

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

Each district is required to develop a comprehensive leader evaluation system that is aligned to W.S. 21-2-304 (b) (xv) and (xvi), W.S. 21- 3 -110 (a) (xxx) and (b), and the Wyoming Department of Education Chapter 29 rules and regulations. As well as aligning to standards there are six required components that must be included in each superintendent evaluation system and several technical issues to be decided. When developing the comprehensive system districts should discuss the following questions:

- A. Which standards and benchmarks will the system be aligned to and which district leader positions will be evaluated using those standards?
- B. What materials will be collected as multiple sources of performance evidence?
- C. What rating system will be used to describe performance and at which levels will it be used?
- D. What are the elements of the evaluation cycle as they pertain to evaluators and to those being evaluated?
- E. What documents are needed to guide the process for evaluators and those being evaluated?
- F. What specific quality control policies or procedures are needed to ensure the system is being implemented and is working?
- G. What supports are available for the continuous improvement of the superintendent?
- H. Which tool will be used - one recommended by WSBA, one from another district or group, or one created by the district?
- I. What revisions will be made to the tool to make it more district specific?
- J. How will WDE/SBE be informed about the system the district is using?

Leadership is a complex undertaking that requires the use of actions, methods, ideas, and beliefs in a variety of areas of practice. Some examples of areas of practice include instructional leadership, community engagement, and personnel management. The various areas of practice are typically represented by different standards or categories that may be described separately, but, in the day-to-day life of the leader, they overlap and interlink. The following definitions are used in the rest of this document.

Wyoming Standards: seven broad areas of professional practice that define the performance expectations of a district leader.

Wyoming Benchmarks: specific tasks that describe the actions, methods, ideas, and beliefs related to the standard or area of practice.

Categories: broad functional areas that define the district leader's duties and are aligned to the Wyoming Standards.

Responsibilities: specific tasks that describe the actions, methods, ideas and beliefs related to the category and are aligned to the Wyoming Benchmarks.

Components: six required sections of a system that when developed and implemented with fidelity constitute a comprehensive evaluation system

Elements – the phases of the evaluation cycle that are completed each year to ensure continuous improvement

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

- A. Which standards and benchmarks will the system be aligned to and which district leader positions will be evaluated using those standards?
- The three models presented by WSBA are aligned to the state standards and benchmarks. The WSBA Wyoming Standards Superintendent Evaluation is standards-based aligning to all the standards and benchmarks in Chapter 29. The other two models, the WSBA Leadership Governance Superintendent Evaluation and the WSBA Superintendent Evaluation, are formatted around categories and responsibilities that are usually found in district policies and superintendent job descriptions. These two models also address all the standards and benchmarks. Several other Wyoming districts have had their models analyzed for alignment to the standards by WDE.
 - Each district must determine the leaders who are to be evaluated using these standards. A district may decide to use the system with their superintendent and additional central office staff such as assistant superintendents or directors or to use the system for the superintendent only.
- B. What materials will be collected as **multiple sources** of performance evidence? (Component 1)
- WSBA has provided a document titled “Sources of Evidence” which districts can refer to when determining what materials will be used as sources for performance ratings. WSBA suggests that Boards collaborate with the superintendent to identify which of these materials to use for each standard or category. Identifying what information is needed, how to gather the information, and how frequently information is gathered should be the focus of these discussions.
 - **Multiple Sources of Evidence** - Selected by the district to provide a more comprehensive and accurate assessment of performance. Considerations:
 - a) For each standard/category consider what information or artifacts you will accept to determine performance?
 1. Look through the list of sources of evidence and choose several that make sense.
 2. Ask the superintendent to suggest measures.
 - b) How will you gather the information?
 1. The superintendent will gather the information and provide it to the Board.
 2. The Board will ask for information from stakeholders other than the superintendent.
 - c) What is the timeline for gathering or receiving evidence?
 1. Select dates to receive evidence based on the evaluation cycle.
 2. Ask the superintendent to provide regularly provide information (weekly report, monthly report, periodic self-reflection)

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

- C. What **rating system** will be used to describe performance and at which levels will it be used? (Component 2)
- WSBA has suggested options for the rating system. Each district will need to first determine whether they want to rate at the standard/category level or at both the standard/category level and the benchmark/responsibility level. Fully describing what each rating means is critical to the evaluation process. Boards should discuss how they intend to compile the information – each trustee rating individually, the ratings averaged, a median or mode found, a consensus rating determined, or all ratings recorded. Each of the WSBA models provides a place for benchmarks/responsibilities to be checked for meeting expectations. This could easily be converted for use with the rating system that is chosen if a board wishes to rate at a more granular level. Once the rating system is determined it should be described on the tool being used.
 - **Rating System** - Performance level descriptors defined by the district and in compliance with W.S. 21-3-110(b) which requires a report on leaders in need of improvement or ineffective. Considerations:
 - a) What rating system will you use?
 1. 5 point –
 - ✓ Option A: 5 = Always effective, 4 = Often effective, 3 = Sometimes effective, 2 = Rarely effective, 1 = Never effective
 - ✓ Option B: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Fair, 2 = Poor, 1 = Unsatisfactory
 - ✓ Option C: 5 = Effective, 4 = Capable, 3 = Somewhat Effective, 2 = Needs improvement, 1 = Ineffective
 2. 4 point –
 - ✓ Option A: 4 = Full compliance, 3 = Progress being made toward compliance, 2 = Performance may need attention, 1 = Performance not in compliance
 - ✓ Option B; 4 = Exceeds Expectations, 3 = Meets Expectations; 2 = Partially Meets Expectations; 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations
 - ✓ Option C: 4 = Exemplary, 3=Proficient, 2=Needs Improvement, 1=Unsatisfactory
 - ✓ Option D: 4=Consistently effective, 3 = Often Effective, 2 = Occasionally Effective, 1=Ineffective
 3. 3 Point
 - ✓ Option A: 3 = Meets Expectations, 2 = Some improvement needed, 1 = Major improvement needed
 - ✓ Option B: 3 = Exceeds, 2 = Meets, 1 = Does Not Meet
 4. 2 Point
 - ✓ Option A: 2 = Met, 1 = Not Met
 - ✓ Option B: 2 = Satisfactory, 1 = Unsatisfactory
 - ✓ Option C: 2 = Good Enough, 1 = Needs Improvement
 - b) At what level (standard/category level or benchmark/responsibility level) will you use the rating system?
 1. Each benchmark/ responsibility will be evaluated separately, with benchmark/responsibility scores aggregated to the standard/category level.
 2. Only standards/categories will be rated.

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

3. An evaluator will make an “Expectation Check” to indicate that the benchmark /responsibility has been met.
 - ✓ Option A: Met/Not Met;
 - ✓ Option B: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory;
 - ✓ Option C: Adequate/Needs Improvement
 - ✓ Option D: Yes/Not Yet;
 - ✓ Option E: + (Okay)/Δ (Change Needed);
 - ✓ Option F: Check Mark/No Check Mark

c) How will you collect and aggregate ratings from multiple evaluators?

1. Each board member will independently rate.
2. All individual ratings will be displayed
3. The average or the mode will become the rating
4. The Board will discuss the individual ratings and reach consensus on the final one
5. The Board will meet as a whole board to determine the rating for each standard/category or benchmark/responsibility.

D. What are the elements of the **evaluation cycle** as they pertain to evaluators and to those being evaluated?
(Component 3)

- These decisions are focused on elements that will be included in the evaluation process to ensure that it a model of continuous improvement. The cycle might include: a self-evaluation by the superintendent, setting goals, providing feedback, providing evidence, analyzing evidence and a time table for when each of these aspects will be completed. The time frames should provide enough time for both evaluators and those being evaluated to consider and complete the various aspects of the evaluation. WSBA suggests several timeline options for completing the process and rationale for those suggestions. WSBA believes that formative feedback is an important aspect of a comprehensive evaluation system. Boards will need to determine how to provide feedback in a meaningful way. Boards will also need to decide if they are assessing all standards/categories each year or as Chapter 29 rules allow, assessing the “Focus on Maximizing Learning” standard/category each year and focusing on some, but not all, the remaining standards/categories. Chapter 29 rules require all the standards/categories be evaluated at least once over a five-year period. Decisions that are made for this component should be written in a guidance document for future board members and superintendents.
- **Evaluation Cycle** - Designed by the district for professional growth, to refine goals, and provide formative feedback. Considerations:
 - a) What are the elements of the system? (The following is a suggestion of possible elements, but districts may modify to fit their needs.)
 1. Responsibility of Evaluators: Review evaluation process annually, identify standards/categories of focus collaboratively, set goals collaboratively, gather and analyze supporting evidence, provide formative feedback, complete summative evaluation, identify areas of focus collaboratively, refine goals collaboratively.

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

2. Responsibility of Leaders: identify standards/categories of focus collaboratively, set goals collaboratively, provide evidence, complete self-reflection, identify areas of focus collaboratively, refine goals collaboratively.
- b) Which standards/categories will be addressed each year?
1. Must evaluate the standard/category of “Focus on Maximizing Learning” each year and must evaluate the rest of the standards/categories at least once every 5 years.
 2. Could do all each year.
 3. Could rotate standards/categories over the 5-year period by collaboratively deciding on the focus for each year.
- c) What are the timelines for each element of the system to be completed?
1. Annually - once each year complete all elements of the system.
 - ✓ July - Review evaluation process, set goals collaboratively, review goal progress
 - ✓ Nov. - Gather and review supporting evidence (limited for a new superintendent)
 - ✓ Nov./Dec./Jan. – Write summative evaluation and provide feedback
 - ✓ Jan./Feb. – Conduct employment and contract discussions (or do contract discussions in June)
 - ✓ Repeat cycle
 2. Periodically, at designated times throughout the year, complete certain elements of the system
 - ✓ July - Review evaluation process, set goals collaboratively, review goal progress
 - ✓ Oct./ March/June - Gather and review supporting evidence, provide formative feedback
 - ✓ Nov. – Write summative evaluation and provide final feedback (limited for a new superintendent)
 - ✓ Jan. – Conduct employment and contract discussions (or wait to do contract discussions in June)
 - ✓ Repeat cycle
 3. Monthly complete certain elements of the system
 - ✓ July - Review evaluation process, set goals collaboratively, review goal progress
 - ✓ Designate standards/ categories and benchmarks/responsibilities to be evaluated during each monthly board meeting
 - ✓ Gather and review supporting evidence, provide formative feedback monthly
 - ✓ Nov. – Write summative evaluation and provide final feedback (limited for a new superintendent)
 - ✓ Jan. – Conduct employment and contract discussions (or wait to do contract discussions in June)
 - ✓ Repeat cycle
 4. Rationale behind suggested timelines: Summative evaluation in November – completed before potential changes to the board due to elections plus the accountability results have been received

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

by the district; Contract discussions in June – by June the district will have a better idea of budget constraints and negotiations with staff will have been completed; Monthly or periodic feedback – formative feedback provides an opportunity to improve performance during the year.

E. What specific documents are needed to **guide the process** for evaluators and those being evaluated?
(Component 4)

- Having documents that describe the evaluation process for evaluators and superintendents is a wise idea. These documents should clearly describe elements of the evaluation system as they apply to evaluator responsibilities and the responsibilities of the person being evaluated, timelines, supports that may be available for continuous improvement, and the tool to be used. They might also explain the processes for gathering evidence, for compiling the information, for developing goals, and for reaching final determinations. These documents are meant as guidance documents and therefore it is up to the board to decide if any need to be adopted as part of policy or regulations.
- **Guidance Documents and Training** - Determined by the district to better prepare evaluators and those being evaluated. Considerations:
 - a) What guidance is important for future board members and for future superintendents?
 1. Standards/categories to be evaluated (all or some)
 2. Tool used for evaluation
 3. Evaluation cycle
 4. Performance rating descriptions
 5. Process for final performance determinations
 6. Evidence to be gathered

F. What specific **quality control** policies or procedures are needed to ensure the system is being implemented and is working? (Component 5)

- The board should adopt policies and procedures to ensure the evaluation system is being implemented with fidelity. The policy on superintendent evaluation does not need to detail all the specifics. It should indicate if the system is aligned to the state standards and that the evaluation system will be implemented by the board annually. It could reference where any guidance documents may be found (procedures or regulations or other). The policy should also reference the methods used to safeguard any confidential information used in the evaluation system. Finally, the policy should describe how the board will periodically assess how well the system is working.
- **Quality Controls**- Policies and procedures defined by the district to ensure system is implemented with fidelity. Considerations:
 - a) What policies should be adopted to ensure the system is implemented with fidelity?
 - b) How will evidence be collected and protected?
 - c) How will the board review the evaluation system to ensure the system is working properly?

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

- G. What **supports are available** for the continuous improvement of the superintendent? (Component 6)
- Since one purpose of the system is to assist the superintendent in improving performance, the board and superintendent should determine what assistance is available. This is an excellent opportunity for a collaborative discussion which will vary from district to district and from superintendent to superintendent. The supports may change from year to year based on the experience of the superintendent and board as well as the focus of district improvement efforts. Supports can also be designed to aid evaluators in increasing the quality of their evaluations and the feedback they provide to those being evaluated.
 - **Supports** - Designed by the district to foster professional learning and growth in those being evaluated and those serving as evaluators. Considerations:
 - a) What resources will be provided for superintendent growth?
 1. Professional development
 2. Mentor
 3. Courses of study
 4. Self-reflective practices
 5. Additional feedback
 6. Participation in leadership academies or networks
 7. Online resources
 - b) How will constructive feedback be provided?
 1. In person or in writing or both
 2. By each board member, by the board as a “committee of the whole”, by a committee of the board, by the board chairman
 - b) What training needs to be provided for evaluators?
 1. Analyzing evidence
 2. Providing formative feedback
 3. Developing goals
 4. Understanding the standards/categories, benchmarks/responsibilities and performance rating descriptions
- H. Which evaluation tool will be used - one recommended by WSBA, one from another district or group, or one created by the district?
- The three tools from WSBA are aligned to the Wyoming state standards. There are other options that are also aligned to the Wyoming state standards. The McRel Superintendent Evaluation and the McRel Central Office Evaluation are partially aligned but would need some revisions to fully align to state standards. The Leader in Me is aligned but could use some slight revisions. Fremont #1’s Superintendent Evaluation is aligned to the standards.
 - Should the district decide to create its own system based on alternate standards that are different from the Wyoming standards, there are additional steps that need to be completed: A) On or before Feb. 1, 2019 notify WDE/SBE that the district intends to use alternate standards; identify local standards and

Guidance to Districts on Superintendent Evaluation Systems

benchmarks; describe the alignment with state standards; provide assurances that more information will be submitted and B) On or before June 1, 2019 submit the purpose and goals of the system, evidence the alternative standards reflect best practice; and evidence of system quality (a description of the six components of the evaluation system.)

I. What revisions should be made to the chosen tool to make it more district specific?

- Each of the WSBA tools can be modified to include additional information such as the rating system, instructions for completing the tool, and timelines. After deciding the level at which ratings will be made, the format should be changed to reflect that decision. The introduction and summary pages should be revised to reflect district preferences. Districts that choose to use the Leadership Governance model will need to add the specific responsibilities from their LG policies to each category while keeping the responsibilities that are listed on the tool.

J. How will WDE/SBE be informed about the system?

- Each district must inform the WDE by February 1, 2019 of its plans to either use the state standards or use their own alternate standards. If a district chooses to use state standards: on or before Feb. 1, 2019 it will notify WDE/SBE that it is using state defined standards. If a district chooses to use their own standards: On or before Feb. 1, 2019 it will notify WDE/SBE that the district intends to use alternate standards; identify local standards and benchmarks; describe the alignment with state standards; provide assurances that more information will be submitted and B) On or before June 1, 2019 it will submit the purpose and goals of the system, evidence the alternative standards reflect best practice; and evidence of system quality.
- From then on, the district and superintendent will submit annual assurances that the system is developed and implemented. The system will be reviewed every five years during the on-site accreditation process.