar	26.1	19.0	15.5
Somewhat familiar	54.3	52.3	47.4
Not familiar	19.6	28.6	37.1
Evaluation			
Very familiar	84.8	67.0	64.3
Somewhat familiar	13.8	30.2	30.4
Not familiar	1.4	2.8	5.2
Attracting*			
Very familiar	25.4	15.1	16.4
Somewhat familiar	43.5	53.8	46.6
Not familiar	31.2	31.1	37.1
Recruiting*			
Very familiar	23.2	15.2	16.4
Somewhat familiar	47.8	57.1	47.4
Not familiar	29.0	27.6	36.2

* Components are not yet implemented.

Table A6
Survey Respondents' Perceived Importance of the Components of the A&S PGS

Components	% of Principals N=138	% of Other School-Based Administrators N=106	% of Central Services Administrators N=116
Professional Development			
Very important	91.2	96.2	88.4
Somewhat important	8.8	2.9	11.6
Not important	0.0	1.0	0.0
Mentoring			
Very important	83.8	81.2	80.2
Somewhat important	14.7	17.8	18.0
Not important	1.5	1.0	1.8
Recognition			
Very important	69.9	72.3	72.7
Somewhat important	27.8	25.7	26.4
Not important	2.3	2.0	0.9
Evaluation			
Very important	91.2	86.4	86.6
Somewhat important	8.8	12.6	13.4
Not important	0.0	1.0	0.0
Attracting*			
Very important	57.8	52.0	57.8
Somewhat important	37.0	41.0	35.8
Not important	5.1	7.0	6.4
Recruiting*			
Very important	72.8	67.6	66.4
Somewhat important	22.2	28.4	29.1
Not important	5.1	3.9	4.5

* Components are not yet implemented.

Table A7
Survey Respondents' Other Comments on Training About the A&S PGS

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Writing seminar - excellent	MDSE Evaluation Training that was helpful.	Orientation session for new A&S staff at CESC.
Adaptive Leadership Critical Thinking Institutional Racism Noguero's & Freidman's Presentations	I have received much information through MCAASP and conferences. These are only breakout sessions and not real training sessions.	Training provided by Bob Bastress and Peg Donnellon
Member of PAR 7 years. Valuable insight re the PGS!!	I Have found the SSS (ASA) training very helpful and useful in helping me complete my task.	New Administrator Orientation with David Steinberg.
Facilitative leadership, Shared leadership training,	Finances SSPG PAR review process	Individual training regarding writing evaluation reports
having recently gone through AP1,2,intern, I feel like we got plenty of training on the PGS	All of the trainings AP 1's participate in are very helpful with the transition to administration.	As a first year administrator was on the workgroup that worked with Bob Bastress to develop the central services administrator standards
PBIS Grant Writing, Data Driven Decision Making FMS Encore Curriculum	I have participated in OAT I and II as well as Master Scheduling Training.	Customized sessions for my department OAT 1 and 2 were very helpful in establishing a foundation. Need similar sessions for A&S, especially central office.
review of policy as it was being developed at various meetings. I got confused and felt like it was not an effective process.	AP training and facilitative leadership	MCAASP Conference
New administrator training (assistant principal / principal) Financial & Budget - although more would be helpful Observation Tool for laptops - not perfected when I took class	master schedule	MCAASP training for PAR presentations -Facilitative Leadership -ASP3 -Data-Driven Decision-Making
Writing evaluations and observations Data Driven Analysis	Outlook Filemaker Achievement Series MapR Testing	was not aware that there were trainings on this for central service administrators
ASA Seminars (2 meetings to date)	SSS AP	Additional training within our office leadership team
Data Driven Course with Bob Bastress is a must for every principal.	Underperforming teachers - Ray Frappoli	Training tailored specifically to our leadership team's needs
Training for APs with Michael Kline	SSS Training AP1 Training AP2 Training	
With Jon Safir when the A&S PGS system was being piloted; on the review panel so my experience is very different than most of my peers.	HSA, PSAT, MAP-R,SDT Conference, MOU	

(Continued)

Table A7 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Facilitative Leadership Evaluation/supervision of supporting services	As a 2nd year administrator I have not been offered this training other than long drawn out ASA meetings.	
Lenses on Learning	Graduate course work including presentations and seminar assignments for A&S. Meetings with various leaders in a variety of fields, to discuss principles of A&S standards. Research on A&S standards and intention of standards.	
The modules are not useful for a practicing administrator. For the most part the training is "generic" not individualized. It is assumed everyone needs the prescription. There are people nationally known who are quality trainers, please not on race, but on components important to administration. MCPS always puts their own spin on things, rather than put themselves in the role as a "learner". THEY MISUNDERSTAND THE CONCEPT OF TRAINING. TRAINING IS NOT TALKING ALONE!!!!!	AP 1 & AP2 seminars are not as helpful as they could be.	
My involvement in LDAC has helped me become knowledgeable about A and S PGS. Presentations at A and S meetings have also been helpful.	Facilitative Leadership	
Sessions for API and APII trainers. Discussions in LDAC meetings.	AP1 and AP2 Facilitative Leadership	
Online professional development classes offered.	The SSS meetings for last year were lengthy and for the most part a waste of my time.	
	Evaluation of Supporting Services Special Education Process	
	Facilitative Leadership Equity in the Classroom	
	Facilitative leadership	
	Security Training Tech Mod OATs I & II PAR Program/Supporting Staff	

Table A8
Survey Respondents' Perceptions of Helpfulness of
Professional Development (PD) Activities

PD Activities[a]	Principals N=138			Other School-Based Administrators N=106			Central Services Administrators N=116		
	% Attended	N Attended	% Helpful[b]	% Attended	N Attended	% Helpful[b]	% Attended	N Attended	% Helpful[b]
PD During A&S Meetings	96.4	133	88.7	56.6	60	95.0	81.0	94	89.4
Professional Conferences	78.3	108	99.1	72.6	77	93.5	65.5	76	97.4
Elementary AP1 Training	33.3	46	95.7	20.8	22	95.5	9.5	11	81.8
Elementary AP2 Training	30.4	42	92.9	13.2	14	100.0	NA	NA	NA
Secondary AP1 Training	21.7	30	86.7	50.9	54	92.6	11.2	13	100.0
Secondary AP2 Training	21.0	29	86.2	41.5	44	86.4	10.3	12	100.0
Secondary ASP3/Intern Training	12.3	17	100.0	10.4	11	81.8	NA	NA	NA
Elementary Intern Training	44.2	61	91.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
New Principal Training	54.3	75	81.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Student Support Specialist Training	NA	NA	NA	34.0	36	86.1	NA	NA	NA
School Leadership Team Institute (SLTI)	31.9	44	95.5	30.2	32	93.8	NA	NA	NA
Professional Learning Community Institute (PLCI)	25.4	35	88.6	24.5	26	88.5	18.1	21	95.2
Baldrige Training	92.0	127	89.0	75.5	80	91.3	75.9	88	92.0
Data-Driven Decision-Making Course	87.0	120	88.3	37.7	40	92.5	30.2	35	91.4
Office of Information and Organizational Systems (OIOS) Technology Training	74.6	103	82.5	37.7	40	95.0	37.9	44	93.2
Diversity and Equity Training	84.8	117	94.0	74.5	79	89.9	65.5	76	93.4

(Continued)

Table A8 (Continued)

PD Activities[a]	Principals N=138			Other School-Based Administrators N=106			Central Services Administrators N=116		
	% Attended	N Attended	% Helpful[b]	% Attended	N Attended	% Helpful[b]	% Attended	N Attended	% Helpful[b]
On-line Learning Modules for Leadership Standards	47.1	65	43.1	50.0	53	47.2	26.7	31	51.6
Observing and Analyzing Teaching 1 (OAT1)	90.1	125	96.0	95.3	101	96.0	64.7	75	90.7
Observing and Analyzing Teaching 2 (OAT2)	89.1	123	96.7	95.3	101	98.0	41.4	48	95.8
Curriculum Update Meetings	92.0	127	88.2	50.9	54	87.0	41.4	48	87.5

1 [a] Since July 1, 2003

[b] Percent of attendees who found the PD activities helpful. The remaining attendees did not find the PD activities helpful. NA: Data are not reported for activities attended by 10 or fewer respondents, because it would be misleading to report the percentages for such a low number. Some of the listed activities are not applicable to all groups of respondents.

Table A9
Survey Respondents' Other Comments About
Other Professional Development They Have Attended

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Lenses On Learning (10 comments)	Literacy training received at the National Academies Conference in Washington DC. Literacy workshops at the NASSP, 2006 OASIS Training/SASI Training	Conferences - ASCD, NAESP MCASSP Annual Fall Conference
Conferences and training provided by A&S professional organizations (ASBA, AERA, NASSP)	Encore Line Special Education Training	Johns Hopkins classes Department/Office training
Breakthrough Coaching (3 comments)	Facilitative Leadership	Course work through Hood College as part of gaining A & S certification.
Adaptive Leadership	Fred Jones, PBIS	I have participated in many trainings presented by MSDE that were related to the program I supervise.
National conferences regarding technology, leadership and therapeutic interventions regarding student achievement and organizing for success of all students.	Attended the PAR training sponsored by the A & S union Attended the state AP conference	There is very little professional development offered to central office A&S other than A&S meetings.
My own reading, research networking.	AP1, AP2, Intern seminars/training were relevant and timely.	compliance training, time management
The Effective Leadership Team The MCAASP fall conference ESAA summer conference, etc.	Shadowing of principals Culturally Competent Schools	Outside professional courses in project management
non-MCPS conferences (ASCD) Special Education workshops Peer observations- very helpful!	Facilitative Leadership Training	Facilitative Leadership
Maryland Principals' Academy	HSA meetings with cohort.	My own professional association meetings
Many conferences outside MCPS; participated and have been a presenter; AFG training and visits	How to prepare a folder for the PAR process for professional staff	SEPA Program Training - Summer 2007
presented at conferences	Emergency Crisis Preparedness	Adaptive leadership Training
Attending conferences through MCAASP funding has been the most valuable professional development experiences in MCPS. OAT was great with the developers from Research for Better Schools. The state meetings on MSA or MSPAP were very good. CEASOM to a certain extent...	PTSA, Quad Cluster meetings, NAACP meetings and community sponsored activities.	Meetings with Department Leadership Teams

(Continued)

Table A9 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Spanish course for Administrators	Participation on MCPS committees were helpful in broadening the big picture on how things are done. Master scheduling training, on the other hand, is not helpful if the goal is to have participants master the content.	Performance matters, MAP-R data usage
Action Research for Equitable Practice	Graduate classes in Educational Leadership	National Conferences Local Conferences
Conferences at the state level and national level have been helpful. I especially appreciate the opportunity to occasionally receive reimbursement from MCAASP travel funds.	Facilitative Leadership	Facilitative Leadership
Cluster Meetings / Presentations Conferences	Regular magnet coordinator meetings at which legal and policy issues have been discussed. Rigorous instruction training PBIS Training	Training specific to my area of work.
National Conferences - technology, PLCs, transitions (ms to hs and hs to college)	data warehouse	Sessions customized for my department.
		MSDE AP training seminar
		Facilitative Leadership
		Training on technology-related issues outside MCPS that I need for my position.
		I was not aware that there were any trainings for central services administrators on the above questions so therefore I did not participate in any of them. I would have if I had known about them.
		Professional growth opportunities that I have sought out for myself and paid for out of pocket.
		I don't attend many A&S meetings these days because it is school focused only. There isn't much to offer an "O" level supervisor in CESC.
		outside conferences
		Facilitative Leadership
		Non-conference meetings with like professionals.
		Rigor through Relevancy Conference
		Developing a PDP and portfolio

Table A10
Survey Respondents' Other Comments About Professional Development

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Is it possible to ask school based principals what kind of training they want rather than telling us what you think we need?	As a veteran assistant principal, there is no professional development, workshops, discussions of important information for APs. All of the training is concentrated on AP1, AP2, AP3, and SSS. As an AP, I get to watch the A&S meetings on a video clip.	Administrative training for Infants and Toddlers Administrators who have the same responsibilities as principal but not the same status.
Continue with impact of race on achievement. Continue with Baldrige opportunities	The on-line modules are a useful training piece for those in their AP1 and AP2 years. This would have been a good preparation for the Administrator's written exam. But having to do this after passing that exam and having served as an administrator for many	I am struck by the range of options available to school based administrators to build their skills as leaders. Few are made available to central service administrators and many are supported by those same administrators.
Data-driven Course ---- Send feedback to participants about final project and get notebooks out in a timely manner. More strategies on starting initiatives in the building about diversity.	It is hard for AP's to get out of the building to participate beyond the AP1 and AP2 training.	We need to treat central service administrators the same as principals and directors. supervisors get left out of leadership meetings and communications
1.Coaching and advising principals on the applications processes to such institutes as the Washington Post Principals Leadership Institute, Middle States, Fulbright, etc. 2. Grant Writing 3. Externships with US Dept of Ed., committee work on educational legislation (eg. NCLB) 4. R&D activities for presentations at national and state conferences and symposiums.	I have had great difficulty finding the on-line modules (Leadership Standards)on PDO so I can register and participate in this training. Even following the written directions did not help locate the courses.	All of the trainings that I attended regarding PGS was directed to school staff. I also attended a training for A&S that focused on the SEIU PAR process and that too was directed only at principals - I was the sole CESC person in a room of 15 people. I don't believe there is much out there for us.
Professional development needs to be scheduled flexibly so I can have the option to attend without having to be out of my building.	Opportunities for assistant principals to meet	Strategies for "most often selected" professional development plan areas/topics
The principal training on the FMS has not been effective thus far.	Assistant principals need the opportunity to continue their development beyond AP1, AP2 & AP3 years. There is too much tendency not to allow them to leave the building for training.	

(Continued)

Table A10 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
I think it is important that we design training opportunities for administrators in the same way staff development teachers receive training. I think there should be a variety of offerings from administrators around the area, and throughout the country. The fall conference should have a component where principal's and AP's can present strategies that they are using and found to be effective.	Additional training on "breaking news" in proposed policy and regulations changes.	
Use of technology training needs to be more focused..	We need differentiated training for magnet COORDINATORS!	
PD training beyond what is offered at A&S should be voluntary, not mandatory.	Pulled from the school too often for trainings	
More practical experiences, especially for AP1's, AP2's and ASA's. The expertise of successful A&S personnel is rarely tapped and the training is strictly theoretical. Veteran principals are rarely called on to share their expertise; we are missing an opportunity to tap some of our most valuable resources.		
Professional development should be based on a needs assessment as well as the identified needs of the school you are leading. The system should get off politics and focus on instruction.		
Principal training separate from central office and conducted by higher level officials than OOD staff.		

Table A11
Survey Respondents' Other Comments About Professional Development Plans

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
The PDP seems like a professional exercise and something to "complete". It is not a helpful tool, especially for those of us who were in the training program or first year principals.	I have done a mental PDP but not a written and it is always around the SIP and AYP. I am never asked for one by the principal. I do many plans for improvement but usually concerning student and school progress	I have a PDP and an active portfolio....my new immediate supervisor (for a year) has never seen or asked about either. My PDP is very useful for meeting a goal, but it is not related to professional development.
My PDP should not be tied to my school's SIP goals for meeting AYP. We are saturated with data, AYP, AP, SATs, you name it we've had it! My professional development should focus on those things that I feel I want to enhance and grow in for my own satisfaction, interest, passions, stimulation, and marketability. Principals are expected to be the instructional leaders in their schools. To do so requires that we stay well informed on the broader areas of and issues in educational research, yet this is the very area we are lacking in knowledge. MCPS does a quasi-good job of providing us with cutting edge research for those initiatives the it is promoting, however, the scope is too narrow. Professional development should not be the "flavor-of-the-day/drive-by training" that some of our A&S meeting sessions seem to dissolve into. Prof. development also takes time, time that most school-based administrators do not have because of the myriad of never-ending managerial and AYP demands.	The PDP process was cumbersome and not self-evident in terms of assisting my professional growth.	Not necessarily connected to my work—used like an "old" strategic plan—sits on the shelf
I was directed to write a PDP in one area I did not choose.	Supervisors shouldn't have as much to say about one's professional development plan. A professional ought to be able to develop in a manner conducive with his interests. The greatest caveat is the development should in turn benefit the work environment.	It was a form to be filled out and never has been looked at again

(Continued)

Table A11 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
The PDP is only helpful to me when I can reflect on my needs and the needs of my students/school. It is not helpful (useless and a waste of my time) when I have to contrive a PDP to meet the demands of my supervisor.	I received very little feedback about my PDP during any of my AP1, AP2, or Intern meetings. It was not an important part of my development team meetings.	I have not received a request to develop a PDP from my supervisor
I completed one PDP 5 or 6 years ago and have not revisited it since.	After AP training there should be some follow up on how to continue to write and work towards a meaningful PDP	This needs a lot of work. Some central service administrators do not know what a PDP is or what it means. Continuous budget cuts on the support side are in direct conflict with professional development in that funds are cut in this area all the time year after year
Who truly has time. If it is not an organic outgrowth of the "job" it is a ridiculous expectation.		I'm not sure that a PDP for central office staff is relevant. I haven't bought in to that yet although I do encourage my SEIU staff members on their PDP. It gives them great insight to their strengths.
I did not find it helpful to complete a PDP as an AP1 and 2.		I must revisit the status of my PDP. I am not sure if I have a fully developed PDP per PGS. I appreciate its value, but it's difficult to circle back to this when work is so pressing.
Our PDP should be directly connected to our school goals. We should be able to articulate specifics about what we are doing to reach our goals but the PDP should not be a separate document unless there were a concern.		Unsure of the necessity of this add on.
PDP has not been as effective as it should be because it is/is not focused differently in all schools. I found out that each school does it very differently. It is perceived as an add-on by school admin. And staff in many schools.		I have drafted my PDP, discussed in our leadership team, but never finalized or implemented – no time, too hard to initiate on my own, no "partnering" to keep me on the straight and narrow
I do not find the PDP process helpful – I am self motivated and take training as I need it. Writing it down doesn't help much.		

(Continued)

Table A11 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
PDP tends to be another "hoop" to jump through at the AP and Intern level. I have had an executive staff member say, "Is that going to be challenging enough for you?" as opposed to recognizing that it is an area of growth that I was seeking. Similar to teacher level, I am not sure PDP should be requested during development/evaluation years. It seems that the entire goal of the leadership program is to provide professional development and the task of writing/implementing a PDP is potentially redundant.		
I have not completed a PDP as a principal yet. However I did as an AP and intern. This year I will be required to complete a PDP.		
My supervisor has not had a conversation with me about my professional development nor was I observed or evaluated in my evaluation year last year.		
My supervisor micromanages my PDP.		
I read many professional journals and seek out and find the training that I need.		

Table A12
Survey Respondents' Other Comments About Consulting Principals and Consultants

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
My CP was very supportive. He balanced supervision with caring. He was awesome.	My principal consultant was undoubtedly the single most valuable part of my AP training. Quite simply, she is worth her weight in gold. It is beyond me why OOD and OSP does not engage her as a consultant more frequently.	I am not aware of who the consulting services administrators are and or how to access their support if needed.
Assignments need to be thoughtful, differentiated and appropriate otherwise meeting with them is just one more person taking time away — in a contrived way- from this huge job...one more person to meet with, adding no value and taking up valuable time.	My Consulting Principal is candidly supportive and appreciated.	I checked needing more information about the review panel in an earlier section, but don't even know if that applies to central service A&S. What is the structure for CS A&S? We also need information on how a consulting administrator is identified and assigned to an administrator not meeting standard. And we need information on that person's role and responsibilities.
My CP was wonderful and invaluable helping me through my Acting Principalship and first year as a principal.	I LOVE my consult. PLEASE keep them. He has saved my life. I would have quit without him. His knowledge and experience are invaluable to me.	Did not know that we have consultants for central office.
I hear very uneven feedback from principals who have had a CT; elementary feedback is more positive than secondary.	My consultant has been outstanding.	I am not aware that there are Central Services consultants.
My CP provides a wealth of knowledge to new administrators. He shares his personal experiences to aid in the development of blooming administrators. He remains a sounding board and go-to-guy for advice about numerous issues and professional development, well beyond the required AP1, and AP2 programs.	I believe it depends on the CP as to the value of the experience. Mine was excellent! However, others in my cohort at the time did not receive the same level of feedback, assistance, or confidentiality/trust. Trust is key, and essential to the learning process.	I did not know a CP for central services administrators existed.
My CP struck a nice balance of being available but not in the way. I received consistent support without being overwhelmed.	A Consultant was provided for me during my first year (05-06 school year). I started off 06-07 with my consultant, but then my new supervisor told me there wasn't money in the program for me to have a consultant.	I am not sure what a Consultant for Central Services admin is, or how I find that person.
My CP was exceptional!		I don't even know who this person is. (but I only supervise supporting services)

Table A13
Survey Respondents' Other Comments About Recognition

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Recognition seems to be given only to favorites. No matter how well your school does, if you are not a favorite, then there is no recognition. There are people who are recognized whose schools do not make AYP but they get recognition any way.	It would be nice to provide teachers with the opportunity to recognize administrators other than the principal.	Particularly at A&S more people need to be recognized. How is it decided who gets recognized for what. There are people who work hard everyday to make a difference in the lives of students who do not win awards, but deserve recognition.
We received three letters last year congratulating our school for meeting MSA — problem is they arrived one in the Fall and two in the Spring (all saying congratulations for the scores from the PREVIOUS year) — that seems contrived.	I am proud of the recognition I receive from my direct supervisor and school-level peers, from the students I work with and their parents, and from the teachers I serve. Sometimes those recognitions are more meaningful because I feel these are heartfelt	The Red Hat recognition shows how out of touch MCPS leadership is.
Depends on who the supervisor is. I have had many over the past few years.	All my supervisor recognizes are my faults and inadequacies. QUOTE: "Let's just concentrate on the things you need to improve on, not the good you have done for the program"	Immediate and specific feedback is best—the hand-written note or email. Formal letters to personnel file and supervisor help. I enjoy the red hats at A&S. Professional growth opportunities are ALWAYS welcome and very infrequent in central office.
Recognition seems to be only for high-flying schools, but what about the schools whose staffs work hard every day and meet the "real" benchmarks of keeping students in school, students passing their courses, being promoted, graduating, securing and maintaining jobs in the community, and those who plow ahead in schools with tremendously high ed loads. The "red hat" club has become meaningless because the recognition seems to extend only to those in some kind of a "members-only" club that is more exclusionary than inclusionary. Having been an administrator for 20+ years I have received only two letters of recognition during my A&S tenure. Thank goodness I get my perks from sources other than MCPS!		Trust and respect are the best forms of recognition.
It seems that the Bulletin's views are limited. There are many wonderful things happening in the county and they are not all recognized.		It seems that only school administrators are recognized for their achievements.

(Continued)

Table A13 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
The same principals seem to win awards and win recognition in MCPS. You'd think we had not other principals worthy of recognition.		Dr. Weast routinely recognizes excellent principals, but it seems that central services A & S staff are recognized far less.
Recognition appears to be inconsistent, political. Red hat recognition is not appreciated – personal and political. There are many, many principals who deserve recognition for their successes and years of commitment and have never received it.		
Recognition seems to only be for underperforming schools and no one else.		
Recognition is nice, but not tremendously important to me. If it is sincere, a smile and a handshake is plenty to keep me going. If it is insincere or generated in bulk so I am an anonymous recipient, it has a negative impact on my morale.		
Many of the same schools and administrators are being recognized over and over when many of our more quiet but very effective administrators are doing a fantastic job.		
It would be nice if a school system this size could give more than a red hat for recognition. Seems like a plaque or certificate would mean more and could be displayed with pride.		
Very difficult to get on the Bulletin.		
I'm not sure what recognition from my supervisor means.		
Asking people to share their expertise is a means of recognition we rarely use. As a system we do a very poor job of making A&S staff feel valued. There are very few atta' boys delivered. (And we need to lose the term, "it's not a gottcha" because it always is.)		
I presented at 2 national conferences representing MCPS. Not only did I pay for both trips- my supervisor did not recognize my accomplishment.		
My most recent supervisor is too worried about her own job to recognize the talents of others.		

(Continued)

Table A13 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
MCPS has never recognized the hard work done by principals. If the school system were a Baldrige System, rather than a top down administration, school administrators and schools would feel supported. Currently and for a number of years, things are thrown at schools to do, when they are already working and have too much on their plate. (New technology doesn't work, the software has not been tested, nor is the training accurate. etc.) Find out what schools need through a diagnosis of student performance (data) and provide the support identified. There are no links between offices and each produces another binder...Integrate and stop the printing machine.		
Recognition through the "red hats" and video highlights help appreciate individual accomplishments & roles you do not see often. It is a good example for principals to follow at the school level with staff.		

Table A14

Survey Respondents' Other Comments About Observations and the Evaluation Process

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Grade 5 walk-through during math. He asked questions. I answered.	My supervisor was very unclear of how he completed my Mid Year Progress report as an AP 1. This is something that I think should be made clear so the expectations and the means of evaluation is expressed.	As an AP1 and AP2 I was not observed by my principal with notes and conference.
Mark Kelsch and Sherry Liebes were hands-on administrators. They observed me in my various roles and took the time to not only critique but encourage me as I grew professionally. They met with my teachers and teams and gained critical insight about our school.	Although I was given a few opportunities for feedback, nothing was formally discussed or put in writing except the mid year and final eval. When I was an intern, I was told 2 days prior to the eval meeting that she was unhappy with my performance.	My former supervisor completed a draft form of my evaluation and asked for me to read it and share any additional information. I am not aware of any formal observations that were conducted. I now have a new supervisor and hope the process will be followed as it is intended.
I have not been informed whether I am in an evaluation year or a PDP year and I have been too busy to ask.	I received feedback and support for formal observations and reflective conversations with teachers and supporting staff.	Meetings were perfunctory, not helpful to professional growth. This is all very time consuming; networking and formal retreats would be better use of time.
My former supervisor never completed my evaluation!	My principal never observed me.	
During the years I have been a principal, I have been evaluated twice, but have never had a formal observation or post observation conference, and have never received a written observation report from my supervisor.	Most of them are based on classroom presentation	
	Many informal observations have been made that have been helpful.	

Table A15
Survey Respondents' Comments About Other Data Sources
Used in the Evaluation Process

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Input from consulting principal	AP1&2 development meetings	Informal observations and my input
My newsletters and other correspondences. My handling of personnel issues.	My supervisor has identified tasks I have completed in each of the standards.	Weekly Items Meeting Agendas
Exemplars, artifacts, and team discussion	Very unclear about what is being used or if my supervisor is comfortable using it.	Interviews
MAp-R scores Pre and Post increase in gains toward making AYP	Information from those I supervise. Informal observation of my work with students and staff and parents.	I have not been evaluated in my current role, but was in a different A&S role. The evaluation used mostly informal observations and conversations.
Supervisory School Visits	PDP was part of my packet, but was not addressed at my Professional Development meetings. Surveys of staff were very complementary. A letter was sent to Dr. Weast on my behalf describing how I made a difference in the school climate.	Day to day observance of my performance.
The supervisor should meet with the administrator to review the portfolio together.	Data for teachers in my departments - grades, # of failures.	Budget processes, project management, management of personnel, hiring processes, interactions with Board and exec staff, interactions/communication with community, legal proceedings, written products--e.g., Board memoranda; records on timeliness and quality of correspondence--initiated by department or in response to public inquiries.
Development team packets	Professional Development Team Meetings	Use of my professional growth experiences
Derogatory anonymous letters	9th grade academy information	She has made use of informal observations - ability to arrive at creative solutions, ability to move staff to better processes, ability to complete tasks in a timely manner.
Discipline and climate survey data.	Commendations from parents.	I wrote it, he signed
Only used informal observations		

Table A16
Survey Respondents' Other Comments About Strengths of the A&S PGS

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
I have not seen all the parts of the PGS implemented. If MCPS were to implement the whole thing, I think it would be comprehensive process.	Although APs are well trained to exhibit all of those qualities specified above there is not enough time in the day to run a building, discipline students, and get into the classes to see that all is go	I am unclear as to what is in place to support underperforming administrators. I need more clarification in this area.
Only if used appropriately and equitably among community superintendent. and directors of performance in OSP. Since the expectations and challenges are different and unique for DCC school principals, the evaluation needs to reflect that difference. I have colleagues in less challenging schools that are not evaluated on half of the expectations for those of us in the DCC.	It is consistent with the ISLIC standards that are the basis of most good university masters and certificate programs these days. "Theory" and "practice" are somewhat consistent.	It is a very lengthy and difficult process to deal with under-performing administrators. I'm not so sure that the amount of time it takes to put together a portfolio and the amount of time that supervisors then look at the portfolio are worth it. I can understand the need for evaluating employees through observation, but I don't agree with asking busy administrators to put together a portfolio for another administrator who is also busy and doesn't have time to look at it. I would recommend not requiring the portfolio.
The PGS focuses professional growth on the standards. I would have checked more of the boxes above if the verb "is" had been replaced with "can be" because I see a lot of potential for good things happening, but I see abuses, too.	You can be well-prepared to carry out each of the standards but you are only able to demonstrate this to the degree your supervisor is comfortable and competent enough to give you room to demonstrate it.	
While I checked all of the boxes that I believe to be true, I also believe that all of the above depends on the fidelity of the implementation. If the supervisor uses the PGS as designed, if the CPs truly are working for their client and if the client trust the people who are supposed to provide the support. The design is great! It's the implementation that will make or break the program.	It is wonderful to have consistent standards, although I do not feel that I was evaluated consistently among the 3 administrators that I have been evaluated by.	
	When used properly the A&S PGS can provide all of the aforementioned qualities.	

Montgomery County Public Schools

Table A17
Survey Respondents' Other Comments About Weaknesses of the A&S PGS

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
As stated previously, it will only be weak, if supervisors do not use it as intended and clients lose trust in it.	On-line modules. Would be great as part of the AP1 and AP2 training program prior to the Administrator's written exam.	Wonderful when followed. Not all principals feel obligated to follow the process with APs.
Executive staff does not necessarily understand the intricacies of the PGS and the importance of having enough time to complete it with fidelity.	My mid year and final evaluations as an AP are a list of accomplishments and tasks for the up coming time period. I would benefit from some feedback on what I have done well and where I have weaknesses.	Central services administrators aren't assigned mentors (if they are, I'm not familiar).
I get a call if there is an irregularity in a teacher evaluation or if one is missing. Does this happen with the CS? I have had no formal observations some years (even when I was being evaluated) and punitive ones others. I have received no feedback on my evaluations of other administrators.	Just because a Principal is a successful Principal does not mean that person is a successful trainer. There needs to be more checkpoints with the principals who are trainers. There need to be more visits to the schools to see how the Principal is training	Because leadership doesn't understand how much work staff is being asked to do and the amount of time it takes to implement the PGS, the PGS can not possibly be implemented effectively.
I had a great AP experience but that was because I had a great principal others in my group did not have the same experience.	My principal was not aware of how he was supposed to evaluated me as an Assistant School Administrators like there is for AP1 and AP2	Employees are not empowered to identify areas for personal professional development.
Too many of the consulting principals for AP's/Interns were ineffective principals and this is causing problems. AP's are not being prepared adequately.	Inconsistent training based on the fact that principals may not be interested in "training" an AP and/or lack training skills.	Evaluations are at times completed in a perfunctory manner. Completed without following the guidelines (no truly formal observations, conference, etc.). Due to time restraints, some (who are meeting standards) write their own evaluations for the supervisors. Supervisors simply sign off on the document to meet deadlines or out of compliance. Defeating the purpose.
Not all supervisors follow the guidelines/requirements of the A&S PGS related to the evaluation of administrators.	The system seems to focus on a simple meets standard, doesn't meet standard. It doesn't seem to include a process or tool for providing feedback that would help me improve my performance. If I do something well, I would like to know what made it good.	In my experience, I have not seen this implemented as fully as the teacher PGS.

(Continued)

Table A17 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
Some central office staff do not appear to follow the framework that is required of non-central office staff. Some still have the belief of "I gotcha".	There has to be a greater level of accountability for supervisors of administrators. They need to provide evidence of and be coached on how to work with other administrators. When you place a competent AP with a weak principal, you are creating a situation.	It needs to include PD offerings that help administrators learn to navigate MCPS, its culture, its budget process, its structure, its stakeholders/ influencers, (and, yes, its politics) to enable them to more effectively manage and lead.
Tech problems and time constraints were experienced for the online module. Trainings in person are much preferred to online courses.	Inconsistency among effective principal trainers.	Lack of knowledge of the system from the perspective of the supervising administrator. Some supervisors do not use the system in the way for which it was intended- professional growth.
The process is not followed by all administrators.	In my intern year, this new evaluation system was aborted. I was never evaluated, being matched with a bad match (poor administrator) who had no concept of how to train anyone, just expected me to take over her job. Threatened to give me a bad evaluation.	Secondary administrators need the opportunity to run a school for at least a month or two to be better prepared when they secure a principalship. It needs to be a set amount of time that all secondary administrators honor just like in elementary schools. The expectation needs to be set from OSP.
The structure does nothing to improve teachers who meet standard, but need further development. The structure does not provide any "real" change in teaching methods and strategies. It has too little depth, but lots of coverage.	The system is only as strong as the person who is conducting the evaluation. Not all persons are capable of effectively implementing the process.	The A&S PGS does not place enough emphasis on professional growth for central service administrators.
There should be a component that allows comprehensive input from the person being evaluated. This component should hold as much weight as the evaluators input.		The A&S PGS modules have become more of a mandate instead of professional growth for administrators.
		The A&S PGS for central administrators appeared or was perceived as after-thought thrown together after the principals were given opportunities for input into the system and who received most of the trainings.

(Continued)

Table A17 (Continued)

Principals' Comments	Other School-Based Administrators' Comments	Central Services Administrators' Comments
		The process for supporting under-performing central services administrators is unclear.
		The requirement of the portfolio is not a good use of anyone's time. There is no mentoring in place for central office staff and no support or encouragement to grow professionally or seek other A&S positions. It seems that there is much mentoring, support and encouragement and professional development opportunities for school based administrators, but not for central office administrators.
		The supervising administrator often does not have the time to spend in reflection and discussion with all their other responsibilities.
		Wonderful when followed. Not all principals feel obligated to follow the process with APs.