Rubric for Evaluating Administrator Project Objective Accomplishment Aligned to PSEL Standards

This rubric evaluates how well a principal accomplished their project's objective, specifically aligning the evaluation to the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL). Each Indicator is scored on a 4-point scale. The indicators will be averaged to determine the rating for the project.

I. Clarity and Alignment of Objective

Score	Ineffective (1 point)	Developing (2 points)	Effective (3 points)	Highly Effective (4 points)
Objective Definition	The project objective is vague, undefined, or not clearly stated.	The project objective is stated but lacks specificity or is not easily measurable.	The project objective is clearly defined , specific, and measurable, providing a strong target for the project.	The project objective is exceptionally clear, highly specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART).
PSEL Alignment	The project objective has minimal or no discernible connection to PSEL Standards.	The project objective demonstrates a general connection to one or more PSEL Standards,	The project objective is explicitly aligned to one or more relevant PSEL Standards, demonstrating an	The project objective is deeply and strategically aligned to multiple, relevant PSEL Standards, reflecting a comprehensive

but the link is not understanding of

leadership

competencies.

explicit.

understanding of

leadership.

effective educational

II. Progress Towards Objective

Score	Ineffective (1 point)	Developing (2 points)	Effective (3 points)	Highly Effective (4 points)
Actions Taken	Few or no actions were taken towards the objective, or actions were largely ineffective.	Some actions were taken towards the objective, but they were inconsistent or lacked strategic planning.	Clear and logical actions were taken, demonstrating a planned approach to achieving the objective.	A comprehensive and highly strategic set of actions were consistently implemented, demonstrating proactive and adaptive progress.
Challenges Addressed	Significant challenges were unaddressed, hindering progress towards the objective.	Some challenges were acknowledged, but solutions were partial or reactive.	Key challenges were effectively identified and addressed, minimizing their negative impact on objective accomplishment.	Anticipated and skillfully navigated all significant challenges, implementing innovative solutions that enhanced progress toward the objective.

III. Evidence of Accomplishment

Score	Ineffective (1 point)	Developing (2 points)	Effective (3 points)	Highly Effective (4 points)
Data Collectio n	Minimal or no data was collected to track progress or evaluate the objective.	Some data was collected, but it was limited in scope, reliability, or relevance to the objective.	Relevant data was systematically collected to track progress and provide insight into objective accomplishment.	Robust and diverse data sources were expertly utilized, providing comprehensive and reliable evidence of objective accomplishment.
Data Analysis	Data was not analyzed, or analysis was superficial and did not inform conclusions.	Data was analyzed, but the analysis was incomplete or did not fully support conclusions about the objective.	Data was thoroughly analyzed to draw clear conclusions about the extent to which the objective was accomplished.	Sophisticated data analysis methods were employed, yielding profound insights into objective accomplishment and identifying areas for future growth.

IV. Impact and Outcomes

Score	Ineffective (1 point)	Developing (2 points)	Effective (3 points)	Highly Effective (4 points)
Direct Impact	Little to no observable impact on the target area of the objective.	Some observable impact, but it was limited or not directly attributable to the project.	Clear and positive direct impact on the specific area targeted by the objective, with observable changes.	Significant and measurable positive direct impact on the target area, demonstrating a profound influence.
Indirect/Systemic Impact	No evidence of broader, indirect, or systemic impact beyond the immediate objective.	Some emerging or minor indirect impact, but it was not a primary focus or consistently demonstrated.	The project demonstrates some positive indirect or systemic impact, contributing to broader school improvement or cultural shifts.	The project generated significant and sustainable indirect and systemic impact, creating positive ripple effects across the school community and beyond.

V. Reflection and Learning

Score	Ineffective (1 point)	Developing (2 points)	Effective (3 points)	Highly Effective (4 points)
Self-Asses sment	Little to no reflection on the project's successes, challenges, or areas for improvement.	Some reflection, but it was superficial or lacked critical self-assessme nt.	Thoughtful reflection on the project's strengths and weaknesses, demonstrating a capacity for self-assessment.	Deep and insightful self-assessment, identifying key learnings and critically evaluating the principal's role in the project's outcomes.
Summary Con	nments:			
Project Score:				
Signature of E	mployee		Date	
Signature of S	unervisor		Date	