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Executive Summary

This project sought to develop a data based evaluation system for superintendents. The current system employed by boards of education to evaluate their superintendents is not effective. Current superintendent evaluation systems employ fairly simple checklists. These checklists focus largely on personal characteristics rather than on progress toward established district goals. The current system for superintendent evaluations also does not provide a means for board members to obtain data on the performance of the superintendent. Board members are currently unable to observe the superintendent as he or she performs their duties.

This situation with superintendent evaluations occurs within the context of the changing nature of public education. Increased globalization and access to information has created a situation where competition is at an all-time high. As a result of this increased competition, governments have increased accountability for public schools. During the past several decades, governments have passed legislation requiring schools to continually improve student achievement or face sanctions of varying degrees.

This capstone project was designed to address the shortcomings with the current evaluation system for superintendents. This system incorporates the use of data that is provided to board members to inform their evaluation of the superintendent. Progress toward board approved district goals, which includes improvements in student achievement, is also a part of this system. Through the use
of a 360-Degree assessment, board members are provided with data to use in their evaluation of the superintendent.
Chapter 1

The Need for a New Evaluation Process for Superintendents

Albert Einstein defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over, and expecting different results (Moncur, 2012). All across America, public school boards are doing this very thing; they are attempting to obtain new and improved results while utilizing the same methods to complete key tasks. This project will examine the process boards of education use to evaluate their superintendents. The governance processes currently employed in most districts were established decades ago for districts that were tasked to prepare students for an industry-based economy (Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

The mission of the public school district has now changed. In the Twenty First century, districts must prepare students to enter a global economy based on information and technology within an environment of ever-increasing public scrutiny. But districts are still using the same evaluation procedures that were established long ago in an inept effort to achieve these new goals. The current structure of school district governance and some processes used to carry out their authority provide an excellent example of what Einstein defined as insanity.

An example of this disconnect between the new goals for school districts and the processes used to achieve these new goals is the evaluation of the district superintendent. During the first few decades of the Twentieth century, it was necessary for school districts to be closely bound to the communities they served (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). In many ways, the school district was a direct reflection of
the communities’ values and needs. This situation gave rise to a structure where local control of the district was of paramount importance and, in many ways, was a necessity. State legislatures delegated decision making authority to locally elected board members, who would then be responsible for policy making decisions, and hiring and evaluating a school superintendent whose duty was to manage the daily operations of the school district (Maeroff, 2010).

To a large extent, school boards are using the same processes to hire and evaluate superintendents that were developed decades ago (Maeroff, 2010). However, public school districts are now being held accountable for increasing student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps like never before. The past several years have witnessed an unprecedented increase in the demands placed on school districts in an environment of shrinking resources and increased public scrutiny (Candoli, Cullen, & Stufflebeam, 1994). In fact, the outdated processes currently used in many districts are actually counterproductive to the primary mission of increasing student achievement.

Local boards of education, who are elected by the public, are responsible for hiring and evaluating a superintendent (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005; Candoli, Cullen, & Stufflebeam, 1994). The superintendent is then responsible for making difficult decisions on a daily basis that may impact board members’ thinking when evaluating the superintendent. Many of these decisions affect employees of the district on a personal level.
In particular, in states such as Kentucky where Boards of Education are prohibited from taking personnel actions against district employees with the exception of the superintendent, the sole responsibility for making these decisions lies with one person. In these states, when district employees lose their jobs as a result of budget cuts, when administrators may be demoted for poor performance, or when teachers may be terminated as a result of misconduct, the superintendent is the sole decision maker.

While the superintendent may make these decisions for the benefit of the school district, board members sometimes get political pressure from their constituents who are unhappy with these decisions, or are friends and relatives of those negatively affected. When this happens, board members will sometimes apply political pressure to the superintendent. The superintendent is trying to do the job he or she was hired to do by effectively managing district personnel in an effort to increase student achievement. When these decisions are made and community members apply pressure to the Superintendent through their Board of Education members, the very structure of public school governance is in direct contradiction with the effective leadership of the District.

The review of literature will discuss the involvement by federal and state governments and the increased scrutiny and pressure on school districts over the past several decades to improve student achievement and eliminate achievement gaps. While the environment in which school boards operate has changed, many of the key work processes of school boards have not. This project will offer a process that has
the potential to improve one of these key functions: the evaluation of the superintendent.

**Background**

One of the defining characteristics of the American educational system is the close relationship between individual school districts and the communities that they serve (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). School districts are expected to meet the needs and exemplify the values of their communities. The idea that schools were bound to their communities by these circumstances gave rise to Horace Mann's notion of the "common school" (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). In his idealized vision, Mann described a common school system that would not only exemplify the community that it served, but would also function to unify and perpetuate the values of the nation, while meeting its need to provide a workforce capable of entering an economy based on agriculture and industry (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Indeed, an educated populace is a necessity for a democracy to thrive and prosper. Educated citizens are a requirement for a society that elects its own leaders (Maeroff, 2010). It is one of the primary functions of public schools in America to produce citizens with these traits and skills.

In addition to ensuring an educated populace that enables a democratic society to endure, school districts were tasked with producing large numbers of graduates for an industrial economy. During the decades when the current school governance structures were developed, the economy of the United States was based on industry and agriculture (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Thus, school districts adopted calendars based on the needs of the agricultural community and were designed to produce
graduates capable of entering either the industrial or agricultural workforce after high school (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Likewise, schools were organized much like factories with students arranged into grade configurations based on age, moving through the system in much the same way an automobile moves through the production process on an assembly line (Tyack & Hansot, 1982).

The governance structures of schools also began to resemble a business/industrial model with a board and chief executive officer. Initially, during the early Nineteenth century school boards or “trustees” actually managed the daily operations of the schools and school district (Maeroff, 2010). These boards exercised the authority to adopt policy and hire teachers (Maeroff, 2010). As public educational institutions began to grow in both size and complexity, school boards evolved and began to hire professional superintendents (Maeroff, 2010). School boards still retained a great deal of authority over the school district through the hiring, evaluation of, and sometimes firing of the school superintendent. While this arrangement worked very well from the mid-Nineteenth through the mid-Twentieth centuries, events during the past three decades (1980’s – present) have made the current roles and relationships of school boards and superintendents increasingly problematic. Thus, a new process for evaluating superintendents is needed.

An Age of Reform

While our school governance structures were developed to meet the needs of the country during the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth century, events of the past few decades have created a situation where the needs and expectations of the country
have changed dramatically. The publication *A Nation at Risk* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) functioned to create a firestorm of public criticism and reform efforts in American education. This report called unprecedented attention to America's schools, and proposed that the nation was falling behind the Soviet Union and several other communist countries. As a result, the very survival of our nation was at stake. This report compared the quality of teaching and learning with similar qualities in the Soviet Union and other industrialized, communist countries (Jackson, 2009). The findings suggest that American schools were failing to produce students that were competitive with their counterparts in several other countries, and thus placed the entire nation "at risk" (Jackson, 2009). This report sparked the beginning of an age of reform, and ultimately increased accountability in public education that continues today.

In the years following the publication of *A Nation at Risk* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983), there have been numerous actions by federal and state legislatures aimed at improving the academic performance of America's schools and students. Federal efforts such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (2001), better known as Title I, the No Child Left Behind Act, and the more recent Race to the Top initiative have attempted to place consequences on districts and schools for not meeting expected levels of student achievement (Jackson, 2009). Most states have also enacted similar laws aimed at increasing levels of student achievement. For example, in Kentucky, the *Kentucky Education Reform Act* (KERA) passed in 1990, and Senate Bill 1 enacted as
“Unbridled Learning” (Ellis, 2011) have attempted to legislate increased student achievement by implementing systems that hold districts and schools accountable for improving levels of student achievement. For example, Senate Bill 1 sought to improve student achievement by increasing the number of credits required to graduate, especially in language arts, math, and science (Jackson, 2009). This bill also required that districts adopt new and more challenging curriculum standards, and increased the amount of time students spend in class by extending the school day and year (Jackson, 2009). Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the Bill penalizes schools and districts for not achieving mandated levels of student performance, especially in reading and math, and reducing achievement gaps with potential punitive measures (Jackson, 2009).

While these legislative acts have attempted to increase the competitiveness of American’s graduates using various methods, very little attention has been paid to the basic governance structures of districts. While state and federal governments have increasingly become involved in establishing acceptable results for districts and schools, local control by publicly elected school boards has not been addressed (Maeroff, 2010). Whereas federal and state governments have established new accountability systems, local boards of education have continued to utilize the same governance processes, including the evaluation process of the superintendent. State and federal legislators have simply abdicated their responsibility in this matter. On the one hand, they require increased levels of student achievement and penalize districts and schools when those levels are not attained. But, they have not legislated
new systems of district governance. Rather, state and federal governments, and local school districts have sought new results while using the same district governance processes, including the evaluation process of the superintendent, that were created decades ago.

One new trend has emerged in the realm of public school governance. When the Kentucky Education Reform Act was passed in 1990 (Ellis, 2011), one of the key elements of the law was the creation of “School Based Decision Making Councils” (SBDM). The Kentucky statute KRS 160.345 gives a school-based council formal authority to determine several key issues such as curriculum selection and the hiring of the school principal. While this concept was initially welcomed by many, it has recently been shown that school-based management can be counterproductive to improving student achievement (Waters & Marzano, 2006). School-based management can inhibit the role of the district superintendent to make positive changes in a school operating under a School Based Decision Making Council. So, the primary change in public school governance has shown to be counterproductive to the primary focus of the district (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

A Disconnect Between Goals and Processes

With the explosion of the internet in the 1990’s and the birth of the information age, schools and districts began to face unprecedented challenges (Friedman, 2005). Due to increased mobility, the free flow of technology and information, and the globalization of the economy, students now have to compete not only with individuals in their neighborhood or community for jobs, they must now
compete globally (Friedman, 2005). In previous decades, students could graduate from their local school and be expected to immediately enter the workforce in the local factory or on the family farm. However, due to the availability of knowledge, the globalization of economies, and the ease with which information can be transmitted, students are now tasked with competing with their peers from all over the world for slots in graduate programs or jobs in the technology sector of the economy (Friedman, 2005).

An example of how districts have not changed to meet the new goals mandated by state and federal legislation, and by the new reality of global competition, is the evaluation of the school superintendent. Two of the most important functions of a board of education are to hire and evaluate a superintendent (Dervarics & O'Brien, 2011). For many years, the issue of evaluating a superintendent has perplexed board members and made many superintendents both nervous and confused (Maeroff, 2010). The process being utilized in many districts is not effective for board members or superintendents. Currently, the primary consideration in many superintendents’ evaluations is political skill (Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner; Glass & Franceschini, 2007). A superintendent’s ability to communicate and achieve district approved goals, including increasing student achievement and decreasing achievement gaps, is largely ignored by the current evaluation process used by most districts (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000).
While new evaluation systems for teachers, principals, and superintendents has not been specifically legislated, the U.S. Department of Education has made the development and adoption of new evaluation systems for principals and teachers a prerequisite for states to apply for federal Race To The Top Funding (Reform Support Network, 2011). The teacher and principal evaluation systems are changing as a direct result of increased accountability for student and school success (Reform Support Network, 2011). The evaluation systems used in most districts focus on the superintendent’s ability to manage the budget and maintain positive relationships with board members (Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner; Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

In an age of ever-increasing accountability for student achievement, superintendents must begin to focus their efforts in different directions. Thus, a new evaluation process is needed to gauge the effectiveness of these new efforts by the superintendent. The evaluation process currently utilized by most boards is appropriate for determining the level of political acuteness and interpersonal skills of a superintendent (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner). At a time when improving student achievement is becoming more important, the evaluation process used by boards to evaluate their superintendents needs to change as well. A better evaluation process will incorporate the degree to which the superintendent is working with the board to create an environment where district employees can be successful and where student achievement can increase.
Rationale

In an age of ever-increasing accountability for public school educators, superintendents must be able to do more than just maintain good relationships with board members. Obviously, the vast majority of superintendents work very hard to accomplish more than just good relations with board members (Candoli, Cullen, & Stufflebeam, 1994; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000; Glass & Franceschini, 2007). As the literature points out, most superintendents and boards view the ability to maintain good relationships with board members as one of the primary reasons for positive evaluations of superintendents (Brown & Irby 1997; Candoli, Cullen, & Stufflebeam, 1994; Edington & Enger 1992; Linn & Dunbar 1986; Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2003). In an era where taxpayers are expecting much more educational value for their tax dollars, superintendents must be able to have a more positive impact on student achievement than ever before. A new evaluation system is needed to encompass the myriad of duties that a superintendent must fulfill. If a more appropriate process is utilized by boards to evaluate superintendents, then the superintendent and the local board of education will be better able to meet the needs of the students in their district.

Statement of the Problem

The vast majority of superintendents are evaluated annually, receive overwhelmingly positive evaluations, and feel that they have been treated fairly in their districts’ evaluation processes (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). So, this begs the question, “Why is a new evaluation system needed for superintendents?” The
answer to this question is that the dynamics of education in America are changing. Accountability in the field of education has never been greater, and is now being legislated by both state and federal governments. In order to function effectively within this new environment of accountability, various systems employed in the field of school district governance need to change as well. For example, the systems used by states to evaluate teachers and principals are currently being redesigned to incorporate student test scores, student growth, and the “voice” of students and parents through surveys (Reform Support Network, 2011). The teacher and principal evaluation systems are changing as a direct result of increased accountability for student and school success. The processes used to evaluate teachers and principals are changing to align with the desired outcomes of increasing student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps (Reform Support Network, 2011). However, the procedures used by boards to evaluate their Superintendents have not changed to align with these desired outcomes. Thus, the superintendent evaluation system needs to also change.

**Overview of the Capstone Project**

The goal of this capstone project will be to develop a process to be used by local boards of education to evaluate their respective superintendents. This process will include components that enable the school board to assess progress towards board approved goals, positive trends in student academic performance, appropriate stewardship of district finances, and effective communication with the public.
Description of Participating Educational Institution

The Greenup County School District (GCSD) is a public school district located along the Ohio River in Northeastern Kentucky. The GCSD is located approximately two hours east of Cincinnati, Ohio and one hour west of Huntington, W.V. The GCSD is required by law to provide a free and appropriate public education for all children living in the District. The GCSD is one of three public school districts within Greenup County. The other two school districts located within Greenup County, Raceland Independent and Russell Independent.

Structure and offerings. The school district offers a PreK-12 grade public school educational program under the registration of the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). The educational program leads students to graduate with a general high school diploma. The Greenup County School District is mandated by KDE to teach state developed curriculum standards that are organized by grade level. The GCSD is also mandated to assess students with several different exams at different points during a child’s educational career. All of these test results are published in newspapers. Currently, as a result of Senate Bill 1 passed by the state legislature, KDE is currently revising the curriculum standards and segments of the state-mandated testing program.

The delivery of the program and services is organized around the traditional grade level structure. There is a half-day preschool program operating on the campus of each elementary school. Priority enrollment in this preschool program is offered to students considered to be at-risk as determined by socio-economic and developmental
status of the child. Preschool services are provided in conjunction with Northeast Head Start. The kindergarten program is full-day. The elementary curriculum is delivered in grades one through five at four separate schools. The middle school curriculum is delivered in two middle schools (grades six through eight) that are loosely organized around multi-disciplinary teams. This service delivery model has been utilized since the two middle schools opened in 1989. The high school curriculum is delivered in a standard grade nine through twelve format along departmentalized teams.

**Human resources.** The central office consists of 25 employees; seven are certified administrators and three resource teachers. There are also five classified positions within central office, which act to supervise various segments of classified employees, for example bus drivers, Family Resource/Youth Service Centers, and custodians/maintenance. There are also 10 support personnel at the central office. Each of the four elementary schools is staffed with a principal, with the largest, McKell Elementary, also having an assistant principal. Both middle schools also have assistant principals. The high school is staffed with two assistant principals and a full-time athletic director. There are a total of 13 administrators allocated to the schools in the district. All schools are staffed with a full-time guidance counselor, with the high school and McKell Elementary having two. The GCSD employs 205 teachers, which are allocated directly to the schools. The district has a total of 499 employees.
Staff development needs are determined in a variety of formats, such as annual evaluations, Individual Growth Plans (IGP), and regular round-table discussions with the superintendent. There are also periodic climate surveys, ad hoc surveys, and the GCSD recently underwent a Scholastic Audit performed by personnel from KDE in 2011. Each school conducts regular faculty meetings. Schools periodically report needs to the BOE at public meetings. All staff has the opportunity to participate in education and training. Yearly goals are established for staff members in their respective IGP. These IGP’s also support the School and District Improvement Plans. Certified staff has the opportunity to attend a variety of professional development workshops in addition to having access to on-line professional development through PD 360. Currently, no data exists to support the effectiveness of the IGP or professional development processes.

**Facilities and enrollment.** As shown in Table 1, the district facilities include seven school buildings, a central office/maintenance facility, and an older school building that is utilized as a storage facility. The district also operates four Preschool/Head start programs. These programs are housed in separate facilities adjacent to Argillite Elementary, and Greysbranch Elementary schools. The Preschool/Head start program at McKell is housed in the old McKell Intermediate facility, which is connected to McKell Middle School. The Preschool/Head start program at Wurtland is currently housed in Wurtland Middle School. An old fire station adjacent to Wurtland Elementary and Wurtland Middle School is currently
being renovated with plans to move the Preschool/Head start program into this facility.

Table 1
District Configuration and Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Student/Teacher Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argillite Headstart</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argillite Elementary</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greysbranch Headstart</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greysbranch Elementary</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKell Elementary</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKell Elementary</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurtland Headstart</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurtland Elementary</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKell Middle</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>26:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurtland Middle</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>26:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenup County High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>28:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greenup County Schools Website

**District governance.** Local control of the school district is by a five-member elected Board of Education that establishes a code of conduct and policies. The superintendent of schools is the professional advisor to the Board of Education.
Under Kentucky state law, the local Board of Education only deals with the hiring of the superintendent and board attorney (KRS 160.160). The primary means for the Board of Education to exercise leadership within the school district is through the adoption of policies and procedures.

**School governance.** Each school is governed by a School Based Decision Making Council (SBDM), which is comprised of three teachers, two parents and one principal. The SBDM Council assists the principal in the administration of the school per KRS 160.345.

**Student demographics.** The students are the primary customers of the school district’s educational services. The community and parents expect the school district to provide students with a competitive education in a safe environment. For most students, this means they will graduate from high school with a general academic diploma. Students are supported by special education teachers, instructional assistants, coaches, directors of athletics, and guidance counselor personnel. Ten students in the district are on track to receive a Certificate of Attainment.
Table 2

District Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with a disability</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and talented</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greenup County Schools District Report Card
Community involvement and stakeholders. The GCSD's primary stakeholder groups are parents, businesses, industry, military branches, post-secondary institutions, and community members. Parent and community needs are represented in PTA, SBDM, and memberships on many hiring interview committees, and district planning committees such as the facilities planning committee and the Comprehensive District Improvement Planning Committee.

Partnerships with small businesses, civic groups, and churches have been valuable. The district reaches out in a variety of ways to include its senior citizens in school activities. The involvement of the various stakeholder groups in planning and implementation of district goals and objectives is sparse at best.

Currently, the district has established procedures for communication with stakeholder groups. The district publishes an employee and a parent newsletter each month. These newsletters provide both groups with important information regarding upcoming events and improvement efforts in the district. The district also maintains a smart device application that parents can download to their mobile devices. The application provides basic information such as school calendars, bell schedules, and special event announcements. The district also communicates with stakeholders through the use of a weekly e-mail, “Fast Friday Facts”. These e-mails contain timely information that focus on current events. For example, in the spring when allocations are approved by the Board of Education, this e-mail focuses on informing parents and community members about how resources are allocated to schools in an equitable manner.
An important involvement of stakeholders is in the election of the five-member Board of Education, whose terms expire every four years. One of the Board’s most important functions is the approval of the district’s annual operating budget. Board Members communicate with stakeholders at community forums that the district hosts to showcase various improvement efforts and events. In addition, stakeholders will sometimes attend Board meetings and formally address the Board as a delegation.

**Improvement efforts.** The district has initiated a series of programs intended to improve student achievement. The district has expanded opportunities for students with programs such as Twenty-First Century and ESS. These programs are designed to address a range of learning needs of students – providing homework help, enrichment activities and credit recovery for students who have fallen behind. The district is also working closely with Dr. Robert Thomas from Eastern Kentucky University in the area of mathematics. Dr. Thomas provides professional development and coaching to math teachers at the middle and high school levels. Instructional rounds are also used in an effort to monitor effective classroom practices. During instructional rounds, district and school administrators will visit a particular school and perform brief classroom visits.

There has been a concerted effort within the district to increase positive news stories concerning the GCSD. Local newspapers have frequently covered positive academic aspects of the GCSD. During the past eight to ten years the amount of technology available to students and teachers in the district has grown substantially,
and several news stories have focused on how teachers and students are using this technology. Local newspapers will also periodically print stories about innovative classroom projects, and special guests that visit schools.

The current improvement systems in place are only those required by law. In February 2009, a scholastic audit was conducted by personnel representing the Kentucky Department of Education. The findings of this audit were fairly negative in the areas of leadership, curriculum, and instruction. Since August 2009, a team of central office administrators has met on a regular basis in an effort to coordinate recommendations set forth in this audit report.

This capstone project will address some of the identified deficiencies, particularly with district-level leadership. Through the use of the 360-Degree Assessment process, the Superintendent and the Board of Education will communicate about specific district goals and areas of responsibility for each. The 360-Degree Assessment also provides data that indicates progress toward board-approved goals. This capstone will demonstrate that this process enables the district to have a more cohesive, consistent district leadership team.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The vast majority of superintendents who are evaluated annually receive overwhelmingly positive evaluations and feel that they have been treated fairly in their district’s evaluation process (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). With this in mind, the question of “Why is a new evaluation system needed for superintendents?” is very relevant. In order to answer this question, one must first understand how the position of the superintendency has evolved and how the dynamics of education in America have changed in the past few decades. Accountability in the field of education has never been greater and is now being legislated by both state and federal governments. This accountability has been legislated at the federal level through laws such as the No Child Left Behind Act (League of Women Voters, 2011). Accountability measures have also been enacted at the state level. For example, in Kentucky, the Kentucky Education Reform Act and Senate Bill 1 have both contained accountability systems for schools and districts (Innes, 2010).

In order to be as effective as possible within this new environment of accountability, various processes of district governance need to change as well. For example, the processes used by districts to evaluate teachers and principals are currently being redesigned to incorporate student test scores, student growth, and the “voice” of students and parents through surveys. The teacher and principal evaluation systems are changing as a direct result of increased accountability for student and school success.
The system used to evaluate teachers and principals is changing to align with the desired outcomes of increasing student achievement and eliminating achievement gaps. However, the processes used by boards to evaluate their superintendents have not changed nor are addressing these desired outcomes. Thus, the superintendent evaluation system needs to change.

The goal of this capstone project was to develop a process by which boards of education can evaluate their superintendents. This process included components that enabled the school board to assess progress toward board approved goals, positive trends in student academic performance, appropriate stewardship of district finances, and effective communication with the public.

The review of literature is a compilation of the research presented from books and studies that discuss various topics surrounding superintendents and their evaluation. The topics discussed include:

1. The historical evolution of the superintendency;
2. Governmental involvement in school district governance;
3. The complexity of the position, superintendent longevity;
4. Benefits of an effective evaluation process;
5. Characteristics of an effective evaluation process;
6. Current methods for performing superintendent evaluations, and;
7. The benefits of a new evaluation system.

It is necessary to become familiar with each of these components in order to fully understand why a new evaluation process for superintendents is needed.
In order to understand the dynamic environment in which a superintendent functions and the need for an effective evaluation process, this chapter begins with a description of the school superintendency and how it has evolved over the past few decades.

**Historical Evolution of the Superintendency**

The school superintendency has been around in American school districts since the mid-1800’s. Most historians agree that the position of school superintendent first appeared in the late 1830’s in the cities of Buffalo, New York and Louisville, Kentucky (Kowalski, 2006). Most schools were one-room schoolhouses with a single teacher hired to teach children and manage the daily operations of the school.

As the population of the country increased, one-room schoolhouses were replaced with more efficient graded schools (Tyack & Hansot, 1982). Ultimately, these schools were organized into city or county school districts. This trend continued until 1850, when 13 large cities with many schoolhouses appointed a superintendent to oversee the day-to-day business of schooling (Chapman, 1997; Glass, 1992). According to Spring (1994), during the time when districts began to employ superintendents, the “primary reason for creating the position was to have a person work full-time at supervising classroom instruction and assuring uniformity in the curriculum” (p. 119).

As the population of the country continued to increase, the number of superintendent positions also increased. The first superintendents championed the common school reform movement and advocated for public education in a
challenging political environment (Kowalski, 2006). In 1874, the landmark Kalamazoo case gave local school boards the authority to tax property owners for the support of secondary schools (Spring, 1994). This increased revenue allowed districts to subsequently expand public high schools (Spring, 1994). The taxing authority allowed a further expansion of the number and size of schools in America. This increased the need for a trained professional to oversee these growing institutions. As the number of city and county school districts increased in number and size, boards began to increasingly recognize the need for a single top administrator (Stufflebeam, 1995).

Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) offered the following description of the early American superintendent:

Many early superintendents faced serious challenges, including the survival of the common school itself. Those who took on the job of superintendent, in support of the common school, were true educational reformers. They traveled from large cities to villages, spreading the word about a free public education. In some respects, many early superintendents were like secular clergy. They served as moral role models, disseminator of the democratic ethic, and, most importantly, builders of the American dream. (p. 2)

As the context of education in America evolved from a series of one-room schoolhouses to a collection of districts with multiple schools, each providing additional services such as school lunches and transportation, the complexity of the daily operations increased dramatically. The increases in the number of schools
within a district, as well as in managerial tasks required in districts, led to the emergence of the modern superintendent.

**Governmental involvement.** The involvement of the federal government in public education predates even the creation of the Constitution of the United States. The Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 both contained provisions for an educational system in the new republic (League of Women Voters, 2011). Once the Constitution was written and adopted, Article 1, Section 8 granted Congress the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the general welfare of the citizens of the United States. This “general welfare” clause gave the federal government the power to support and sometimes alter the provisions of public education in its own right, and to participate jointly with states in activities that improve the educational services provided to its citizens.

Furthermore, two constitutional amendments played an important role in public education. The Tenth Amendment stated that, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people” (League of Women Voters, 2011, p. 1). This Amendment ceded most decisions regarding public education to the states. However, in 1868, the 14th Amendment guaranteed certain rights to all citizens, including an appropriate public education by stating, “all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens in the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor
shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law,” (League of Women Voters, 2011, p. 2).

Between the establishment of the federal government and the mid-1900’s there were several instances of federal involvement in public education. Some of these acts and laws are listed in Table 3. Despite this involvement, dramatic results were not produced until in the mid-1940’s. The end of World War II brought about unprecedented social challenges in America. With millions of service men returning home following the War, the federal government passed the GI Bill, which provided post-secondary education assistance. Then, in 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which allocated billions of federal dollars to school districts to fund interventions for economically disadvantaged children.

Likewise, other federal laws created significant changes to public education. In 1972, Title IX prohibited discrimination in education based on gender, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act prohibited discrimination based on disability. Throughout the 1960’s and 1970’s, federal involvement focused on prohibiting discrimination and promoting equality and equal access to public education. However, in the decades that followed, the focus of the federal government began to shift to issues relating to accountability.
## Table 3

Federal Involvement in Public Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Ordinance &amp; Northwest Ordinance</td>
<td>1785/1787</td>
<td>Requirement of a system of public education to be established in each township formed under a specific formula. Regulated monies raised via taxes and selling or renting land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Grants</td>
<td>1841/1848</td>
<td>Congress granted 77+ million acres of land in the public domain as endowments for support of schools. Federal government also granted surplus money to states for public education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Began to collect data on schools and teaching that would help states establish effective school systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI Bill</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Provided post-secondary education assistance to GIs returning from World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Established comprehensive set of programs including Title I of federal aid to disadvantaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Prohibited discrimination in education based on gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Prohibited discrimination in education based on disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Nation at Risk</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Report indicating that the USA was falling behind in educational achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA Reauthorized</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>No Child Left Behind Act penalizes schools and districts for not achieving “Adequate Yearly Progress”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race to the Top</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education offers states the opportunity to apply for billions in grant money to support public education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(League of Women Voters, 2011, p.2).
Federal and state accountability legislation. By the early 1980’s, a series of controversial studies regarding the state of American educational institutions ignited a national firestorm, and a school reform movement spread across the country during the next two decades. With the publishing of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, state and national policymakers and politicians began the urgent call to repair America’s schools and acknowledged that integral to the success of reform efforts were school and district leaders (Chapman, 1997; Fullen, 1993; Hoyle et al., 2005).

The role of the superintendent has had to adapt to the demands and issues created by the reform movement surrounding public education in America. The demands for accountability and school reform have surfaced in most state legislatures and in Congress during recent decades. Publicly reported assessment scores, the availability of information about schools and school employees, and comparisons of national assessment scores to other industrialized nations have all placed increasing demands upon public school superintendents. These demands have affected all states via the federal legislation of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Also in Kentucky, state mandates of the Kentucky Education Reform Act in 1990, and Senate Bill 1 of 2009, or Unbridled Learning, have functioned to increase the level of accountability schools, districts, and superintendents face (Innes, 2010). The accountability placed on school districts by federal and state governments have created a situation where the superintendent is expected to be the primary change agent within the school organization (Leithwood, 1995; Costa, 2004). As a result of the legislated reforms of the past few decades, the superintendent is in a position to
not only manage daily operations, but to be the driving force behind building district capacity as well as viewed as a catalyst in promoting organizational change. Thus, superintendents have enormous responsibility in regards to school and district performance and accountability in facing the educational issues of today in an environment of high-stakes accountability (Danzig & Delicki, 2004; Costa, 2004).

**Complexity of the Job**

There is a basic premise that the school board governs through its policies and procedures, and the superintendent manages the daily operations of the district while adhering to adopted Board policies and procedures. In general, boards are elected by their community to set priorities, approve policies, and evaluate the outcomes of the district's operations (Opstad, 2010). These duties are laid out in Kentucky statute KRS 160.290 (Appendix A). The role of the superintendent is to identify needs and to develop and suggest policies and procedures, provide leadership, and manage day-to-day operations of the district (Opstad, 2010).

It is clear that the role of the superintendent has changed dramatically over the past several decades. The traditional role of the superintendent, according to most state laws, was to assist the board in the development and administration of policies and procedures (Poplau, 1998). Carter and Cunningham (1997) state that, "This role has proven an over-simplification that tends to cloud understanding almost as much as it clarifies it" (p. 16). In 1994, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) revised their respective standards for superintendents (See Appendices B and C). According to Carter and
Cunningham (1997), these efforts have helped somewhat to clarify responsibilities. However, the expectations among districts will never be fully defined or evaluated because “of the divergent interests and expectations that exist in each district” (p. 16).

**A new environment.** While superintendents are making decisions about the same issues as in previous years, the new environment of high-stakes accountability requires a closer working relationship between school boards and their superintendents. The relationship between the board and superintendent now requires board members to have a better understanding of the superintendent’s methods and motives. Prior to the current era of high-stakes accountability, boards could afford to concern themselves only with results. Now board members must have a better grasp of the methods a superintendent uses and the rationale for specific decisions a superintendent makes.

The relationship between the superintendent and the board of education can be enhanced through the accessibility and use of data and information. It is critical that board members understand their role and responsibility to the school district. The level of cohesiveness between the superintendent and board is critical as they both attempt to address the demands of accountability in their quest to improve student achievement within their district.

Properly meeting the numerous challenges of the superintendency in the current political and social climate is difficult. This challenge is further complicated due to the number of people directly and indirectly affected by decisions in adverse ways. This is not limited to just the board of education, but the school district
members, the community, parents, stakeholders, and most importantly, the students of
the district. As the superintendent makes decisions aimed at increasing student
achievement, it is likely that some school employees, parents, community members,
business owners, or other stakeholders will be adversely affected. For example, it
may be necessary for a superintendent to remove a principal or a teacher for
ineffectiveness. This principal or teacher will sometimes be defensive and feel that
they have been treated unfairly. Likewise, friends and family members of the
principal or teacher will feel a degree of animosity toward the superintendent. It is
important that processes are in place to reinforce the superintendent’s relationship
with their board and enable both parties to maintain a focus in student achievement.

Accordingly, the position of superintendent is the most powerful and the most
complex position in the arena of public education. Merrow (2001), in a PBS
documentary, declared that the superintendent’s position is the toughest job in
America. The challenges that today’s superintendents face are vast and the issues are
ongoing and evolving on almost a daily basis. These issues include program
accountability resulting from high-stakes testing, the need for teachers to utilize the
most effective instructional strategies while teaching the identified state standards,
and the overwhelming challenge of eliminating achievement gaps.

While addressing accountability related issues, the superintendent must also
address issues such as technology, diversity, professional development, and the
recruitment, and retention of highly qualified teachers in the classroom (Natkin,
Cooper, Fusarelli, Alborano, Padilla & Ghosh, 2002). Norton, Webb, Blugosh and
Sybouts (1996) describe additional issues facing superintendents such as developing an annual budget while being subjected to continual funding cuts from state legislatures and Congress, increasing poverty rates of school district families, balancing political agendas of school board members, competition for students with surrounding private and charter schools, and handling the pressures from special interest groups from within the district.

Superintendent roles and responsibilities. The literature is consistent in describing the increasingly complex role of the superintendent in today’s society. Bjork and Kowalski (2005) identify five stages in the evolution of the superintendency. The stages are teacher-scholar, business manager, educational statesman, social scientist, and what is currently described as a communicator. Each of these five stages can easily fit into Cuban’s key roles of a superintendent which are student achievement, the management of the district, and politics. Norton’s (2001) study also lists similar role expectations as viewed from Arizona superintendents: ensuring a staff of highly qualified teachers, school readiness, achievement and assessment for all students, and the maintenance of financial stability within the district.

The difficult task of improving student achievement while working within a political realm is not only described in the research on the topic, it is also evident in the popular media. An editorial in the Washington Post (2004) depicted the Twenty-first century expectations for a superintendent. The job qualifications referred to someone who has managed an entrenched bureaucracy, has developed a multimillion
dollar budget, knows how to deal with a demanding public and aggressive press corps, can articulate a mission, a possessor of leadership skills political smarts, and management prowess. The qualifications listed also specified that the next superintendent of the Washington, D.C. school district should be able to aggressively improve teacher quality, be an inspiring leader, and be someone who is committed first and foremost to the advancement of all children.

Stufflebeam (1995) asserted that the modern superintendent “has become one of the most complex and challenging leadership roles in American society” (p. 159). According to Stufflebeam (1995), on an almost daily basis superintendents must effectively interact with a wide array of stakeholders such as teacher unions, the media, representatives from higher education, district office staff, government officials from the local, state, and federal levels, state departments of education, professional groups, community organizations, parent and student groups, local businesses, and state legislators. In addition to these challenges, a superintendent is responsible for increasing student achievement as recent research indicates that a successful superintendent can, in fact, have a positive effect on student achievement (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

Lashway (2002) and Stufflebeam (1995) have both asserted that modern superintendents are under significant pressure to spend a majority of their time and effort on achieving performance goals to meet accountability standards as defined by federal and state accountability systems. The importance of alignment between how superintendents spend their time and effort and expected academic results cannot be
overstated. As the difficulty of reaching a complex academic goal increases, so does the need for a high degree of alignment between efforts to achieve academic goals and governance structures. It is important that processes be created which enable the superintendent to devote more of his/her time and effort to meeting student achievement goals.

Different descriptions of the responsibilities of superintendents have been examined closely in the literature. The role of a superintendent has changed as education has moved into a new era. The modern superintendent has to manage the daily operations of a school district and also lead his/her district to meet academic goals in a time of unprecedented accountability (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005; Hess, 2002; Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005; Levine, 2005; Waters & Marzano, 2006). This requires new ways of thinking about what school districts do and how they do it. At first glance, the role of a superintendent is simple, to work with the Board and district administrators in order to improve the educational services the district provides to its stakeholders. However, there are numerous internal and external factors that pose significant challenges to superintendents, such as competing with surrounding districts for the most talented workforce, managing large group dynamics, dealing effectively with shrinking budgets, human resources issues, and building and maintaining community support for their school districts. The overall effectiveness of a superintendent is heavily influenced by these factors, some of which are beyond his or her control. Perhaps the most important factor is the degree to which the superintendent and the board of education can work in concert to achieve
district goals. This project attempted to demonstrate how this factor can be addressed with an effective, data-based evaluation process on the performance of the superintendent.

**Board responsibilities to evaluate.**

In most states, as in Kentucky, the task of evaluating the superintendent is the responsibility of the local board of education. School boards have many responsibilities, but the two most critical tasks boards have are to hire and evaluate their superintendents (Hess, 2002; Sullivan, 2005). It is evident from the research examined that boards are faithful in performing an annual evaluation of superintendents (Hess, 2002; Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; Glass & Franceschini, 2007). The problem is that these evaluations are annual events rather than a process for continuous improvement (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005; Mortensen, 2009; Opstad, 2010; Rice, 2010). In addition, the process used by boards does not allow for the integration of meaningful data and is essentially a checklist of personal qualities rather than an indication of the overall effectiveness of superintendents (Sackos, 2009; Sharp, Malone & Walter, 2003; Stuffelbeam, 1994).

These issues are each at least partially due to the ambiguity of the state statutes that require an annual evaluation of the superintendent. In Kentucky, KRS 156.557 (Appendix D) describes in detail different aspects of evaluation of all certified educators. The vast majority of this statute focuses on evaluations for certified employees other than the superintendent. While this statute requires an annual evaluation of the superintendent, Section Four is fairly vague and leaves many
important decisions at the discretion of the local Board of Education. In fact, this
statute is so incomplete it does not even require that the annual evaluation be
performed in writing (KRS 156.557). Of a total of four pages, this statute only
contains one subparagraph dealing with the evaluation of the superintendent:

(4) (a) Each superintendent shall be evaluated according to a policy
and procedures developed by the local board of education and
approved by the department.

(b) The summative evaluation of the superintendent shall be discussed
and adopted in an open meeting of the board and reflected in the
minutes.

(c) If the local board policy requires a written evaluation of the
superintendent, it shall be made available to the public upon request.

(d) Any preliminary discussions relating to the evaluation of the
superintendent by the board or between the board and the
superintendent prior to the summative evaluation shall be conducted in
closed session. (KRS 156.557)

There is no mention in this statute of any methods to gather data on the performance
of the superintendent. Likewise, there is no mention of the Board setting meaningful
goals for the superintendent or the school district. The decision of whether or not to
set specific goals for the superintendent is currently left to the Board of Education.
Evaluation issues in Kentucky.

The current ambiguity surrounding superintendent evaluation processes is the result of several factors. First and foremost, the state legislature has failed to draft legislation that requires local boards to develop a process for evaluating their superintendent which is more comprehensive and is a continuous process rather than a stand-alone event. In addition, the current statute should require regular training for Boards of Education to perform evaluations of their respective superintendents. The statute that outlines the process for hiring a superintendent is well-defined and requires specific training for the selection committee. There should be a similar training for Boards when dealing with the evaluation of the superintendent.

Secondly, the Kentucky School Boards Association has failed to devote sufficient resources and time to the topic of superintendent evaluations. An examination of this organization's website reveals topics that are best-suited for district and school administrators such as anti-bullying programs, reading programs, and so forth. Very little is found in the way of training for boards in the evaluation of their superintendents. There are significant resources available for Boards to utilize when they are performing searches for their next superintendents, similar resources should be available for superintendent evaluations.

Third, most local boards have failed to pursue any improved methods for evaluating their superintendents. In their myriad of responsibilities, it is understandable that local board members would simply follow the same process that
has always been used in their district with little thought given to improving the process.

The superintendent is the only employee in the school district who is evaluated by the Board of Education. In addition to being the only person evaluated by the Board, the superintendent is also the only person in public education who is evaluated by non-certified individuals who each have limited experience in evaluation or the field of educational administration (DiPaola & Stronge, 2001). Thus, Board members attempt to evaluate a superintendent when they have little working knowledge of how he or she performs duties on a daily basis.

The past few decades have witnessed a dramatic increase in the complexity of the position of superintendent. Previously, superintendents were expected to be effective managers of their districts. However, they now need to be instructional leaders, effective communicators, and use data to change the behaviors of those in their districts in a manner that promotes school improvement (Bjork & Kowalski, 2005). In particular, communication and the effective use of data have now become essential skills for superintendents to possess (Lashway, 2002; Stufflebeam, 1995). Griffith, Stout, and Forsyth (as cited in Bjork & Kowalski, 2005) note that specific communication skills for administrators include effective speaking in multiple settings, as well as writing in multiple formats. They also note that these types of communication are identified as core competencies according to standards for superintendents from multiple organizations. Bjork and Kowalski (2005) also refer to organizations such as the American Association of School Administrators (AASA),
the National School Boards Association (NSBA), and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) in emphasizing the importance of communication with effective school leadership. The ISLLC standards and NSBA standards are presented in the Appendices E and C.

Carter and Cunningham (as cited in Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005) note that little research has been conducted on the performance evaluation of superintendents, and even less research has been devoted to the results of such evaluations. However, changing political and economic conditions, as well as an increased emphasis on public education have increased demands for superintendents to be more accountable for student performance as well as being effective organizational managers. As districts have continued to consolidate and grow, and with increased accountability legislated by state and federal governments, a superintendent’s role and responsibilities has become ever more complex. (Bjork and Kozlowski, 2005)

Longevity.

Districts where there is a high degree of superintendent turnover have to spend valuable time and money to fill the position of the superintendency. Instead of spending this time to fill superintendent vacancies, districts would be well-served to develop or implement an evaluation process that provides their superintendents an opportunity to implement strategies aimed at achieving Board-approved goals. Sharp (as cited in Sullivan, 2005) asserts that an effective evaluation process is critically important to the improvement of the school district. He also states that the
relationship between the Board and Superintendent can have a positive influence in how the district staff and community perceive the Board (Sullivan, 2005). Thus, a well-designed superintendent evaluation system provides opportunities for improvement that can help prevent high turnover among superintendents.

Superintendents are expected by their boards and communities to achieve positive results for their districts in a reasonable amount of time. If positive results are not achieved in a reasonable amount of time, then the superintendent’s tenure may be brief. It is clear that superintendents do spend significantly less time in their positions than corporate Chief Executive Officers, or CEO’s (Merrow, 2001).

It is clear that if a superintendent is highly effective then they can have a lasting positive impact on the district and community they serve, and on student achievement (Waters & Marzano, 2006). An effective superintendent has the ability to meet the immediate needs of students within his/her district while simultaneously addressing more long-term needs in a district such as facilities planning. Bryant (2001) explains the importance of stability within the highest levels of district leadership, saying that “the stability of the superintendent has an impact on the success of any school district. High turnover among top administrators can undermine reform efforts, as each succeeding superintendent attempts to put his or her stamp on the district” (p. 2). State and federal accountability systems, decreasing funding, and increased public scrutiny have functioned to put additional pressure on the position of superintendent.
While many board members are ill equipped to perform an effective evaluation of their superintendents, most follow long-established procedures for performing the evaluation. In most cases, the process used to evaluate the superintendent is very simple. Forms are completed by individual board members and these separate forms are summarized by the board chair (Bryant, 2001; Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; Costa, 2004; DiPaola, 2007; DiPaola & Stronge, 2001; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Edington & Enger, 1992; Glass, 1992; Matthews, 2001; Robinson & Bickers, 1990; Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2003; Stuffelbeam, 1995; Wiggall, 2004). These forms are then discussed with the superintendent once a year during an executive session.

This process is followed by many board members because it is required by either local board policy, state law, or both (Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; Glass & Franchechini, 2007; Hess, 2002). However, just because Boards implement their evaluation processes with fidelity does not mean that the processes are effective. For example, it has been noted that “school boards tend to evaluate their superintendents in one or two ways: (a) informal, inconsistent observations of the human relations and budgeting skills and (b) formal assessment of observable and non-observable management functions” (Brown & Irby, 1997, p. 16). Several studies have indicated that most boards do evaluate their superintendents on an annual basis (Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; Edington & Enger, 1992; Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2003).

The Need for an Effective Evaluation Process
To prevent a high turnover rate among superintendents, there is a need for an evaluation process that will provide superintendents with feedback that will allow them to grow professionally. Another reason why a well-designed evaluation process for superintendents is needed is because the governance structure of school districts is sometimes difficult to manage. For example, in some states Board members can become involved in personnel matters, in other states they cannot. Despite the fact that this is defined in law, some Board members still attempt to influence decisions relating to personnel matters (Maeroff, 2010). A well-designed evaluation process can help to draw clear lines of authority between the Board of Education and the superintendent. In addition, communication can be enhanced by a system that requires the Board to set meaningful, quantifiable goals for the superintendent, and allows the superintendent to develop and share plans for achieving those goals. Most superintendents who leave their districts for other districts report that a primary reason for leaving is conflicts regarding personnel decisions with school board members (Kowalski, McCord, Peterson, Young, & Ellerson, 2010; Maeroff, 2010). Improving communication and reinforcing roles between board members and superintendents may reduce these conflicts regarding personnel decisions.

Superintendent Preparation Programs.

The vast majority of superintendents follow the traditional career path of teacher, principal, central office administrator, superintendent (Glass, 1992; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000). Likewise, most superintendents possess Master’s degrees, with many possessing a Doctorate (Glass, 1992; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000).
Two reports, *Better Leaders for America's School: A Manifesto* (2003) and *Educating School Leaders* (2005) questioned the overall process currently being used by most universities to prepare educational leaders. Both reports indicate that better leaders are needed in our schools and school districts. This assertion is supported by the fact that over 20 percent of superintendents surveyed indicated that their level of academic preparation was either “fair” or “poor” (Kowalski, McCord, Peterson, Young, Ellerson, 2010).

Improving the quality of our school and district leaders can partially be accomplished by increasing both the quantity and quality of the candidate pools with state licensing agencies and by reforming the academic institutions that are preparing our next generation of educational leaders. Both of these issues support the need for more research dealing with the evaluation of superintendents. In addition to more research dealing with the evaluation process, there is also a need for more research in how superintendents, along with other educational leaders, are prepared by universities.

**Benefits of an Effective Evaluation Process**

Regardless of how well our educational leaders are prepared for positions by their universities, there is a need for an evaluation system for superintendents that will enable them to improve their performance and grow professionally. Current practices utilized by boards of education do not employ any formal processes which allow superintendents the opportunities to demonstrate professional growth. The primary method to demonstrate professional growth for a superintendent should lie in the
evaluation process used by a school board (Eadie, 2003; Sullivan, 2005). If the current processes used to evaluate their superintendents are not efficient nor inconsistent, then superintendents will struggle to meet the challenges of creating and maintaining an atmosphere of continuous improvement in their districts (Hess, 2002; Lashway, 2002). If a school board has an effective evaluation process, then this process will stimulate the professional growth of the superintendent and would also help the district to continually improve (Hess, 2002; Lashway, 2002). This would be accomplished by providing the superintendent with quantifiable goals to pursue and by incorporating a process to generate these indications of superintendent growth.

Improving the superintendent evaluation process will increase the superintendent’s effectiveness and will ultimately improve the effectiveness of the district. If a district has an effective superintendent evaluation process that clarifies roles and responsibilities and provides a mechanism for the superintendent to demonstrate district progress toward Board-approved goals, then superintendent tenure may increase. Houston (as cited in Archer, 2006) reports that there is a positive correlation between student achievement and superintendent’s tenure. This assertion is corroborated by Waters and Marzano (2006). In districts where there is stability within the superintendency, improved student achievement will likely occur.

Considered to be the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the school district (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005; Leithwood, 1995), the superintendent is responsible for the entire organization. Unlike corporate CEO’s, a school superintendent is not able to dictate all factors involving the organization’s success.
For example, superintendents are expected to increase levels of student achievement despite the fact that some students are not prepared for school at age five, or do not receive adequate support from their parents. Superintendents also inherit central office and building level administrators when they are first hired by the Board. They cannot choose their own subordinates. Superintendents are expected to improve student achievement using pre-existing employees. An effective evaluation process of the superintendent’s performance is needed to determine their ability to move the district toward Board approved goals. Before an effective evaluation can be conducted, there needs to first be a clear understanding of what the Board expects the superintendent to accomplish. There needs to be a well-defined process that is followed by the board when the evaluation is performed. DiPaola and Stronge (2003) believe the evaluation of the superintendent is frequently conducted by an informal process based more on impressions than real data. Any evaluation based upon these vague impressions would only be marginally beneficial, at best.

An effective superintendent evaluation process can improve the communication between the superintendent and the board members (Hess, 2002; Matthews, 2001). Bjork and Kowalski (2005) identified communication as being critically important in developing and maintaining effective relationships between school boards and superintendents. Bjork and Kowalski (2005) also note that improving the communication between the school board and the superintendent may help to improve the job satisfaction superintendents experience. In these instances, communication refers to many things including a clear understanding of the roles and
responsibilities between the superintendent and the board of education. This includes a clear understanding and respect of each party for the authority of the other.

Contemporary school board members face many of the same challenges that superintendents face. School board members are faced with adopting an annual budget to provide services to students in the face of ever-increasing cuts in federal and state funding. One of the most important challenges boards face is to effectively evaluate their superintendent (Hess, 2002). According to Sullivan (2005), the importance of this evaluation is based on:

(1) Creating clear expectations;
(2) Establishing goals;
(3) Providing feedback, and;
(4) Establishing effective communication.

An effective system of evaluating the superintendent will enable the board to decide what it wants the superintendent to accomplish, and whether or not progress is being made toward these goals (Hess, 2002; Sullivan, 2005).

There is a commonly held belief that no matter how well educational programs or processes are designed, they are no better than the individuals that implement them. There is a strong positive correlation between the effectiveness of a program and the personnel involved (Poplau, 1998). DiPaola and Strong (2003) assert that effective people ensure effective programs, so it would follow that a well-designed and effectively implemented evaluation process should be utilized for all personnel in the educational arena, especially the superintendent. Such a process
would enable Board members to use data, rather than relying on vague impressions, to gauge a superintendent’s performance. By requiring the Board to adopt tangible goals, such a process would require Board support for any initiatives aimed at achieving their goals.
Current Superintendent Evaluation Practices

In 1980, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) called for formal evaluations of superintendents (DiPaola & Stronge, 2001). The current standards on which many superintendents are evaluated were developed by these two organizations, NSBA and AASA (Rice, 2010). However, in most instances, there has been very little progress made in the development of effective superintendent evaluation procedure or practices (Hess, 2002). In Kentucky, the current state statute does not specify that the superintendent evaluation has to be performed in writing, and only recently specified that the summative, or final evaluation, has to be delivered in open session. (KRS 156.557) (see Appendix D). The fact that the summative evaluation is delivered in public does not necessarily make the evaluation more effective. The current statute in Kentucky (KRS 156.557) is fairly ambiguous and leaves the exact evaluation procedures to the local board of education.

In the AASA 2000 Study of the American School Superintendency, Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) reported that most superintendent evaluations are discussed and completed in executive sessions. Executive sessions are closed to the public and only board members are in attendance. In most states, the results of the superintendent’s evaluation are made public in an open meeting. When the results are presented, they are usually presented only in a general manner and are sometimes shared at the same meeting in which the superintendent’s contract is discussed (Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000).
Even though the way in which superintendent evaluations are performed has changed very little, boards of education do appear to implement the established procedures faithfully (Kowalski, McCord, Peterson, Young, & Ellerson, 2010). Just as there is a consistency in how superintendent evaluations are performed and delivered, there is also a high degree of consistency in how boards are rating their superintendents. Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) reported that when surveyed about their most recent evaluation, 69 percent of superintendents responded that they received an “excellent” rating; and over 91 percent responded as being evaluated as “good” or better.

An effective evaluation process is beneficial for superintendents, and for school board members. Robinson and Bickers (1990) assert that an effective evaluation process for superintendents will result in:

1. Improved communication between the Board and superintendent;
2. Improved role clarification with the Board as a policy-making body, and the superintendent as the manager of the daily operations of the district;
3. Improved goal-setting by the Board; and
4. Greater alignment between Board-approved district goals and daily operations.

Districts that align key processes to district goals are more effective at improving student achievement (Archer, 2006). In this sense, a superintendent evaluation process that allows for alignment between board goals and efforts to improve student achievement can prove to be extremely valuable.
superintendent can act knowing that he/she is supported by publicly stated, board-established district goals, then the superintendent’s job satisfaction, longevity, and effectiveness can have the opportunity to improve.

Booth and Glaub (as cited in Robinson & Bickers, 1990) noted that researchers have divided the components that can lead to a superintendent’s eventual success into internal and external factors. Internal factors are individual traits that a superintendent possesses such as knowledge, work habits, the ability to handle stress and the ability to remain calm in times of crisis. Some external factors discussed are efficacy of district and school administrators, community support, funding, and the expectations of the school board. A well-designed evaluation process that clearly states the Board’s expectations and measures the extent the superintendent has worked to achieve those goals will enable the board to assess the superintendent’s performance.

An effective superintendent evaluation process will require the Board to establish clear district goals, guide the professional growth of the superintendent, define the Board’s expectations of the superintendent, clarify the roles of both parties, enhance communication between the board and superintendent, improve educational performance, and review the effectiveness of the district (Mayo & McCartney, 2004; DiPaola, 2007). An effective system can also provide the Board with data on which to base personnel decisions regarding the superintendent. Such decisions can include contract renewal, salary changes, or termination (Robinson & Bickers, 1990).
Despite the various reasons for superintendent evaluation, the most important function of the evaluation process is to enable the Board to guide and assess the performance of the superintendent. According to Hoyle, Bjork, Collier and Glass (2005), the superintendent has a direct impact on the overall performance of the school district. Hoyle et al., (2005) also stress that an effective superintendent can have a positive impact on teacher performance and thus, student achievement. Mayo and McCartney (2004) maintain that an effective evaluation process can assist the superintendent in the identification of weaknesses, so the superintendent can then improve and have a greater positive impact on the district.

Unfortunately, due to the current structure of public school governance, the evaluation process of the superintendent has great potential to become politically influenced (Costa, 2004; DiPaola, 2007; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Edington & Enger, 1992; Matthews, 2001; Mayo & McCartney, 2004; Mortensen, 2009; Opstad, 2010; Pitts, 2010; Rice, 2010; Robinson & Bickers, 1990; Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2003; Stuffelbeam, 1995; Sullivan, 2005). This claim is also supported by Glass (as cited in Mayo & McCartney, 2004) who notes that political motivations, not district results, appear to be the most frequent criteria for hiring and firing superintendents. Due to this unfortunate situation, a superintendent who is highly effective at improving a district can still easily be non-renewed by the board. An evaluation process that utilizes data rather than subjective measures and political motives can dramatically improve how superintendents are evaluated.
Characteristics of an Effective Superintendent Evaluation

Designing an effective superintendent evaluation process is a definite challenge. It is important to remember that an effective superintendent evaluation process should focus on clear goals, and provide performance standards tied to these goals. There should also be indicators for each performance standard which can be evaluated using data. Robinson & Bickers (1990) have also listed the following criteria as appearing consistently as elements of appropriate superintendent expectations:

1. Relationships with the School Board
2. Relations with District Staff
3. Community Relations
4. Student Management and Relations
5. Financial Management
6. Professional and Personal Characteristics
7. Achievement of District Goals
8. Instructional Leadership
9. Board Policy Implementation

DiPaola (2007) notes that an effective evaluation also needs to reduce subjectivity. An effective evaluation process must also meet legal and ethical requirements, provide the superintendent with clear feedback, serve in the best interest of the district, and produce reliable data (DiPaola, 2007).
It should be noted that an effective evaluation process should not necessarily protect superintendents from disagreements or even conflicts with their boards. In fact, the research indicates that job performance and longevity do not seem to be related (Glass, Bjork, Brunner, 2000). The data collected by Hoyle, et. al (2005) indicates that even though many superintendents receive positive evaluations, their districts pursue dismissal or contract buyout. In addition, the research indicates that most conflicts between boards and superintendents arise from financial management issues, community and political pressure, and unclear understandings of superintendent and board roles (Mortensen, 2009). An effective evaluation process can minimize these potential conflicts by clarifying roles, improving communication, and aligning Board-approved goals with the evaluation process.

Like Robinson & Bickers (1990), Costa (2004) has divided the evaluation process into distinct elements: procedures, policies, and products. Procedures describes the timelines in which the evaluation of the superintendent occurs and include specific events such as a pre-evaluation conference, any goal-setting that occurs, and the final meeting in which evaluation is performed. Timelines are an important element in the evaluation process, as they allow the superintendent time to enact strategies aimed at achieving board-approved goals. Setting and meeting a specific schedule for the evaluation process is critically important. Sharp, Malone, and Walter (2003) noted that the evaluation process is a time consuming process by nature, and a regular schedule to ensure that the process is followed faithfully and effectively is necessary.
Costa (2004) specifies that there should be a written policy for the superintendent’s evaluation. The process should include the specific procedures the board will follow in performing the evaluation, and all instruments, forms, or plans used in performing the evaluation. In addition, Costa (2004) points out that there should be a clear understanding of the products that pertain to the evaluation process. These products can include the superintendent’s job description, the superintendent’s contract, the board’s stated goals for the superintendent, if any exist, the improvement or strategic plans for the district, and the actual evaluation instruments. In most cases, several of these documents will exist in board policy and procedure manuals.

The research examined indicated that most local boards do evaluate their superintendent on an annual basis. Most state statutes that require this evaluation are fairly vague and leave specific details and procedures to the discretion of the local board. Some state school board organizations offer an evaluation process that meets state statutes. The Kentucky School Boards Association provides such a process (see Appendix F).

The problem with the evaluation methods used by most boards is that they are little more than generic checklists of job responsibilities that are aligned to the organization’s standards of the profession (DiPaola et al., 2003). Another issue is that several of these models do not offer a method for obtaining data for the board to consider in the evaluation process. Perhaps the most serious problem with these evaluation techniques is that they do not allow for incorporation of board-approved district goals for the superintendent to work to achieve. If an evaluation process
includes such a component, there are several potential advantages. First, the superintendent will better understand the expectations of his or her board. Secondly, if progress toward these approved goals can be measured, then the board will have data upon which to base its evaluation of the superintendent.

The evaluation of a superintendent is a challenging, ongoing process and remains more of an art than a science. Just as the needs of a district are unique so are the evaluation practices they will find most effective. DiPaola (2007) points out that district size, location, complexity, financial situation, and board-approved goals make using a standardized process problematic. Other issues that complicate the evaluation process are the competence of the board members conducting the evaluation and the possibility of members' biased attitudes or hidden agendas and motivations.

**Checklist completion.** There are many different types of procedures that can be utilized in the evaluation process of a superintendent. In many states, a checklist is completed by individual board members in isolation, followed by a closed session meeting in which the individual ratings are compiled and consensus is reached for each indicator on the checklist (Costa, 2004). After consensus is reached on these ratings, then the final document is then shared with the superintendent. There are many problems which render this process ineffective. In most cases, these ratings are based on informal board observations, and any vocal constituents that have communicated with board members (Bryant, 2001; Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; Costa, 2004; DiPaola, 2007; DiPaola & Stronge, 2001; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Edington & Enger, 1992; Glass, 1992; Matthews, 2001; Robinson & Bickers,
Unfortunately, any specific board-approved district goals are not incorporated into the evaluation process (Costa, 2004; Matthews, 2001; Mayo & McCartney, 2004; Opstad, 2010; Rice, 2010). By using checklists, the board members are limited to rating the superintendent’s performance on only the criteria listed on the checklist. Sometimes, a specific issue or progress toward board-approved goals may need to be incorporated into the evaluation process. Using checklists inhibits the inclusion of any these sporadic issues.

360-Degree assessments. Another way to generate data for the evaluation process of a superintendent is to utilize a 360-Degree assessment. A 360-Degree assessment is where individuals in the superintendent’s immediate work circle complete anonymous surveys about the superintendent’s performance. According to Atwater and Waldeman (1998), one obvious benefit of using a 360-Degree assessment process is to increase the superintendent’s self-awareness so that improvements can be made in how the superintendent relates to his/her coworkers. The 360-Degree assessment process uses multiple raters and can be obtained from different stakeholder groups. For example, the 360-Degree assessment process can also include staff, students, parents, and community members. The feedback generated by the 360-Degree assessment can enable the superintendent to better understand his/her strengths and weaknesses and make him/her more aware of how they are perceived by stakeholders. (Fleenor & Prince, 1997; Hazucha, Hezlett, & Schneider, 1993; Heathfield, 2001).
Although there are some definite advantages of using the 360-Degree assessment in the evaluation process for superintendents, there are also some legitimate areas of concern. For example, some participants in the 360-Degree assessment process may have limited knowledge of the daily challenges of a superintendent. For this reason, Heathfield (2001) and Hazucha, Hezlett, & Schneider (1993) believe the 360-Degree assessment should not be the only data considered by the Board in the evaluation of a superintendent. Heathfield (2001) goes on to argue for the integration of the 360-Degree assessment data into an evidence-based evaluation process that also utilizes other tools such as student achievement goals for the superintendent and financial goals for the district. Another disadvantage of using 360-Degree assessments is that individuals in the superintendent’s immediate work circle may have self-serving motives and may answer the survey questions in an inaccurate manner.

Recent trends. Mathews (2001) has found that some school boards are beginning to take the issue of superintendent evaluations more seriously and that there is a trend toward a thorough evaluation process. Matthews (2001) also found that there is a trend in superintendent evaluations to integrate student achievement, financial data, and progress made toward board approved goals. Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) have made similar assertions, stating in their findings that school boards are beginning to incorporate compliance with board policy, progress toward stated goals, and student achievement into the superintendent evaluation process.
Glass et al., (2000) have also reported that many superintendents still do not realize the value of the evaluation process.

Regardless of the specific process used to evaluate the superintendent, there seems to be a recent trend to incorporate the use of student achievement data and goals into the evaluation process of the superintendent. Sharp, Malone, and Walter (2003) report two states, Illinois and Texas, take this a step further and link superintendent compensation to student achievement. There currently appears to be little consistency in the use of student achievement data in the evaluation process of the superintendent. Sharp, Malone, and Walter (2003) have found that in some states, such as Arkansas, Arizona, and Kentucky, student achievement is only a minor consideration in the evaluation of the superintendent. Castallo, as cited in Sharp et al. (2003) believes the Board should allow the Superintendent to review instructional program results and “set achievement goals for the district based on local, state, and national assessments” (p.7).

The primary function of a school district is to educate children, so it seems logical that some measure of student achievement would be included in the evaluation of the superintendent (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Since each state utilizes different student assessments, the particular student achievement data used and the degree of improvement expected should be agreed upon by the Superintendent and the Board. This seems only appropriate considering the recent trend to incorporate student achievement data into the evaluations of teachers and principals in Kentucky. It is important to note that since a superintendent is responsible for many other district
functions such as appropriate stewardship of district finances, labor relations, and community engagement, there should be additional indicators of a superintendent’s performance considered in his or her evaluation.

Costa (2004) is in agreement with this line of thought, asserting that the superintendent’s evaluation should be revised to reflect the standards-based, high-accountability environment currently confronting public school districts. Costa further argues that in this age of accountability there is a need for superintendent evaluations to provide an accurate reflection of the success or failure of the district superintendent.

Significant efforts have been made to develop effective accountability models that incorporate student performance. Teacher and principal evaluation processes have begun to include student assessment data (Pitts, 2010). The methods of evaluating school district superintendents have changed very little for the past few decades. Due to the fact that the superintendent is essentially an independent contractor whose tenure in a district is guaranteed only to be the length of his or her contract, the superintendent is perhaps the most accountable professional in public education.

Kentucky is one of many states where an annual evaluation of the superintendent is required by state statute (Sharp, Malone, & Walter 2003). Robinson and Bickers (1990) note that the motivation for superintendent evaluation extends beyond meeting a state statute, but should focus on the potential benefits for superintendents and boards of education. If the superintendent evaluation process is
well-designed, then it will improve communication, clearly define roles and responsibilities, and aid in planning and goal-setting. It is possible for the superintendent evaluation process to enhance the performance of the entire district. The evaluation of the superintendent will also clarify the expectations of the board for the superintendent while also providing accountability for the superintendent's performance. An effective performance evaluation process will also substantiate any decisions the board makes regarding the contract or salary of the superintendent. Lastly, a well-designed evaluation process will identify any new district goals.

Conclusion

For many years, the issue of evaluating a superintendent has perplexed board members and made many superintendents both nervous and confused. The process being utilized in many districts is not effective for board members or superintendents. Board members receive very little training on how to perform an effective evaluation. It has been noted that, "Beyond these problems are the competence of the evaluator and the assumptions upon which the evaluations are based: Bias, and value judgments are embedded in superintendent evaluations."(Linn & Dunbar, 1986, p. 209). In addition, board members are expected to effectively evaluate an individual who is performing an incredibly complex task; doing much of the work behind closed doors (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

Most board members observe their superintendent once or twice a month during formal board meetings, with no observations made during the regular work day when the superintendent performs some of his/her most important work. While
there may be some informal conversations between Board meetings, these are often minimal and infrequent (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Yet, these individuals are expected to critique the superintendent's performance and provide suggestions for growth.

From a superintendent's perspective, the current processes are not beneficial or conducive to professional growth or the attainment of district goals. Superintendents, unlike all other public school educators, are not evaluated by fellow educators. Rather, they are evaluated by members of a Board of Education who have little, or no experience working in a school system, and usually even less knowledge about the daily demands placed upon a superintendent. In addition, a great deal of the superintendent's work takes place behind closed doors in individual meetings with other administrators, parents, or community members. The current process does not allow for a Board member to perform an informed evaluation of the superintendent. This problem is widespread and is procedural in nature (Bryant, 2001; Candoli, Cullen, & Stufflebeam, 1994; Costa, 2004; DiPaola, 2007; DiPaola & Stronge, 2001; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Edington & Enger, 1992; Glass, 1992; Matthews, 2001; Robinson & Bickers, 1990; Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2003; Stufflebeam, 1995; Wiggall, 2004).

The problem is not the individuals involved, but the nature of the process that is currently being used to evaluate superintendents. Boards of Education routinely complete evaluations on their respective superintendents using checklists that frequently list personal characteristics instead of quantifiable measures (Bryant, 2001;

Not only is there a high measure of consistency concerning the frequency of the evaluation of superintendents, the existing research has also produced similar findings in the methods used to evaluate superintendents. For example, Candoli, Cullen, and Stuffelbeam (1994) found that most boards use standard evaluation forms that consist of either rating scales or checklists and that these forms are first discussed in private, without the superintendent present, and then shared with the superintendent at a later date. Likewise, boards in Arkansas were found to evaluate their superintendents using checklists 76.2 percent of the time. (Edington, & Enger, 1992). Sharp, Malone, and Walter (2003) determined that superintendents in Indiana, Illinois, and Texas were also evaluated in writing using checklists. Wiggall (2004) found that, “the great majority (81 percent) of boards use either an evaluation instrument or some type of predetermined process to evaluate the performance of their superintendent.” (p. 3)

Just as there is consistency within the research on the frequency and methods used to evaluate superintendents, there is also a high degree of consistency in how superintendents were scored, or rated in their most recent evaluation. For example, Glass and Franceschini (2007) found that over 90 percent of superintendents indicated that they had received a rating of “excellent” or “good” on their most recent
evaluations. Likewise, Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) found that approximately 90 percent of current superintendents had been rated as either “excellent” or “good” in their last evaluations.

It is no surprise that since the vast majority of superintendents are receiving overwhelmingly positive evaluations, most superintendents indicate that they are currently very satisfied with how their evaluations are being conducted. For example, Wiggall (2004) found that, “Three quarters of the superintendents responding agreed that the board would be fair and unbiased in their appraisal of the superintendent’s performance.” (p. 3). Glass & Franceschini (2007) found that almost 90 percent of superintendents felt that they had been treated either very fairly or fairly during their last evaluations.

Based on the existing review of literature, the vast majority of superintendents are evaluated annually, receive overwhelmingly positive evaluations, and feel that they have been treated fairly in their districts’ evaluation processes. So, this begs the question, “Why is a new evaluation system needed for superintendents?” The answer to this question is that the dynamics of education in America have changed dramatically in recent years and are continuing to change at an ever-increasing rate. Accountability in the field of education has never been greater due to federal and state legislation.

In order to function effectively within this new environment of accountability, various systems employed in the field of education need to change as well. For example, the systems employed by states to evaluate teachers and principals are
currently being redesigned to incorporate student test scores, student growth, and the “voice” of students and parents through surveys. The teacher and principal evaluation systems are changing as a direct result of increased accountability for student and school success. Thus, the superintendent evaluation system should also change.

**Overview of the Capstone Project**

The goal of this capstone project was to develop a process to be used by local boards of education to evaluate their respective superintendents. This process included mechanisms that indicate progress toward board approved goals, indicate positive trends in student academic performance, demonstrate appropriate stewardship of district finances, and promote effective communication with the public.

In an age of ever-increasing accountability for public school educators, superintendents must be able to do more than just maintain good relationships with board members. Obviously, the vast majority of superintendents work very hard to accomplish more than just good relations with board members. However, as the literature points out, most superintendents and boards view the ability to maintain good relationships with board members as one of the primary reasons for positive evaluations of superintendents. In an era where taxpayers are expecting much more educational value for their tax dollars, superintendents must be able to have a more positive impact on student achievement than ever before. A new evaluation system that incorporates many of the aspects of a superintendent’s myriad of responsibilities
will enable superintendents to become more effective leaders for their districts by improving communication with the boards of education, clearly defining board and superintendent roles and responsibilities, and enhancing board and district improvement planning.
Chapter 3

Populations Impacted by this Study

Background

The 360-Degree assessment process was incorporated into the evaluation of the superintendent in Greenup County during the spring of 2010. This strategy was implemented after a new member to the Board of Education expressed concern about taking office on January 1st, and then being asked to complete the evaluation of the Superintendent just a few months later. The Board member, Mrs. Kelly Adkins, was also troubled by persistent rumors that the Superintendent spent hours playing games and looking at trucks on his computer during the school day. Mrs. Adkins was not alone in her concerns about the performance of the Superintendent; other Board members had similar concerns. She requested a source of data upon which to base the evaluation of the Superintendent. The 360-Degree assessment process is the result of this desire.

Following an initial meeting with Mrs. Adkins, the researcher contacted a leadership consultant working with the Greenup County School District, Mr. Phil Eason. Mr. Eason is a retired Superintendent and works with the Kentucky Association of School Administrators providing training for new and aspiring superintendents. Mr. Eason had started working with the GCSD as a result of some critical findings relating to a January 2009 Scholastic Audit performed by personnel from the Kentucky Department of Education. Mr. Eason introduced the researcher to
the 360-Degree assessment process. Throughout the next few months, we worked together to fine tune the initial questions and the process.

After the initial administration of the 360-Degree assessment took place, the survey results were provided to Mrs. Adkins. The results of the survey were very negative. As a result, the Board of Education asked the Board Attorney to conduct individual private interviews with some district administrators. This was done in an effort to provide additional information to corroborate with the survey data. Once the interviews were completed, the Board of Education and the Board Attorney met with the Superintendent. Shortly after this meeting, the Superintendent announced his retirement.

After the retirement announcement, the author continued to refine the 360-Degree assessment process with Mr. Eason. After a new superintendent was hired, the Greenup County Board of Education indicated its desire to continue using the 360-Degree assessment process each spring. While the process was initially implemented under less than ideal circumstances, it has proven to be a valuable tool to provide the Board of Education with feedback on the performance of the superintendent.

**Populations Impacted**

**Superintendent.** Obviously, the change in how the superintendent’s evaluation is performed will affect the superintendent in many ways. There will need to be an increased emphasis on pursuing the goals approved by the Board. While maintaining good relationships with members of the board are still important, this
should not be the basis of the evaluation of the superintendent. The superintendent will need to become comfortable with receiving direct feedback from those individuals supervised. While it is true that the individuals completing the survey questions do not have experience as a superintendent, it is necessary for the superintendent to recognize that the central office administrators and principals completing the survey do have meaningful feedback to provide. While it would be normal for a superintendent to be a little defensive when first receiving feedback on their performance from their subordinates, the superintendent should remain professional and accept that the central office administrators and principals are attempting to assist the board of education in gathering data.

In addition to becoming comfortable with receiving feedback from his or her subordinates, the superintendent must become comfortable engaging in conversations with board members concerning district goals. This has been one of the most significant benefits of using this process in the Greenup County School District. The act of determining district goals is critically important, and the Board and the Superintendent should arrive at these goals jointly. Once the district goals on which the superintendent will be evaluated are established, the superintendent must be proactive. The superintendent should enlist the aid of his or her central office staff to develop action plans to reach the district’s goals. Second, the superintendent should communicate these action plans to the board of education and solicit its input on the plans. The superintendent should also regularly update the board on progress made toward addressing the district goals. In Greenup County, while the Board has
established goals, the current Superintendent has chosen not to submit formal action plans to the Board for their review. He has indicated to this research that he does not think that it is necessary to develop the specific action plans, or share regular updates with the Board.

The superintendent should also recognize that this process provides definite measures upon which the evaluation will be based. This is a marked advantage over the current situation in which many superintendents find themselves. By engaging in a dialog with his/her board members, the superintendent has the ability to influence the goals the board will set for the district. In addition, the superintendent has the advantage of gauging the board’s level of satisfaction with his/her performance through the sharing of the action plans and on the regular updates on progress toward the board approved goals.

District administrators. The administrators in the district must take care to act in an honest, ethical manner while participating in this process. Undoubtedly, there is the opportunity for district administrators to “take cheap shots” at the superintendent through the 360-Degree assessment process. However, district administrators should take care to answer the survey questions in an honest manner. In addition, if asked by the superintendent to help develop strategies intended to achieve the board-approved district goals, district administrators should behave in an ethical manner and provide the district with their best efforts.
Board members. Board members must trust this process and forgo preconceived notions regarding the evaluation of the superintendent. This process empowers the board members to work with the superintendent to set goals for the district. Board members should provide meaningful feedback to the superintendent when the progress reports are given. This on-going dialog is critical to making the evaluation of the superintendent a process of continuous improvement rather than a singular annual event. When board members express their satisfaction or dissatisfaction when progress reports are given, then adjustments to the action plans can be made by the superintendent. In this process, it is critical that Board members focus on the goals set for the district and not let unhappy constituents cloud their impressions of the performance of the superintendent.

Faculty members. This process can result in an increased sense of organizational integrity. Through the adoption of a well-defined process for the superintendent’s evaluation, faculty members will likely better understand how and why certain events occur in the district. By publicly communicating the action plans aimed at achieving district goals, faculty members will better understand happenings in the district. The Board and Superintendent can address the common perception that local politics influence the evaluation and retention of the superintendent with the 360-Degree assessment process.

On the advent of the new teacher and principal evaluation processes that incorporate new measures of effectiveness, such as surveys and student achievement, the practice of using the 360-Degree assessment can assure faculty members that
some of the same measures to evaluate their effectiveness are also used to evaluate the Superintendent. In particular, the inclusion of student achievement measures within the board-approved district goals will help communicate to the faculty members of the district that student learning is the number one priority of the district. This will also send a strong message to faculty members that everyone in the district is accountable for student achievement.

**Community.** Some of the same advantages this process presents for faculty members can be realized by the community. First, by publicly communicating the process used to evaluate the superintendent, the community can be better informed about a key function of the board of education. This will also enable the community to better understand the roles of the board and superintendent, and reduce the perception that “local politics” heavily influence the actions of the senior leadership of the school district. If there is a greater degree of faith in the organizational integrity of the school district, then increased parents and community satisfaction with the school district is a reasonable expectation (Waters & Marzano, 2006).

**Students.** It is reasonable to expect that most of the board approved district goals should deal with student achievement. Thus, there is likely to be a greater emphasis on improving student achievement in the district. In Greenup County, the Board did not initially stress student achievement in their goals for the district. The Board only specified that it wanted to see a positive trend in student achievement data. Ideally, goals relating to student achievement should be more specific. There should be goals for overall proficiency, achievement gaps reduction, graduation rates,
and college and career readiness. With a greater degree of cohesiveness in the superintendent evaluation process and the accompanying improved communication between the board and the superintendent, increased longevity by the superintendent is likely to occur. This will also improve the learning environment in the district (Bryant, 2001; Sullivan, 2005).

**Longevity of this Process**

Currently, the longevity of the superintendent evaluation system is dependent upon the desire of the board of education and the superintendent to continue its use. Even though this process is currently in use in some other districts in Kentucky (Glasgow Independent, Russellville Independent, Russell Independent), there is no current board policy in Greenup County mandating its use. However, in the next few months, it is likely that Board Policy 2.14 (Appendix G) will be revised in Greenup County to mandate this process. By revising the board policy, there will be a greater degree of longevity despite turnover on the Board of Education and with the Superintendent.

**Internal and External Factors that Impact this Study**

**The researcher’s role in the school district.** The researcher is a central office administrator in the Greenup County School District with one area of responsibility focusing on certified evaluations. This responsibility requires providing certified evaluation training to the other administrators in the Greenup County School District, including ensuring that building principals adhere to the district’s current approved certified evaluation plan. In addition, I update our district
administrators on the changes taking place in Kentucky with teacher and principal evaluations with the new “Professional Growth and Evaluation System” currently being piloted in several school districts.

Steps to ensure integrity of the process. The role of the researcher was to draft questions that align with the Board approved district goals, administer the surveys after our Board Chairperson approves the final questions, and to report the results to the Board of Education. All crucial decisions, such as the approval of district goals, the selection of the final survey questions, and the interpretation of the survey results were performed by the Board of Education. While I helped incorporate this process into the evaluation of the Superintendent, all critical steps were performed by others. This allowed me to maintain a professional relationship with the Superintendent, while meeting my professional obligations as they relate to his evaluation.

The process is dependent upon the integrity of those who participate in it. However, the same is true of any evaluation process in the field of education. Because this process generated and was dependent upon data, it enabled those involved to be more objective and less subjective. The Superintendent has chosen to embrace portions of this process and the advantages it offers. Through the survey data, the Superintendent has been able to clearly understand how his leadership decisions are viewed by his subordinates. For example, the survey data indicated that the superintendent did not regularly inform all administrators about important events in the district. This indicated that more thorough communication may be needed
from the Superintendent. As a result, he has been able to learn from the data this process generates and has been able to develop his leadership style as a result. Our current Superintendent has also been able to gain a clear understanding of what the Board expects from him in terms of leadership style and the pursuit of district goals.

Opportunities and challenges. This process was first developed in the Greenup County School District during the winter and spring of 2009-2010. Once the results of the initial survey were presented to the Board of Education, the Superintendent decided to retire instead of facing possible termination by the Board. So, the first experiences of those involved in this process were problematic and stressful. The primary point that was recognized by those involved was that the problem was not with the process, it was with the individual guiding our district. The process simply revealed how ineffective the Superintendent was at that time.

During the three years since the first administration of this process, the Board and the current Superintendent have enjoyed increased communication and role clarification. This has enabled our district to move toward achieving district goals and improving our level of organizational integrity. This is despite some issues that have had to be addressed. The Superintendent was defensive when the results of the first survey were shared with him. He has since recognized the value of this process and embraced the feedback from his fellow administrators and is grateful that the Board bases his evaluation on this data rather than rumors from their respective constituents. In addition, some administrators initially used the survey as a means to “take cheap shots” at the Superintendent. This was addressed by our Board Chair,
who made it very clear that the surveys were to be taken seriously and were intended to provide the Board with clear data on progress made toward Board approved goals.

The Superintendent and Board of Education Chairperson are so confident in this process that they co-presented a session with the author at the annual Kentucky Association of School Administrators Conference in July 2012 and again in February 2013 at the Kentucky School Boards Association Conference (Adkins, Baker, & Hall, 2012; Adkins, Baker, & Hall, 2013).
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Implementation Strategies

The Greenup County School District first began using the 360-Degree assessment process to provide perception data to the Board of Education during the spring of 2010. This strategy was implemented after a new member on the Board of Education expressed concern about the performance and effectiveness of the Superintendent. In addition, the board member was hesitant to provide feedback on the performance of the Superintendent after serving as a Board member for only a few months. The Board member, Mrs. Kelly Adkins, wanted a means to obtain data upon which to base the evaluation of the Superintendent.

The first time the 360-Degree assessment process was used, the survey questions were of a general nature and focused primarily on communication and leadership (Appendix H). Those who report directly to the Superintendent answered the survey questions in an anonymous fashion. The Greenup County School District used the online application “Survey Monkey” to complete this task. Following an initial training session for all administrators participating in the process, those individuals completing the survey received an e-mail from the individual at central office responsible for certified evaluations, the author. This e-mail explained the process and contained a link to the survey. Individuals were given a period of one week to complete the survey.

Once the window for completing the surveys closed, the results were sent via email to the Chairperson of the Board of Education (Appendix I). The Chairperson
then shared these results with the other Board members in closed session and a
general discussion of the results took place. This stage of the process occurred in
May. The Board also considered some mismanagement issues relating to district
finances and completed all required evaluation forms. It is important to note, that at
this time all evaluation forms are considered to be preliminary and are subject to
modification, and are not subject to open records requests

During the initial attempt to use this evaluation process, the Superintendent
chose to resign after the survey results were shared with him. Normally, after sharing
the survey results with the Superintendent, there should be a discussion between the
Board and the Superintendent about the results and new goals for the district. Once
the Board and Superintendent reached consensus on the ratings and goals, the
required forms are finalized and a narrative “performance review” was added to the
evaluation, which specified the board approved goals for the Superintendent
(Appendix J). At the regular board of education meeting in June, the final evaluation
of the superintendent is shared in open meeting as required in KRS 156.557.

In the weeks following the performance review, the superintendent should
enlist the aid of his district office staff to draft action plans that are intended to
achieve the goals set forth in the evaluation. These action plans should be shared
with the board at either the July or August meeting. At this time, the board has the
opportunity to provide input and share ideas about the action plans. The
superintendent should then update the board at regular intervals on the progress being
made toward the board approved goals contained in the performance review.
The following spring, the 360-Degree assessment is administered for a second time. However, the questions for this administration are written to assess the degree to which the superintendent has achieved or made progress toward the board approved goals for the district (Appendix K). These questions are written by the central office administrator who is responsible for certified evaluations. These questions are aligned with the American Association of School Administrator's standards for the superintendency (Appendix B). These new questions are sent to the board chairperson via e-mail, and then he or she chooses which questions to use. The board chairperson also has the ability to use some of the general questions that focus on communication and leadership from the first administration of the 360-Degree assessment. Once the survey questions are approved by the board chairperson, the 360-Degree assessment is administered and the process repeats itself on an annual basis (see Figure 1). Thus, the evaluation of the superintendent is a process of continuous improvement and not an isolated annual event.

Figure 1. 360-Degree Assessment Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late April-Early May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those that report directly to the Superintendent complete anonymous surveys that pertain to the Superintendent’s communication and leadership abilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid-May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Board of Education uses the data from the 360-Degree assessment to construct a preliminary evaluation of the Superintendent. At this point the Board members also begin preliminary discussions about long-term goals for the district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Late-May-Early June
The Board of Education meets with the Superintendent sharing the results of the 360-Degree assessment giving him/her a chance to comment on the results. The Board also shares its preliminary ratings with the Superintendent at this time. A discussion also takes place concerning the long-term goals for the district with the superintendent giving input.

June
The Board of Education formally delivers the evaluation of the Superintendent in open session along with the agreed upon long-term goals for the district.

July
The Superintendent enlists the aide of district level administrators and creates action plans aimed at achieving the board-approved district goals.

August
The Superintendent shares the action plans with the Board of Education, giving the members opportunity for comments and suggestions.

September-April
The Superintendent provides regular updates to the Board of Education as appropriate during the next several months.

Early April
The following spring, new questions are written for the 360-Degree assessment, which are aligned to the board approved district goals and AASA's standards for the superintendency.

Late April
The Board Chairperson approves the second set of questions and decides which, if any, questions from the previous administration of the 360-Degree assessment to include.
The 360-Degree assessment is administered and the process repeats.

Training

Districts interested in incorporating the 360-Degree assessment into their current superintendent evaluation process will need to be trained. The training needs to include the rationale for using the 360-Degree assessment, a clear description of the process, and the benefits of using it. As a portion of this capstone project, a presentation was developed that can be used with boards of education, superintendents, and district administrators (Appendix L).

Any individual providing this training should possess experience or expertise in district governance issues. In particular, the trainer should have sufficient knowledge of student achievement terminology and finance issues to provide the board with appropriate training. Such personnel could include, but are not limited to, former superintendents, former or current board members, or university personnel. A few of the advantages of this process are that it is fairly simple and easy to conduct, and there is also minimal training that is required for those using it.

Problems with Implementation

While this process was certainly created under less than ideal circumstances, it has proven to be a valuable tool for districts that have chosen to utilize it. The first time the 360-Degree assessment was utilized, however, there were some problems. There was apprehension from some administrators who feared that their responses
would become public knowledge. However, after using this process for three years, district administrators have grown substantially more comfortable participating in this process.

The process was designed to capitalize on the talents of the central office staff and to provide regular updates for the board. However, the current Superintendent in Greenup County has chosen not to fully implement the entire process. He does not write the formal action plans nor does he update the Board on a regular basis. He has indicated to the researcher that he does not feel those steps are necessary.

In the years following the initial implementation of the 360-Degree assessment, it has become apparent that additional training may be needed for the Board. Specifically, the details and wording of different academic measures may need to be clarified. For example, the difference between achievement gap reduction goals and overall proficiency rates may need to be explained to board members. This will enable the Board to write more appropriate goals for the Superintendent.
Chapter 5

Impact on the District

This process has had a definite positive impact on the Greenup County School District. In the spring of 2010, a new Board member requested a meeting with this researcher to discuss the process used for the evaluation of the Superintendent. She was confused about how to offer meaningful feedback to the superintendent after having only been a Board member for three months. She also indicated that all Board members had received complaints from district employees and community members concerning the Superintendent. Following this meeting and after some collaboration with Phil Eason of Leadership Strategies, a group working with the district leadership team, the 360-Degree assessment process was proposed to our Board. Draft questions were written by the author and were approved by our Board. The survey was administered in the spring of 2010. Upon receiving the results, our Board Chairperson and Board Attorney chose to conduct follow-up interviews with some respondents to corroborate the survey results because the results were overwhelmingly negative. Following some private discussions with the Board and the Board attorney, the superintendent chose to resign.

A new Superintendent was hired in August of 2010. The superintendent knew when he was hired that the 360-Degree assessment process would continue to be used to generate data for his evaluation. This data collection process has been used consistently on an annual basis since 2010 and has empowered our Board to set direction for our district. This process has also guided the work of the
Superintendent. Our Board has expressed a strong commitment to the 360-Degree assessment process (Appendix M).

**Superintendent**

Obviously, this process affects the Superintendent more than anyone else in the district. The first time this process was used, the Superintendent chose to resign. However, the current Superintendent recognizes the value of this process and takes advantage of the opportunities it offers him to follow the direction set by the Board. The current superintendent has followed the directives set by the Board in his performance review. Along with honest, transparent communication, the 360-Degree assessment process has enabled the Superintendent to maintain a positive working relationship with the Board of Education.

**Central Office Administrators**

By knowing that the Board has approved a series of goals for the district, our central office administrators have a clear understanding of why the Superintendent is doing certain things. The central office administrators also have a greater sense of accountability in assisting the Superintendent to reach the district goals adopted by the Board. By working closely with the Superintendent, the central office staff has enjoyed a closer working relationship with each other and with the Superintendent. This process has not only solidified the Board-Superintendent team, it has also solidified the central office team.
Principals

Like the central office administrators, the principals of our district also have a clear understanding of why the Superintendent is stressing certain things. For example, if the Superintendent is especially concerned about financial issues, then principals should be aware that this may be due to a specific contingency fund balance the Board has established as a district goal. By knowing the direction that has been set by the Board through its approved goals, principals are better able to lead their buildings and School Based Councils to support the work of the district. As with the Board-Superintendent team, this process has helped to strengthen the ties between the district schools. The principals understand that they are all on the same team, working toward a set of Board approved goals.

Board of Education

The Board member that first expressed concerns about the performance of the superintendent in the spring of 2010 is now the Chairperson of our Board of Education. As she has indicated, (Appendix M) our Board recognizes the value of the 360-Degree assessment process. Specifically, our Board realizes that this process has empowered them to set specific direction for the district through the establishment and approval of district goals.

The belief in the process is perhaps best portrayed by the increasing use of the 360-Degree assessment process to other individuals in the Greenup County School District. Our Board has asked district administrators to complete 360-Degree
assessment surveys about their work. Our Board received these results in the fall of 2011 and has changed some meeting procedures as a result.

In addition, our Board endorsed the use of 360-Degree assessments for new teachers in our district. During the fall of 2011, the students of all teachers in our district with less than two years of experience were surveyed about the learning climate in their class. These survey results were given to the respective principals who reviewed the results and drafted growth plans with the teachers.

Finally, in the fall of 2012, with the support of the Board of Education, 360-Degree assessments were administered for central office administrators and building principals. Principals answered anonymous survey questions about the support they had received from the central office staff. Likewise, teachers in our district answered survey questions about the support they had received from their building principals. The superintendent then used this data to write growth plans for all central office administrators and principals.

District Employees

The employees of our school district have been informed of the 360-Degree assessment process several times through district newsletters and e-mails. In addition, district employees have been informed through the district newsletter each time this process has expanded to include the Board, new teachers, and all other administrators in the district. Our employees understand that this is simply a process to generate feedback in an effort to improve performance.
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Findings and Conclusions

School boards have many responsibilities, but the two most critical tasks boards have are to hire and evaluate their superintendents (Hess, 2002; Sullivan, 2005). It is evident from the research reviewed that boards are faithful in performing an annual evaluation of the superintendents (Hess, 2002; Candoli, Cullen, & Stuffelbeam, 1994; Glass & Franceschini, 2007). The problem is that these evaluations are annual events rather than processes of continuous improvement (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005; Mortensen, 2009; Opstad, 2010; Rice, 2010). In addition, the processes used by boards does not allow for the integration of meaningful data or board approved goals and is essentially a checklist of personal qualities rather than an indication of the overall effectiveness of the superintendent (Sackos, 2009; Sharp, Malone, & Walter, 2003; Stuffelbeam, 1994).

The current superintendent evaluation processes are annual events characterized by a lack of data, and political pressure by constituents. Without specific guidance by state legislatures, districts have been allowed to continue using the same ineffective processes for several decades. These issues are each at least partially due to the ambiguity of the state statutes that require an annual evaluation of the superintendent. In Kentucky, KRS 156.557 describes in detail different aspects of evaluation of all certified educators. The vast majority of this statute focuses on:

1. The criteria of evaluation;
2. Certified evaluation appeals; and
3. Kentucky Department of Education reviews of local evaluation systems.

While this statute also requires an annual evaluation of the superintendent, this subsection is fairly vague and leaves many important decisions at the discretion of the local board of education (KRS 156.557). In fact, this statute is so incomplete it does not even require that the annual evaluation of the superintendent be performed in writing (KRS 156.557).

The current processes employed by districts to evaluate their superintendents are not effective. This is due to several factors. First and foremost, the state legislature has failed to draft legislation that requires local boards to develop a process for evaluating their superintendents which is more comprehensive and is a continuous process rather than a stand-alone event. In addition, the current statute should require regular training for boards of education to perform evaluations of their respective superintendents. The statute that outlines the process for hiring a superintendent is well-defined and requires specific training for the screening committee. There should be a similar training for boards dealing with the evaluation of superintendents.

Secondly, the Kentucky School Boards Association (KSBA) has failed to devote sufficient resources and time to the topic of superintendent evaluations. While this organization does provide training to boards upon request, this is not widely publicized. KSBA does publish a resource for boards to use in evaluating their superintendents. However, this resource provides no mechanism for data collection (Appendix F). An examination of this organization’s website reveals topics that are
best-suited for district and school administrators such as anti-bullying programs, reading programs, and so forth. Very little is found in the way of training for boards in the evaluation of the superintendent. There are significant resources available for boards to utilize when they are performing a search for their next superintendents. Similar resources should be available for superintendent evaluations.

Third, most local boards have failed to pursue more effective methods for evaluating their superintendents (DiPaola et al., 2003). In their myriad of responsibilities, it is understandable that local board members would simply follow the same process that has always been used in their district with little thought given to improving the process. Most board members have never been certified educators and fewer have been administrators. It is understandable that they would simply use the same process to evaluate the superintendent as previous board members. However, boards could benefit and expect better leadership from the state legislature and the state’s School Board Association.

The fourth area of responsibility lies with local superintendents. Since the procedures and forms utilized in the current evaluation process focus primarily on personal qualities, it can be deduced that superintendents have relied on their personal relationships with their boards to ensure positive evaluations. During the development of the new Professional Growth and Effectiveness System in Kentucky, superintendents have applauded the incorporation of student achievement data and student and parent input in teacher and principal evaluation processes (Reform Support Network, 2011). However, superintendents have not lobbied for the use of
similar data into their evaluation processes. The current state statute in Kentucky does not prohibit this practice; indeed this is one of the benefits of this statute being so ambiguous. Thus, one can surmise that superintendents are satisfied with the status quo. One can also assume that state legislators have also been satisfied with the status quo, since no legislation regarding superintendent evaluations has been introduced.

However, it appears that there is a trend in Kentucky toward modifying the way that superintendents are evaluated. The current evaluation process for superintendents has also been addressed by the Commission of Education in Kentucky. In his remarks at the Kentucky School Board conference in February 2013, Commissioner Terry Holiday announced his desire to have every district in Kentucky submit specific plans to his office for the evaluation of superintendents by December 2013. Commissioner Holiday also commented that there would be requirements for the processes submitted by districts to contain measures of student achievement that would be considered in the evaluation of superintendents.

Lessons Learned

This capstone project sought to develop and pilot a new process for gathering data on the performance of the superintendent. The 360-Degree assessment provides the board with anonymous survey data to indicate progress made toward board approved goals. This process seems to be beneficial. This is indicated by the increasingly close working relationship between the Board, Superintendent, and administrators in the Greenup County School District. There is still certainly room
for refinement and improvement. The following are suggestions for those interested in incorporating this process into the superintendent evaluation process in their districts:

1. There should be an initial training for the board and the superintendent that provides an overview of the process (see Figure 1) and the importance of setting appropriate and measurable goals for the superintendent.

2. The adoption of the district goals by the board should not occur without significant input from the superintendent and a close examination of district data. This data should include not only 360-Degree assessment data, but also student achievement data. In particular, these goals should be very specific and should include measurable objectives for college and career readiness, achievement gap reductions, and overall rates of proficiency.

3. There should be training for the district administrators that will be completing the surveys. In this training there should be an emphasis on describing the process, answering the survey questions honestly, and being assured of their anonymity.

4. Once the specific district goals are adopted by the board, these goals should be communicated to district employees, students, parents, community members, and all other stakeholder groups. This communication should occur through the use of district newsletters, web pages, e-mails, and meetings.
5. The superintendent should work with the central office staff to write plans for achieving the district's goals. These action plans should then be shared with the board and modified as necessary following feedback from the board. The board should also be provided with updates on the action plans, and progress toward the goals at regular intervals.

Advantages for the Board

It is understood that the role of the board is to set priorities and direction for the district. This process incorporates a formal way for the board to do this. By adopting annual district goals, the board is setting priorities for the district and is also giving the superintendent a "to do list". This greatly enhances communication between the board and the superintendent, eliminates any misunderstandings about board or district priorities, and provides the public with evidence that the board is actively promoting district improvement. Thus, this process empowers the board to fulfill its primary function.

Advantages for the Superintendent

While it is understandable that some superintendents may be less than enthusiastic about having their subordinates answer anonymous survey questions about them, once they become more familiar with all components of this evaluation process they are likely to embrace this evaluation process. The superintendent will also better understand how this evaluation process insulates them against "cheap shots" from administrators and community members. Through the collaborative goal setting process with the board, the superintendent has the ability to influence the
district goals that the board establishes. Through the collaborative adoption of district goals, the superintendent has input into the objectives upon which he or she will be judged. Superintendents do not currently enjoy this advantage.

By writing and then sharing action plans for achieving the district's goals with the Board, the Superintendent is able to obtain feedback on the methods they are using. Not only does the Superintendent enjoy the advantage of influencing the goals established by the Board, he or she will also benefit from the feedback the Board provides on the action plans. By doing so, the Superintendent is receiving a type of board endorsement of not only the goals they are pursuing but also the methods they are using to achieve those goals. The Superintendent is also able to provide the Board with updates on the progress toward meeting the stated district goals. Each of these measures provides the Superintendent with degrees of security and protects against responses from disgruntled administrators on the 360-Degree assessment. Through pursuing the goals established by the Board, and by soliciting feedback from the Board on the action plans, the Superintendent has the ability to get a preview of the Board's opinion of his or her work. This will enable the Superintendent to gauge the feelings of the Board several times throughout the year instead of waiting on a singular annual evaluation. This allows the Superintendent to make potential modifications to his/her action plans based on Board input prior to the Superintendent's evaluation.
Recommendations to Others

Prior to using this process, boards would be well-served to understand why it is an improvement over the process they have been using. They must appreciate the shortcomings of their current processes. They should have a clear understanding of how this process will empower them to set new direction for their districts. Boards should also be aware that an occasional disgruntled employee will attempt to sabotage the process by answering the 360-Degree assessment survey questions in a way to reflect negatively on the superintendent. However, this is relatively easy to determine, especially if the negative answers are outliers.

Following a presentation at the Kentucky Association of School Administrators Conference in July 2012, the author was invited to conduct a similar presentation at the Kentucky School Boards Association annual conference by the KSBA Assistant Director, David Baird. After conducting a presentation at the KSBA conference in February 2013, the author was invited to provide training on the 360-Degree assessment process by Board members from the following school districts: Beechwood Independent, Clark County, Mason County, Powell County, Somerset Independent, and Walton-Verona Independent. The author is currently working with Phil Eason of Leadership Strategies to provide this training in conjunction with the Kentucky Association of School Administrators.

The evaluation process for superintendents has also been recognized by the Commission of Education in Kentucky. In his remarks at the Kentucky School Boards conference in February 2013, Commissioner Terry Holiday referred to the
“ground breaking work” KASA is conducting regarding superintendent evaluations. Commissioner Holiday also referred to the 360-Degree assessment process during a joint statement with State Auditor Adam Edelen on March 14th, 2013. In this statement, Commissioner Holiday, and Mr. Edelen called for increased transparency in the compensation and evaluation of superintendents following highly-publicized scandals in Dayton Independent and Mason County.

Limitations of the Study

The primary limitation of this capstone is the manner in which it was conceived. Following numerous complaints from several individuals about the performance of the current Superintendent, a new Board member requested a process to gather data in an effort to substantiate or refute these complaints. Since this researcher is responsible for certified evaluations in the district and because of a long-standing friendship with the Board member, this researcher was tasked with developing a new process. This process was implemented in an effort to closely examine the performance of a Superintendent whose effort was suspect. In the years that have followed, the 360-Degree assessment process has been refined to improve communication between the Board and Superintendent, and to ultimately provide the Superintendent with a level of security in his or her position.

Another issue is that while the primary components of this capstone were implemented, not all components were implemented as designed. The Board did approve district goals, and the 360-Degree assessment questions were written to align with these goals. The 360-Degree assessment surveys have been administered a total
of three times with two different Superintendents. However, neither Superintendent
has chosen to write action plans to share with the Board. Likewise, neither
Superintendent has chosen to provide formal updates on progress toward these Board
approved goals. The current Superintendent does not feel that it is necessary to
provide the Board with these regular updates.

Implications for Practice

The superintendent evaluation process will empower boards of education to
perform two of their functions, to evaluate superintendents and to set direction for
districts. Once the board approves goals for the district, it is then the primary
responsibility of the superintendent to determine how to best achieve those goals.
This is not to say that there can be some dialog between the board and the
superintendent about how to best pursue the district’s goals. As the individual who
manages the district on a daily basis and as the professional educator, it is the
responsibility of the superintendent to determine how best to achieve the board
approved goals. This process allows the board to have input on the action plans, but
it is ultimately the duty of the superintendent. In this sense, a greater degree of
organizational integrity can be achieved by using this process to evaluate the
superintendent.

The Board approves the goals after getting input from the Superintendent.
The Superintendent designs and implements the action plans after getting input from
the Board. So, the Board sets the goals for the district and the Superintendent
determines how to best achieve those goals. This goal setting and action plan
component simultaneously makes the board of education and superintendent a cohesive team. It also reinforces the organizational integrity of the district. This is accomplished by the Board and Superintendent each having input on the primary function of the other while each entity retains its final authority.

In order for this capstone to be considered truly successful, the process described in this document needs to be formally adopted by the Board of Education.

Discussions are now underway for this to occur. The goal is for the Board of Education to incorporate this process into the policy pertaining to the evaluation of the superintendent (2.14). This should occur in the late spring, or early summer of 2013.

Another way for this project to be successful is for other districts to begin using the 360-Degree assessment process. This is already happening. Phil Eason of Leadership Strategies has collaborated with several districts as they implement this evaluation process. After recent presentations at professional conferences, board members from other districts have contacted this researcher. These districts include Beechwood Independent, Clark County, Mason County, Powell County, Somerset Independent, and Walton-Verona Independent.

While formal adoption and widespread use of this evaluation process is an indication of the success of this project, the ultimate measure of the success of this project will be increased student achievement. Marzano and Waters (2006) found that district leadership can have a positive impact on student achievement. This evaluation process provides a degree of alignment between the ultimate goals of the
school district, student achievement, and the evaluation of the superintendent. During
the past few decades the public demand for improvements in America's educational
system has increased. There is increasing accountability for teachers and principals
with their evaluations being linked to student achievement. The evaluation of the
superintendent should also be based on more than just political skill. There should be
a specific evaluation process in place for the superintendent which generates data and
is aligned with larger district goals. This project provides such a process.
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Appendix A

160.290 General powers and duties of board.

(1) Each board of education shall have general control and management of the public schools in its district and may establish schools and provide for courses and other services as it deems necessary for the promotion of education and the general health and welfare of pupils, consistent with the administrative regulations of the Kentucky Board of Education. Each board shall have control and management of all school funds and all public school property of its district and may use its funds and property to promote public education. Each board shall exercise generally all powers prescribed by law in the administration of its public school system, appoint the superintendent of schools, and fix the compensation of employees.

(2) Each board shall make and adopt, and may amend or repeal, rules, regulations, and bylaws for its meetings and proceedings for the management of the schools and school property of the district, for the transaction of its business, and for the qualification and duties of employees and the conduct of pupils. The rules, regulations, and bylaws made by a board of education shall be consistent with the general school laws of the state and shall be binding on the board of education and parties dealing with it until amended or repealed by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the board. The rules, regulations, and bylaws shall be spread on the minutes of the board and be open to the public. The rules, regulations, and bylaws may include the use of reverse auctions as defined in KRS 45A.070 in the procurement of goods and leases.

(3) Local boards of education electing to enter into agreements pursuant to the Interlocal Cooperation Act, KRS 65.210 to 65.300, with other local boards of education to establish consortia to provide services in accordance with the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990, 1990 Ky. Acts Ch. 476, may transfer real or personal property to the consortia without receiving fair market value compensation. The joint or cooperative action may employ employees transferred from employment of a local board of education, and the employees shall retain their eligibility for the Kentucky Teachers' Retirement System. The chief state school officer, under administrative regulations of the Kentucky Board of Education, may allot funding to an interlocal cooperative board created by two (2) or more local school districts pursuant to KRS 65.210 to 65.300 to provide educational services for the mutual advantage of the students in the representative districts. All statutes and administrative regulations that apply to the use of these funds in local school districts shall also apply to cooperative boards.

Effective: July 15, 2010
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American Association of School Administrators Standards for the Superintendency

Standard 1: Leadership and District Culture

Demonstrate executive leadership by developing a collective district vision; shape school culture and climate; provide purpose and direction for individuals and groups; demonstrate an understanding of international issues affecting education; formulate strategic plans, goals, and change efforts with staff and community; set priorities in the context of community, student and staff needs; serve as an articulate spokesperson for the welfare of all students in a multicultural context.

Standard 2: Policy and Governance

Develop procedures for working with the board of education that define mutual expectations, working relationships and strategies for formulating district policy for external and internal programs; adjust local policy to state and federal requirements and constitutional provisions, standards and regulatory applications; recognize and apply standards involving civil and criminal liabilities.

Standard 3: Communications and Community Relations

Articulate district purpose and priorities to the community and mass media; request and respond to community feedback; and demonstrate consensus building and conflict mediation. Identify, track, and deal with issues. Formulate and carry out plans for internal and external communications. Exhibit an understanding of school districts as political systems by applying communication skills to strengthen community support; align constituencies in support of district priorities; build coalitions to gain financial and programmatic support; formulate democratic strategies for referenda; relate political initiatives to the welfare of children.

Standard 4: Organizational Management

Exhibit an understanding of the school district as a system by defining processes for gathering, analyzing, and using data for decision making; manage the data flow; frame and solve problems; frame, develop priorities, and formulate solutions; assist others to form reasoned opinions; reach logical conclusions and make quality decisions to meet internal and external customer expectations; plan and schedule personal and organization work; establish procedures to regulate activities and projects; delegate and empower at appropriate organizational levels; secure and
allocate human and material resources; develop and manage the district budget; maintain accurate fiscal records.
Standard 5: Curriculum Planning and Development

Design curriculum and a strategic plan that enhance teaching and learning in multiple contexts; provide planning and future methods to anticipate occupational trends and their educational implications; identify taxonomies of instructional objectives and validation procedures for curricular units, using theories of cognitive development; align and sequence curriculum; use valid and reliable performance indicators and testing procedures to measure performance outcomes; and describe the proper use of computers and other learning and information technologies.

Standard 6: Instructional Management

Exhibit knowledge of instructional management by implementing a system that includes research findings on learning and instructional strategies, instructional time, advanced electronic technologies, and resources to maximize student outcomes; describe and apply research and best practice on integrating curriculum and resources for multicultural sensitivity and assessment strategies to help all students achieve at high levels.

Standard 7: Human Resources Management

Develop a staff evaluation and development system to improve the performance of all staff members; select appropriate models for supervision based on adult motivation research; identify alternative employee benefits packages; and describe and apply the legal requirements for personnel selection, development, retention, and dismissal.

Standard 8: Values and Ethics of Leadership

Understand and model appropriate value systems, ethics and moral leadership; know the role of education in a democratic society; exhibit multicultural and ethnic understanding and related behavior; adapt educational programming to the needs of diverse constituencies; balance complex community demands in the best interest of the student; scan and monitor the environment for opportunities for staff and students; respond in an ethical and skillful way to the electronic and printed news media; and coordinate social agencies and human services to help each student grow and develop as a caring, informed citizen.
Appendix C

National School Boards Association
Standards for the Superintendency

Standard 1: LEADERSHIP AND DISTRICT CULTURE
This standard stresses the superintendent’s performance in leadership through empowering others, visioning, helping shape school culture and climate, and understanding multicultural and ethnic differences.

Standard 2: POLICY AND GOVERNANCE
Working with the board to formulate internal and external district policy, defining mutual expectations of performance with the board and demonstrating good school governance to staff, students and the community at large.

Standard 3: COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS
This standard emphasizes the skills necessary to establish effective two-way communications not only with students, staff and parents, but the community as a whole including beneficial relationships with the media. It also stresses responding to community feedback and building community support for the district.

Standard 4: ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT
This standard requires the superintendent to gather and analyze data for decision making and for making recommendations to the board. It stresses the skills necessary to meet internal and external customer expectations and to effectively allocate resources.

Standard 5: CURRICULUM PLANNING DEVELOPMENT
This standard addresses the superintendent’s skills in staying up to date in curriculum, teaching, learning and testing theories. It requires the superintendent to make sound recommendations for learning technologies.

Standard 6: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP
Standard #5 addresses what is to be taught; this standard emphasizes how it should be taught. It emphasizes the skills required to ensure that the most effective teaching techniques are in place and that all instructional resources are used to maximize student achievement. This standard also requires applying research and best practices with respect to diversity sensitivities.

Standard 7: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
This performance standard requires skills in developing and implementing a staff performance-evaluation system. It also requires skills in applying ethical, contractual and legal requirements for personnel selection, development, retention, promotion and dismissal.

**Standard 8: VALUES AND ETHICS OF LEADERSHIP**
This standard requires the understanding and modeling of appropriate value systems, ethics and moral leadership. It also requires superintendents to exhibit multicultural and ethnic understanding and to coordinate with social agencies and human services to help students grow and develop as caring, informed citizens.

**Standard 9 – STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT & LEARNING**
This standard recognizes that improving student achievement is a critical component of the superintendent position. It requires that the superintendent take responsibility for district oversight of student learning.
156.557 Standards for improving performance of certified school personnel --
Criteria for evaluation -- Content of programs -- Administrative regulations --
Waiver for alternative plan -- Appeals -- Exemptions -- Review of evaluation
systems -- Assistance to improve evaluation systems.

(1) The Kentucky Board of Education shall establish statewide standards for
evaluation and support for improving the performance of all certified school
personnel.

(2) The performance criteria on which teachers and administrators shall be evaluated
shall include, but not be limited to:
   (a) Performance of professional responsibilities related to his or her assignment,
       including attendance and punctuality and evaluating results;
   (b) Demonstration of effective planning of curricula, classroom instruction, and
       classroom management, based on research-based instructional practices, or
       school management skills based on validated managerial practices;
   (c) Demonstration of knowledge and understanding of subject matter content or
       administrative functions and effective leadership techniques;
   (d) Promotion and incorporation of instructional strategies or management
       techniques that are fair and respect diversity and individual differences;
   (e) Demonstration of effective interpersonal, communication, and collaboration
       skills among peers, students, parents, and others;
   (f) Performance of duties consistent with the goals for Kentucky students and
       mission of the school, the local community, laws, and administrative
       regulations;
   (g) Demonstration of the effective use of resources, including technology;
   (h) Demonstration of professional growth;
   (i) Adherence to the professional code of ethics; and
   (j) Attainment of the teacher standards or the administrator standards as
       established by the Education Professional Standards Board that are not
       referenced in paragraphs (a) to (i) of this subsection.

(3) The certified employee evaluation programs shall contain the following
provisions:
   (a) Each certified school employee, below the level of superintendent, shall be
       evaluated by a system developed by the local school district and approved by
       the Kentucky Department of Education.
   (b) The local evaluation system shall include formative evaluation and summative
       evaluation.
       1. "Formative evaluation" means a continuous cycle of collecting evaluation
          information and interacting and providing feedback with suggestions
          regarding the certified employee's professional growth and performance.
2. "Summative evaluation" means the summary of, and conclusions from, the evaluation data, including formative evaluation data, that:
   a. Occur at the end of an evaluation cycle; and
   b. Include a conference between the evaluator and the evaluated certified employee, and a written evaluation report.

(c) The Kentucky Board of Education shall adopt administrative regulations incorporating written guidelines for a local school district to follow in developing, implementing, and revising the evaluation system and shall require the following:
1. All evaluations of certified employees below the level of the district superintendent shall be in writing on evaluation forms and under evaluation procedures developed by a committee composed of an equal number of teachers and administrators;
2. The immediate supervisor of the certified school employee shall be designated as the primary evaluator. At the request of a teacher, observations by other teachers trained in the teacher's content area or curriculum content specialists may be incorporated into the formative process for evaluating teachers;
3. All monitoring or observation of performance of a certified school employee shall be conducted openly and with full knowledge of the employee;
4. Evaluators shall be trained, tested, and approved in accordance with administrative regulations adopted by the Kentucky Board of Education in the proper techniques for effectively evaluating certified school employees and in the use of the school district evaluation system;
5. The evaluation system shall include a plan whereby the person evaluated is given assistance for professional growth as a teacher or administrator. The system shall also specify the processes to be used when corrective actions are necessary in relation to the performance of one's assignment; and
6. The training requirement for evaluators contained in subparagraph 4. of this paragraph shall not apply to district board of education members.

(4) (a) Each superintendent shall be evaluated according to a policy and procedures developed by the local board of education and approved by the department.
(b) The summative evaluation of the superintendent shall be discussed and adopted in an open meeting of the board and reflected in the minutes.
(c) If the local board policy requires a written evaluation of the superintendent, it shall be made available to the public upon request.
(d) Any preliminary discussions relating to the evaluation of the superintendent by the board or between the board and the superintendent prior to the summative evaluation shall be conducted in closed session.

(5) A local district may request from the Kentucky Department of Education a waiver from the guidelines and administrative regulations promulgated by the Kentucky Board of Education as required in subsection (3)(c) of this section in order to
implement an alternative evaluation plan for employees on continuing contracts. The department shall grant a waiver if the alternative plan provides for a three (3) phase certified employee evaluation plan that includes:

(a) Phase One: Evaluation for Professional Growth.
1. Evaluation is based on a wide array of relevant sources and directed toward general and specific recommendations for improvement; and
2. Evaluation does not include documentation that might adversely affect employment status.

(b) Phase Two: Transition.
1. Evaluation is for the purpose of intensive scrutiny of job performance;
2. Evaluation includes documentation that may lead to adverse employment decisions;
3. Assistance and support for improvement shall be provided by the school district; and
4. Placement of an individual in the transition phase shall not be subject to appeal, but the employee shall be notified of the decision in writing.

(c) Phase Three: Evaluation for Deficiency.
1. Notwithstanding KRS 161.760, written notice of potential termination, reduction of direct classroom responsibility, or other adverse actions and conditions for job retention are given the employee;
2. A clear time frame for proposed actions is provided the employee; and
3. The summative evaluation is subject to appeal.

An alternative plan for the evaluation of certified personnel shall be proposed to the Kentucky Department of Education if the local district evaluation committee is in support of the plan. Training necessary to implement the alternative plan shall be provided to the principals, supervisory personnel, and the employees to be evaluated. The local district shall provide support to implement the plan. The department shall provide technical assistance to districts wishing to develop alternative evaluation plans.

(6) The Kentucky Board of Education shall establish an appeals procedure for certified school employees who believe that the local school district failed to properly implement the approved evaluation system. The appeals procedure shall not involve requests from individual certified school employees for review of the judgmental conclusions of their personnel evaluations.

(7) The local board of education shall establish an evaluation appeals panel for certified personnel that shall consist of two (2) members elected by the certified employees of the district and one (1) member appointed by the board of education who is a certified employee of the board. Certified employees who think they were not fairly evaluated may submit an appeal to the panel for a timely review of their evaluation. In districts that have adopted an alternative evaluation plan under subsection (4) of this section, the appeal shall only apply to the summative evaluation of Phase Three.
(8) Local school districts with an enrollment of sixty-five thousand (65,000) or more students shall have an evaluation system but shall be exempt from procedures or processes described in this section as long as the plan meets the standards established by the Kentucky Board of Education for local school district evaluation systems. The local plan shall include an appeals process for employees who believe they were not fairly evaluated.

(9) Between July 15, 2000, and June 30, 2001, each school district shall review its local evaluation system to assure that the system is working effectively and to make changes to improve its system.

(10) Beginning with the 2001-2002 school year, and in subsequent years, the Kentucky Department of Education shall annually provide for on-site visits by trained personnel to a minimum of fifteen (15) school districts to review and ensure appropriate implementation of the evaluation system by the local school district. The department shall provide technical assistance to local districts to eliminate deficiencies and to improve the effectiveness of their evaluation systems. The department may implement the requirement in this subsection in conjunction with other requirements, including, but not limited to, the scholastic audit process required by KRS 158.6455.

Effective: July 15, 2010


Legislative Research Commission Note (7/15/2010). The internal numbering of subsection (4) of this statute has been modified by the Reviser of Statutes from the way it appeared in 2010 Ky. Acts ch. 157, sec. 1, under the authority of KRS 7.136(1).
Appendix E

Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards

Standard 1: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

Standard 2: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.
Appendix F

KSBA Superintendent Evaluation Workbook

Dear School Board Member:

Congratulations! Opening this workbook shows you’re taking a most important job very seriously – evaluating your superintendent.

The information, research, tips and worksheets you’ll find here represent a wealth of experience compiled by our Leadership Services experts that not only makes your job easier, but also ensures your schools have the qualified, progressive leadership they deserve.

This guide will also help you establish and clarify the roles and responsibilities within the superintendent-board team.

KSBA’s Superintendent Evaluation program and workbook give you the tools to create and maintain a solid leadership team that focuses on student achievement. Because the public demands increased accountability for student achievement and community involvement, this job is more important than ever. KSBA’s approach to evaluation is designed to enhance student achievement.

We are here whenever you need assistance.

Bill Scott
KSBA Executive Director

Revised: October 28, 2008
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KSBA Superintendent Evaluation

Selecting and evaluating the superintendent is one of the school board’s most important jobs. A high-quality superintendent evaluation process helps develop good board/superintendent relationships, provides clarity of roles, creates common understanding of the leadership being provided and provides a mechanism for public accountability and is basis for the development of the individual growth plan for the superintendent.

The evaluation process involves four core board-governing roles:
- Vision: Goal setting.
- Structure: Developing a clear written evaluation plan and timeline.
- Accountability: Measuring the superintendent’s performance.
- Advocacy: Communication of goals and progress among the board, superintendent and community.

Performance evaluations are most effective when they are designed and used for communicating future expectations, not simply for reviewing past performance. As many superintendents know, if you don’t know what the board expects, it is difficult, if not impossible, to meet those expectations. On the other hand, if the board fails to monitor progress towards its goals, it will not know when they have been successfully completed.

Most boards find themselves asking questions such as these:
- What should we evaluate?
- How can we do it objectively and fairly?
- When should the superintendent’s evaluation take place?

KSBA has developed an evaluation process and two-part evaluation tool that can help answer these questions and serve as the foundation upon which school boards can build their own evaluation process and documents.

What should we evaluate?
The superintendency is a professional position equivalent to the chief executive officer in the private sector. As such, the superintendent is charged with leading and administering the organization according to the policies adopted by the school board. The purpose of evaluating the superintendent is not to micromanage the organization, but to provide oversight and public assurance that the policies are being effectively implemented. Another critical purpose is to provide input and feedback to the superintendent to help him or her continually improve.

The evaluation process is also used to make critical decisions about contract extensions, non-extensions, or terminations. The evaluation process keeps school boards informed about district activities and progress being made toward goals. The
superintendent can use the feedback to engage in personal professional development. A quality superintendent evaluation process is a win/win for the board, the superintendent and the community. So where do we begin?

The Two-Part Tool
KSBA has developed a two-part evaluation tool. Part 1 is based on eight Performance Standards established jointly by the American Association of School Administrators and the National School Boards Association and formatted by the Oregon School Boards Association. An additional standard related to student achievement was developed by KSBA with input from the Kentucky Department of Education. Part 2 evaluates progress towards the goals established by the board and superintendent at the beginning of the evaluation cycle. Parts 1 and 2 are designed to be filled out by individual board members; a summary of their responses compiled by a designated board member is given to the superintendent. In addition, the individual responses for each board member may be given to the superintendent to further clarify the summary. The consensus report prepared by the board will be used for discussion with the superintendent. The superintendent may also fill out these parts as a self-evaluation and a basis for discussion with the board.

Part 1: Performance Standards
The eight professional standards established by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) with NSBA and the student achievement standard developed by KSBA describe the fundamental job requirements that superintendents must address. These standards serve as the foundation of the performance standards section of the KSBA Superintendent Evaluation Form. For each professional standard, AASA has identified performance indicators that can help you discern whether the standard has been attained. KSBA has included many of the AASA indicators, in addition to others, in the evaluation form so that boards will have some basis from which to make judgments about the superintendent’s performance. These performance indicators focus primarily on personal characteristics and management style of the superintendent.
A tenth standard regarding labor relations is available upon request.

Part 2: Superintendent’s Goals
Each year, the board and superintendent team should meet to develop a clear set of goals for the organization for the coming year. The board’s role is to help set these end results that clarify the board’s expectations of “what” the board expects to be achieved. These goals set collaboratively by the board and the superintendent should support the district consolidated improvement plan, and/or the superintendent’s growth plan and or corrective action plan. The superintendent then prepares an action plan defining the means to be used to achieve the goals. These goals, and the action plans, serve as a basis for Part 2 of the evaluation process.
Superintendent Self-Evaluation
The superintendent self-evaluation may be presented to the board by the superintendent before the board members fill out their individual worksheets. The superintendent may choose to fill out parts 1 and 2 and use as a self-assessment to be presented to the board as a part of the evaluation process. Each of the parts (1 and 2) is independent from the other and may be used separately or in combination.

Compiling Results
The board meets in executive session to discuss the results and agree on a consensus evaluation that will be presented in the meeting with the superintendent. The individual responses in parts 1 and 2 are worksheets only but are given to the superintendent for further clarification of the consensus evaluation. Compiling results is best done by discussion among all board members sitting together in executive session. It is important that the members recognize the importance of coming to a consensus and speaking with one voice in the evaluation. The superintendent works for the board as a whole, not for individual board members. The board must make every effort to speak with a single voice in setting expectations and assessing success.

How can we do it objectively and fairly?
It is the responsibility of the school board to evaluate the performance of the superintendent. No process or form is completely objective. There will always be some subjectivity and judgment on the board’s part. Remember that board members are elected to make those judgments. The KSBA Superintendent Evaluation Form for Performance Standards (Part 1) and Goals (Part 2) are designed to reduce subjectivity and increase objectivity. Fair application of the evaluation process is best determined through collaboration and agreement by the board and superintendent about what, how and when the superintendent evaluation will be conducted.

Documentation
The KSBA Superintendent Evaluation Form is more than a checklist. It requires the objective consideration of evidence or documentation of the degree to which each standard has been met. This can be provided orally, as written lists, or as specific documents. Some boards and superintendents may select a portfolio approach. Part 1 of the form includes a list of performance indicators for each standard. Board members should not rate indicators but, rather, consider indicators in determining the overall rating for that performance standard.

Performance Ratings
A wide variety of scoring scales can be used with this evaluation form. The scale that appears on the form is the common numerical scale that corresponds to letter grades.
**Written Comments**
Written comments always help clarify the evaluation. This provides the board with the opportunity to deliver specific constructive criticism and/or accolades and provides the superintendent with useful information for continuous performance improvement. Again, the board should speak with one voice in making written comments on the final summary evaluation form.

**Public Meeting Law**
A governing body, such as a school board, must comply with law regarding open meetings when evaluating the job performance of the superintendent. A school board must follow the guidelines established in KRS 61.810, and any binding opinion, when determining if an executive session is appropriate and what topics are allowed to be discussed. When in doubt always consult with the local board attorney for guidance. KSBA recommends, as best practice, that a narrative summary of the performance evaluation be completed by the board chair and made available to the public when the evaluation is complete.

**Evaluation Conferences**
Face-to-face conversations between the board and superintendent are essential to an effective process. Meetings should occur to establish the superintendent’s goals, the evaluation document and process to be used, the documentation of the superintendent’s performance and a summative evaluation conference. It is recommended that the superintendent fill out a self-evaluation of parts 1 and 2. When the board meets to discuss the results of its evaluation, it should hear the superintendent’s report of his or her self-evaluation.

**When should the superintendent’s evaluation take place?**

**Pre-Evaluation**
Prior to the beginning of the new school year, goals and expectations for the superintendent should be mutually established with the board. These goals are often established during a planning retreat or work session during the spring. If possible, set goals before the budget process begins. The previous spring is ideal because it allows the incorporation of district goals into budget planning, staffing, and professional development for the coming year. Agreement on the form, process and timeline should also be in place.

**Contract Extension Review**
Superintendents must be notified about extension or non-extension of their current contract. Other timelines may also exist within the superintendent’s contract itself. In order to make these decisions, a performance review should take place prior to these
deadlines so that the board can make informed judgments about continuation of employment.

**Review Results**
The result of the review should be steps for professional development and a growth plan for the superintendent and a plan for informing the community about the results of the evaluation and status of the district’s goals.

**At Conclusion of the Evaluation**
Before the beginning of the next school year, the board and administration should meet to begin the next cycle of goal setting and evaluation. This timeline allows the superintendent time to plan for the ensuing year. The goals should be publicized to keep the district informed.

**Communication with the Community**
The superintendent evaluation process provides the board an opportunity to share the school district’s progress with the community. A summary of the board’s conclusions should be prepared by the board from the worksheet data after the evaluation.
### Superintendent Evaluation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Timeline</th>
<th>District Timeline</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. – Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Superintendent and board clarify vision and mission and update long-range plans for the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. – Mar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Board and superintendent review superintendent job description and the evaluation process, forms and timeline to be used next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. - April</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Superintendent and board set goals for the next school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July - May.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Superintendent should make regular reports regarding progress on district goals to the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. – April</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Board members complete Parts 1 and 2 of the superintendent evaluation form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Superintendent may complete a self-assessment of the evaluation forms parts 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Board members meet to discuss their evaluations and develop the board’s official written evaluation document(s) that will be shared with the superintendent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Board and superintendent meet to discuss and clarify the results of the evaluation documents. Changes to the evaluation may be made as a result of the discussions. Evaluation meetings may be held in executive session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. A copy of the final written evaluation form is placed in the superintendent’s personnel folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. The results of the evaluation and progress on district goals are shared with the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Superintendent Evaluation Forms

Part I. Performance Standards

Instructions
1. Attached are the forms to be completed by each board member rating each of the performance standards. A separate page is provided for each performance standard. Each board member should rate all of the performance standards.
2. Each performance standard has performance indicators listed below it. These performance indicators suggest objective measures to consider; do not rate each performance indicator separately. Only rate the overall performance standard.
3. Your comments in support of your rating will be helpful during the board discussion for preparation of a summary evaluation form.
4. Each board member’s forms should be returned to the board chair or designated board member for compilation.
5. The designated board member or chair will compile the results on a preliminary summary evaluation form. The board will meet to discuss the results and prepare a final summary evaluation form representing the consensus of the board.
6. Because it is important that the board speak with one voice in evaluating the superintendent, the final summary report from the full board will be presented to the superintendent. Additionally the evaluations by individual board members may be presented to the superintendent.
**Standard 1: LEADERSHIP AND DISTRICT CULTURE**

This standard stresses the superintendent’s performance in leadership through empowering others, visioning, helping shape school culture and climate, and understanding multicultural and ethnic differences.

**Performance Indicators:**

(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.)

1.1 Facilitates a community process to develop and implement a shared vision that focuses on improving student achievement.

1.2 Promotes academic rigor that focuses on learning and excellence for schools.

1.3 Creates and supports a community of learners that empowers others to reach high levels of performance to achieve the school’s vision.

1.4 Models learning for staff and students.

1.5 Promotes understanding and celebrating school/community cultures.

1.6 Promotes and expects a school based climate of tolerance, acceptance and civility.

1.7 Develops, implements, promotes and monitors continuous improvement processes.

**The superintendent’s performance for this standard:**

0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING

**Comments:**
Standard 2: POLICY AND GOVERNANCE
Working with the board to formulate internal and external district policy, defining mutual expectations of performance with the board and demonstrating good school governance to staff, students and the community at large.

Performance Indicators:
(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.)
2.1 Understands and articulates the system of public school governance and differentiates between policy-making and administrative roles.
2.2 Establishes procedures for superintendent/board interpersonal and working relationships.
2.3 Understands and interprets the role of federal, state and regional governments, policies, and politics and their relationships to local districts and schools.
2.4 Uses legal counsel in governance and procedures to avoid civil and criminal liabilities.

The superintendent's performance for this standard:
0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING

Comments:
Standard 3: COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS
This standard emphasizes the skills necessary to establish effective two-way communications not only with students, staff and parents, but the community as a whole including beneficial relationships with the media. It also stresses responding to community feedback and building community support for the district.

Performance Indicators:
(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.)
3.1 Develops formal and informal techniques to gain external perceptions of district.
3.2 Demonstrates effective communication skills (written, verbal and nonverbal contexts, formal and informal settings, large and small group and one-on-one environments).
3.3 Promotes involvement of all stakeholders to fully participate in the process of schooling.
3.4 Establishes effective school/community relations, school/business partnerships and public service.
3.5 Understands the role of media in shaping and forming opinions as well as how to work with the media.

The superintendent's performance for this standard:
0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING

Comments:
Standard 4: ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGEMENT
This standard requires the superintendent to gather and analyze data for decision making and for making recommendations to the board. It stresses the skills necessary to meet internal and external customer expectations and to effectively allocate resources.

Performance Indicators:
(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.)

4.1 Demonstrates budget management including financial forecasting, planning, cash-flow management, account auditing and monitoring.
4.2 Develops and monitors long-range plans for school and district technology and information systems, making informed decisions about computer hardware and software, and staff development and training needs.
4.3 Demonstrates knowledge of school facilities and develops a process that builds internal and public support for facility needs, including bond issues.
4.4 Establishes procedures and practices for dealing with emergencies such as weather, threats to the school, student violence and trauma.
4.5 Implements appropriate safety and security practices in schools.
4.6 Meets reporting deadlines as required by statute, regulatory agency, local policy or board action.

The superintendent’s performance for this standard:

0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING
Standard 5: CURRICULUM PLANNING DEVELOPMENT

This standard addresses the superintendent’s skills in staying up to-date in curriculum, teaching, learning and testing theories. It requires the superintendent to make sound recommendations for learning technologies.

Performance Indicators:
(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you in thinking about the standard.)
5.1 Develops core curriculum design and delivery system based on content and assessment standards and best practices.
5.2 Establishes curriculum planning to anticipate occupational trends and school-to-career needs.
5.3 Uses child development and learning theories and the process to create developmentally appropriate curriculum and instruction.
5.4 Includes the use of computers, the Internet, networking, distance learning and other technologies in educational programming.
5.5 Assesses student progress using a variety of appropriate techniques.
5.6 Involves faculty and stakeholders in enhancement and renewal of curriculum to ensure alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment.

The superintendent’s performance for this standard:
0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING

Comments:
Standard 6: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Standard #5 addresses what is to be taught; this standard emphasizes *how* it should be taught. It emphasizes the skills required to ensure that the most effective teaching techniques are in place and that all instructional resources are used to maximize student achievement. This standard also requires applying research and best practices with respect to diversity sensitivities.

**Performance Indicators:**
(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.)
6.1 Collaboratively develops, implements and monitors change process to improve student and adult learning.
6.2 Formulates plan to assess appropriate teaching methods, classroom management and strategies for all learners.
6.3 Analyzes available instructional resources including applications of technology and assigns them in cost effective and equitable manner to enhance student outcomes.
6.4 Establishes instructional strategies that include cultural diversity and differences in learning styles.
6.5 Applies effective methods of providing, monitoring, evaluating and reporting student achievement and uses good research and assessments to improve the learning process.
6.6 Encourages various staffing patterns, student grouping plans, class scheduling plans, school organizational structures, and facilities design processes to support various teaching strategies and desired student outcomes.

*The superintendent's performance for this standard:*

0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING
Standard 7: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
This performance standard requires skills in developing and implementing a staff performance-evaluation system. It also requires skills in applying ethical, contractual and legal requirements for personnel selection, development, retention, promotion and dismissal.

Performance Indicators:
(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.)
7.1 Demonstrates use of system and staff evaluation data for personnel policies, decision-making, promotion of career growth and professional development.
7.2 Identifies and applies appropriate policies, criteria, and processes for the recruitment, selection, induction, compensation and separation of personnel with attention to issues of equity and diversity.
*7.3 Mentors and coaches administrators throughout the district.

The superintendent’s performance for this standard:
0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING

Comments:
*Recommended by Educational support groups.
Standard 8: VALUES AND ETHICS OF LEADERSHIP
This standard requires the understanding and modeling of appropriate value systems, ethics and moral leadership. It also requires superintendents to exhibit multicultural and ethnic understanding and to coordinate with social agencies and human services to help students grow and develop as caring, informed citizens.

Performance Indicators:
(Do not rate individual indicators. These are listed only to help you think about the standard.)
* 8.1 Models and demonstrates multicultural and ethnic practices and is responsive to needs of diverse populations.
8.2 Describes role of schooling in a democratic society.
8.3 Manifests a professional code of ethics and demonstrates personal integrity.
8.4 Models accepted moral and ethical standards in all interactions.
8.5 Explores and develops ways to find common ground in dealing with difficult and divisive issues.
8.6 Promotes the establishment of moral and ethical practices in every classroom, every school, and throughout the district.

The superintendent's performance for this standard:
0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING
Comments:

*Recommended by Educational support groups.
Standard 9 – STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT & LEARNING

This standard recognizes that improving student achievement is a critical component of the superintendent position. It requires that the superintendent take responsibility for district oversight of student learning.

9.1 Facilitates the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of learning.
9.2 Advocates, nurtures and sustains school culture and instructional programming conducive to student learning.
9.2 Ensures management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
9.4 Collects and analyzes assessment data and maintains up-to-date records of student progress, using technologies as appropriate.
9.5 Understands data analysis, how it applies to school and district student achievement goals and demonstrates how to use this data to prioritize decisions and drive change that will improve student learning.
9.6 Understands and demonstrates how to use assessment data to determine and address curricular gaps.
9.7 Demonstrates the need to identify and remove barriers to student learning.
9.8 Secures and utilizes a variety of appropriate school and community resources to support learning.
9.9 Understands and demonstrates that school improvement goals are connected to student learning goals.
9.10 Understands and demonstrates that professional development needs to be aligned to the analysis of test data.
9.11 Communicates student achievement expectations to staff and stakeholders.
9.12 Assesses and analyzes the effectiveness of instruction and makes appropriate changes or recommendations to instruction based upon feedback, reflection, and assessment results.
9.13 Assesses programs and curricula; proposes appropriate recommendations and needed adjustments.

The superintendent's performance for this standard:
0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING

Comments:
*Recommended by Educational support groups
Superintendent Evaluation Forms  
Part 2: Goals

Part of the superintendent's job is to guide the school district toward successful completion of district goals as developed by the board and superintendent and to report progress toward goal attainment on a regular, prescribed periodic basis. Goals may also be developed as part of the superintendent’s personal growth plan.

Instructions
1. Attached are forms to be completed by each board member rating the superintendent’s performance in meeting the goals agreed to by the superintendent and the board at the beginning of the year. Each goal statement needs to be inserted into a separate form before the forms are distributed.
2. Each board member should rate the performance level for each goal.
3. Comments supporting the rating will be helpful during the board discussion for preparation of a summary evaluation form.
4. Board members should bring their forms to the executive session to use as their notes for discussion.
5. The board will meet in executive session to discuss the results and prepare a summary evaluation form representing the consensus of the board.
6. Because it is important that the board speak with one voice in evaluating the superintendent, the final summary report from the full board will be presented to the superintendent.

Additionally the evaluations by individual board members may be presented to the superintendent.
Goal Statement:

The superintendent's performance rating:
(circle one rating only for each goal)

0 UNACCEPTABLE
1 NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
2 GOOD
3 EXCELLENT
4 OUTSTANDING

Comments:
Sample Summary of Superintendent's Annual Evaluation by the ____________ School Board

The board of education of the school district has completed the annual evaluation of Superintendent Sample for 200_. The past year has been a positive one (or a challenging one) for education in our school district. All five school board members have served on the board for at least one full year and have been able to observe and be a part of the successes achieved this year.

The evaluation focused on: 1) eight professional standards 2) the goals for the district agreed on by the board and superintendent last year and 3) personal goals developed from the superintendent's growth plan.

In the areas of the eight professional standards, we have determined that Superintendent Sample's performance was excellent in the areas of leadership and district culture, communications and community relations, and organizational management. In the areas of policy governance, curriculum planning and development and labor relations the board felt his performance was outstanding. Instructional leadership, human resources management and values and ethics of leadership all received a rating of good.

The board determined that Superintendent Sample has done an outstanding job of attaining the goal set by the board and superintendent in August of last year to update and align the elementary language arts and reading curriculum. His success at achieving the goal of improving staff morale and retaining professional staff was rated good. The achievement of success in meeting the third goal, to raise high school math competency and performance on tests, was also rated good.

We will be working with Superintendent Sample over the next several weeks to develop goals for our district and look forward to working together to make our school district successful.
**Goal-Setting Worksheet**

**Goal Statement:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Estimated Resources</th>
<th>Who is responsible?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Plan: Communication Plan:
Appendix G

ADMINISTRATION 02.14

Evaluation

APPROVAL
This policy and related procedures must be approved by the Kentucky Department of Education.

ANNUAL
The Board shall annually evaluate the Superintendent in writing, and the summative evaluation shall be made available to the public on request. The evaluation criteria and evaluation process to be used shall be explained to and discussed with the Superintendent no later than the end of the first month of reporting for employment for each fiscal year.

PROCESS
Any preliminary discussions relating to the evaluation of the Superintendent by the Board or between the Board and the Superintendent prior to the summative evaluation shall be conducted in closed session.

The summative evaluation of the Superintendent shall be discussed and adopted in an open meeting of the Board and reflected in the minutes.

REFERENCES:
KRS 156.557
704 KAR 003:345

RELATED POLICY:
03.18

Adopted/Amended: 07/26/2010
Order #: 011
Appendix H

1. You receive important information directly from the Superintendent.
2. Superintendent ensures established policies and procedures are followed.
3. Superintendent provides clarity of direction.
4. Superintendent is out and about in the district.
5. Superintendent discusses with you regularly the academic progress of children.
6. Superintendent takes the time to show interest in you and the work you do.
7. Superintendent provides helpful feedback on your performance.
8. Superintendent completes your evaluation based on your performance following board policy.
9. Superintendent effectively communicates with you.
10. Superintendent is an effective communicator.
11. Superintendent meets with you regularly to discuss your performance.
12. Superintendent articulates a compelling vision, purpose and direction that inspire you.
13. Superintendent conveys clear priorities for the district.
14. Superintendent makes decisions based on facts versus being influenced by the role, power or position of those involved in the decision.
15. Superintendent gathers information from staff prior to making a decision.
16. Superintendent uses and explains the data used when making decisions.
17. Superintendent assists you on focusing on curriculum, instruction and assessment.
18. Superintendent leads by example.
19. Superintendent leads meetings that encourage productive discussion.
20. Superintendent motivates you to achieve.

21. Superintendent demonstrates the courage to make difficult decisions.

22. Superintendent’s participation usually sets a productive tone for meetings.

23. Superintendent clearly communicates ideas, plans and priorities.

24. Superintendent possesses a true concern for your development.

25. Superintendent demonstrates an understanding of the budgeting process.

26. Superintendent addresses facilities needs in a timely fashion.

27. Superintendent follows through on commitments.

28. Superintendent acts consistently with his/her behavior.

29. Superintendent inspires and motivates me to perform at my best.

30. Superintendent is a valuable resource when dealing with difficult issues.

31. Superintendent ensures facilities are well maintained and attractive.

32. Superintendent inspires trust.

33. Superintendent projects a credible and confident professional image.

34. Superintendent addresses conflict quickly.

35. Superintendent encourages instructional practices that meet the needs of all children.

36. Superintendent encourages the honest expression and debates of your views and ideas.

37. Superintendent treats you with respect.
### Appendix I

**Superintendent Performance Survey**

1. The superintendent works with me on an individual basis to develop my talents, and these activities are documented in my evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The superintendent has communicated very clear expectations to me, and for my specific duties, and these expectations are closely monitored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I receive important information directly from the Superintendent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The superintendent effectively communicates with me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The superintendent updates me weekly as to happenings in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The superintendent has been involved in activities that provide increased assistance to parents in the use of Infinite Campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The superintendent has been involved in activities that provide for the adoption and use of an automated substitute teacher call-out system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The superintendent articulates the importance of an aligned curriculum and its contribution to successful student transitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The superintendent has been heavily involved in developing and implementing processes that address teacher efficacy, and student achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The superintendent has been heavily involved in developing processes that identify staff development needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The superintendent has been heavily involved in monitoring school and teacher websites and provides feedback to principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. The superintendent has taken an active role in assisting principals in identifying underperforming teachers, and in assisting principals to support these struggling teachers through professional development activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. The superintendent has taken an active role in researching the establishment of an employee dress code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. The superintendent has taken an active role in developing a process to identify and hire teachers that are likely to be effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The superintendent is seen to be an advocate for appropriate professional development in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The superintendent is in tune with the professional development needs of the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. The superintendent closely monitors attendance improvement plans in the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The superintendent ensures that there is active two-way communication between the DPP and principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Dear Mr. Hall:

The Greenup County Board of Education completed its evaluation of you at a special Board meeting on June 20, 2011. In lieu of using the “point and click” form supplied by the Kentucky School Board Association, the Board has chosen to give you a narrative outlining certain thoughts in regard to various areas in which you were evaluated.

Each area called for a general rating, ranging from 1 (poor) to 4 (outstanding). Generally speaking, you were rated a 3 in most areas.

Leadership and District Culture (General Rating 3)

The Board believes you have shown yourself to be accessible, personable and optimistic. Students have been outspoken as to your likeability. You do a good job of promoting the District. However, the Board suggests that you spend time in all schools in the District, as well as the high school. The Board understands the high school has had special needs this year, and your time spent there has been more than justified. Nevertheless, all schools in the District are important, and the Board wants you to have a hands-on working relationship with all administrators in the District, including but not limited to the high school.

Policy and Government (General Rating 3)

You have been good about following policies. The District attorney relates that you are good in communicating with him and seeking guidance with policy questions. The Board understands that the communication between the Board and the superintendent is an ongoing process. But the Board suggests that you use various means of communicating with different Board members; keeping in mind that not all of them are adept with the computer. Board members would appreciate weekly updates as to happenings in the District with which the Board should be directly concerned. An example of this is with the recent job opening of a position in the agricultural education department. Several of the Board members related having received telephone calls about the availability of this position, and they knew nothing about it.

Communications and Community Relations (General Rating 2.5)

You are a good speaker in public. You have proven yourself to be approachable, personable and a genuinely good guy. The Board is pleased with the improvement in the number of newspaper articles touting good things that are
happening in our school District, with our students and programs. But, again, anything involving communication is an ongoing process. The Board members want to receive Board notes by e-mail in advance of the Board meetings. The Board wants to see agendas in advance of Board meetings, to enhance preparation. The Board was dissatisfied with your handling of notifying families of elementary students in the District about the change in policy of attendance at Greysbranch and McKell. A letter should have been sent to each affected family, FROM YOU, explaining to the parent the options of attendance and transportation. The Board wants to see better and more effective use of Infinite Campus. Parents need to be instructed as to the use of Infinite Campus and the availability of information regarding their students. The Board wants you to take the lead on these matter, and step up to the plate to see to it that these concerns are properly handled.

**Organizational Management** (General Rating 3)

This area mainly involves budgeting and facilities plans. The Board understands that the bonding capacity has been exhausted, for the time being. The Board is pleased with the overall efforts to provide our staff and students access to the latest technology resources. The Board is pleased with the measures that have been taken to balance the budget and manage the finances. Just as an aside, the Board had a discussion about the possibility of using a computerized system for calling substitute teachers, in an effort to save money. The Board desires you to consider the feasibility of such a plan.

**Curriculum Planning and Development, Instructional Leadership and Human Resources** (General Rating 2.75)

As a preface to comments by the Board, it is understood that you inherited a difficult situation. It was almost like you were handed the keys to the Titanic. Nevertheless, you took the job knowing the ship was listing and needed to be righted, and the Board expects you to do it.

With regard to the high school and new standards – much of the curriculum is state-mandated. Even so, all teachers do not appear to understand the new curriculum and express a need for better understanding and more involvement in what they are supposed to do. The Superintendent is expected to hold principals accountable for ensuring that teachers TEACH – this is not being done. Elementary schools should be teaching the same curriculum, but they are not. Middle schools should be teaching the same material, but they are not. Websites of individual schools are deplorable. Much of the concern of the Board revolves around the intensity of the supervision done by the Superintendent over principals in the District. The principals of the schools are the educational leaders of their schools. The principals are responsible for making sure that teachers teach, and for doing appropriate evaluations. These have
not been done properly for years, and the Board is simply fed up with these lackadaisical practices. The Board believes that if the Superintendent does a better job of shepherding the principals and insisting that they do what they are supposed to do, this will have a “trickle down” effect and the principals will see to it that teachers fulfill their obligations to the students. Speaking of students, the Board is in favor of use of a “360” assessment. That is, the Board thinks that at the end of each grading period, before report cards are sent home, that students be given an opportunity to evaluate the teacher – just like the teacher has evaluated the student. These evaluations should be submitted to the principal, who in turn, should submit the evaluations to you for your review.

Good learning flows from good teaching; and good teaching only comes from a good teacher. The Board acknowledges that most of the teachers in the District are conscientious and do a good job. But, unfortunately, there are those who fall well below the mark. It is your job to weed out these underperforming teachers and put others in their stead who will do as they are supposed to do.

Yet another area of concern of the Board is the mode of dress of employees in the District, not just in the schools but in the central office. Jeans are not appropriate attire for a teacher or any educational professional. Period. Teachers and administrators need to dress as the professionals they are, and you need to see to it that they do.

The Board also discussed the need to “raise the bar” in the hiring process criteria. Our District need not simply hire for the sake of hiring. We need to be more selective in the teachers and personnel to whom we offer employment, and it is believed results will be seen from the improvement. If

The Board is further concerned about the lack of professional development among teachers. The Board wants teachers to be required to actively participate in professional development, and not just attend the training and furtively read magazines or play on their I-phones. By the same token, the professional development trainings need be informative and enlightening and meaningful, so as not to be drudgery.

The Board is especially concerned about attendance issues in the District. The Board wants you to work more closely with the director of pupil personnel, and follow up attendance issues – not just with Ms. Hardy but with Judges McCloud and Preston to work to find solutions to improve attendance in the District.

**GOALS**

Improve the evaluation process District wide, and have more
intensive supervision over principals in the schools.

1) Adopt more stringent criteria for hiring.

2) Improve communications via e-mail, websites, and Infinite Campus.

3) See results and progress on school improvement plans.

4) See an upward trend in testing assessment results.

The Board is well satisfied with your performance thus far. You have shown that the confidence the Board has in you is well-founded. The Board appreciates your diligent service and your work ethic. The Board implores you to bring to bear all of your education, training and experience to address the problems and concerns set forth herein as well as to continue the areas of improvement you have started. This evaluation is offered in a spirit of good will and cooperation, together with an expression of satisfaction and appreciation for your effort.

______________________________
KELLY ADKINS, CHAIRPERSON
GREENUP COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION
### Appendix K

Greenup County Superintendent Performance Review

Sample Questions Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directives from GCBOE in 2011 performance review:</th>
<th>AASA Superintendent Standard &amp; Indicator:</th>
<th>Possible Question(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| "The Board wants you to have a hands-on working relationship with all administrators in the District, including but not limited to the high school." | Standard 7: Human Resources Management  
• Develop a plan to assess system and staff needs to identify areas for concentrated staff development.  
• Demonstrate use of system and staff evaluation data for personnel policy and decision making.  
• Demonstrate personnel management strategies. | • The superintendent has developed and communicated a plan to develop administrators' talents in the district.  
• The superintendent works with me on an individual basis to develop my talents, and these activities are documented in my evaluation.  
• The superintendent has communicated very clear expectations to me, and for my specific duties, and these expectations are closely monitored. |
| "The Board suggests that you use various means of communicating with different Board members; keeping in mind that not all of them are adept with the computer. | Standard 3: Communications & Community Relations  
• Develop and carry out internal and external communication plans. | Contained in Superintendent 360-Degree Survey:  
• You receive important information directly from the Superintendent.  
• Superintendent effectively communicates with you. |
| "Board members would appreciate weekly updates as to happenings in the District with which the Board should be directly concerned." | Standard 3: Communications & Community Relations  
• Identify, track, and deal with issues. | Possible addition to the BOE Effectiveness survey:  
• The superintendent updates me weekly as to happenings in the district. |
| "The Board members want to receive Board notes by e-mail in advance of the Board meetings. The Board wants to see agendas in advance of Board meetings, to enhance preparation." | Standard 3: Communications & Community Relations  
• Develop and carry out internal and external communication plans. | Contained in recent BOE Effectiveness Survey:  
• I receive all materials well enough in advance to allow for adequate preparation for board meetings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directives from GCBOE in 2011 performance review:</th>
<th>AASA Superintendent Standard &amp; Indicator:</th>
<th>Possible Question(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “The Board wants to see better and more effective use of Infinite Campus. Parents need to be instructed as to the use of Infinite Campus and the availability of information regarding their students. The Board wants you to take the lead on these matter, and step up to the plate to see to it that these concerns are properly handled.” | Standard 4: Organizational Management  
- Develop, implement, and monitor change processes to build capacities to serve clients.  
- Use technological applications to enhance administration of business and support systems. | • The superintendent has taken the lead in providing assistance to parents in the use of Infinite Campus.  
• The superintendent has been involved in activities that provide increased assistance to parents in the use of Infinite Campus. |
| “The Board had a discussion about the possibility of using a computerized system for calling substitute teachers, in an effort to save money. The Board desires you to consider the feasibility of such a plan.” | Standard 4: Organizational Management  
- Develop, implement, and monitor change processes to build capacities to serve clients.  
- Use technological applications to enhance administration of business and support systems. | • The superintendent has taken the lead in pursuing the use of an automated substitute teacher call-out system.  
• The superintendent has been involved in activities that provide for the adoption and use of an automated substitute teacher call-out system. |
### Directives from GCBOE in 2011 performance review:

"The Superintendent is expected to hold principals accountable for ensuring that teachers TEACH – this is not being done. Elementary schools should be teaching the same curriculum, but they are not. Middle schools should be teaching the same material, but they are not. Websites of individual schools are deplorable. Much of the concern of the Board revolves around the intensity of the supervision done by the Superintendent over principals in the District."

### AASA Superintendent Standard & Indicator:

- **Standard 1: Leadership and District Culture**
  - Promote academic rigor and excellence for staff and students.

- **Standard 5: Curriculum Planning & Development**
  - Develop a process for faculty input in continued and systematic renewal of the curriculum to ensure appropriate scope, sequence, and content.
  - Demonstrate an understanding of curricular alignment to ensure improved student performance and higher order thinking.

- **Standard 6: Instructional Management**
  - Develop, implement, and monitor change processes to improve student learning, adult development, and climates for learning.

- **Standard 7: Human Resources Management**
  - Develop a plan to assess system and staff needs to identify areas for concentrated staff development.
  - Demonstrate use of system and staff evaluation data for personnel policy and decision making.
  - Demonstrate personnel management strategies.

### Possible Question(s):

- The superintendent, through his words and actions, promotes academic rigor and excellent in staff and students.
- The superintendent has been involved in processes that allow for curriculum alignment activities.
- The superintendent articulates the importance of an aligned curriculum and its' contribution to successful student transitions.
- The superintendent has been heavily involved in developing and implementing processes that address teacher efficacy, and student achievement.
- The superintendent has been heavily involved in developing processes that identify staff development needs.
- The superintendent has been heavily involved in monitoring school and teacher websites and provides feedback to principals.
### Directives from GCBOE in 2011 performance review

#### AASA Superintendent Standard & Indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Standard 7: Human Resources Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It is your job to weed out these underperforming teachers and put others in their stead who will do as they are supposed to do.&quot;</td>
<td>Demonstrate use of system and staff evaluation data for personnel policy and decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Standard 2: Policy &amp; Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Yet another area of concern of the Board is the mode of dress of employees in the District, not just in the schools but in the central office. “</td>
<td>Formulate a district policy for external and internal programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Standard 7: Human Resources Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Board also discussed the need to “raise the bar” in the hiring process criteria. Our District need not simply hire for the sake of hiring. We need to be more selective in the teachers and personnel to whom we offer employment, and it is believed results will be seen from the improvement.”</td>
<td>Demonstrate use of system and staff evaluation data for personnel policy and decision making. Demonstrate personnel management strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Standard 1: Leadership and District Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Board is further concerned about the lack of professional development among teachers. The Board wants teachers to be required to actively participate in professional development, and not just attend the training and furtively read magazines or play on their I-phones.”</td>
<td>Promote academic rigor and excellence for staff and students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Standard 6: Instructional Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Board is further concerned about the lack of professional development among teachers. The Board wants teachers to be required to actively participate in professional development, and not just attend the training and furtively read magazines or play on their I-phones.”</td>
<td>Formulate a plan to assess appropriate teaching methods and strategies for all learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Possible Question(s):

- The superintendent has taken an active role in assisting principals in identifying underperforming teachers, and in assisting principals to support these struggling teachers through professional development activities.

- The superintendent has taken an active role in researching the establishment of an employee dress code.

- The superintendent has taken an active role in developing a process to identify and hire teachers that are likely to be effective.

- The superintendent is seen to be an advocate for appropriate professional development in the district.

- The superintendent, through his actions, models the importance of professional development.

- The superintendent is in tune with the professional development needs of the district.
**Directives from GCBOE in 2011 performance review:**

"The Board is especially concerned about attendance issues in the District. The Board wants you to work more closely with the director of pupil personnel, and follow up attendance issues – not just with Ms. Hardy but with Judges McCloud and Preston to work to find solutions to improve attendance in the District."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AASA Superintendent Standard &amp; Indicator:</th>
<th>Possible Question(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Standard 3: Communications and Community Relations  
  - Demonstrate school/community relations, school business partnerships, and related public service activities.  
Standard 7: Human Resources Management  
  - Demonstrate personnel management strategies.  
Standard 8: Values and Ethics of Leadership  
  - Formulate a plan to coordinate social, health, and other community agencies to support each child in the district. |  
  - The superintendent is actively involved with attendance issues in the district.  
  - The superintendent closely monitors attendance improvement plans in the district.  
  - The superintendent ensures that there is active two-way communication between the DPP and principals.  
  - The superintendent ensures that principals are informed about their students that are currently in the judicial system for truancy or other offenses. |
Appendix L

A Data-Based Approach to the Superintendent’s Performance Review

“90% of any problem is management and the system.”

-Edward Deming
Superintendent Evaluations

"How do I know what the superintendent does? I only see him a few times a month and, with the exception of board meetings, I have very few opportunities to observe him in action."

The job of superintendent is:
- ...complex and consequently difficult to assess...
- ...dominated by meetings and short interactions with board members, employees, and community members...
- ...often conducted behind closed doors...
- All make it difficult for BOE members to form informed opinions about the superintendent's performance.
Superintendent Evaluations

- Superintendents are the only school district employees not evaluated by professional educators.
- Other educators are evaluated by:
  - Single "direct supervisor" or evaluator
  - An evaluator who has first hand knowledge of employees job responsibilities
  - Evaluator that can observe the educator on a regular, sometimes daily basis
Superintendent Evaluations

- Vague judgments based on subjective impressions of Board of Education members...
- All too often based on vocal constituents of Board members...

Superintendent Evaluations

- If performed effectively can:
  - Help identify school district goals...
  - Guide the professional growth of the superintendent...
  - Define BOE expectations of the superintendent...
  - Clarify goals of the BOE and the superintendent...
  - Enhance BOE/superintendent communication
  - Enhance district improvement planning process...
From a simple checklist to a comprehensive Performance Review:

Goal:

- To move from an evaluation system that uses a checklist to measure ambiguous personality traits, toward a system that utilizes data and promotes district goal setting, two-way communication, and a performance review for the superintendent that encourages professional growth and is based on results rather than rumors.
A data-based approach...

- An approach to evaluate the superintendent on data, or measures, and not "tales"...
- Those that answer directly to the superintendent (central office and principals) complete anonymous surveys about the effectiveness of the superintendent...
- This data is provided to the BOE to inform their evaluation of the superintendent...

Performance Review

- BOE uses data from surveys and other sources of data to create a narrative that is structured around agreed upon standards (Leadership, Communication, Management).
- This narrative can also set specific district goals for the superintendent and BOE to address in the coming year.
Appendix M

Matt:

As a school board member I feel that the 360 assessment process has been very beneficial. We have used the model to aid in our evaluation of the Superintendent in order to gain insight into the Superintendent’s effectiveness with staff and with implementation of strategies to reach district goals. Much of this information would be difficult to obtain as a board member who does not interact daily with the Superintendent or the staff. As a board, we have also used the model to receive feedback on the Board of Education’s effectiveness. This process helped the Board of Education to recognize our areas of strength and specific areas that needed improvement. Overall and most importantly, the process helped guide the Board in the development of goals for the District by allowing us to narrow our focus to specific areas that need improvement. I believe this model will continue to be effective in our district because it is easily adaptable to individual and district goals and initiatives. We continue to develop surveys and questions that are in line with both past improvement areas and future goals.

The only improvement I would suggest would be to try to ensure we get 100% feedback from survey groups.

Kelly Adkins, CFO
Ironton-Lawrence County Area Community Action Organization
305 North 5th St.
Ironton, OH 45638
740-532-3534 Ext. 218
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