

Performance Evaluation of Administrators

I. The Evaluation Cycle

The administrative evaluation process operates as a continuous improvement cycle, not as a single end-of-the-year event. The process is expected to promote clear communication, formative feedback, performance growth, and thoughtful evaluation by both the employee and his/her supervisor. This cycle applies to all administrators, including principals, assistant principals, cabinet members, directors, managers, supervisors and specialists.

Goal Setting

The goal setting meeting and approval of the administrator's annual performance goals should be completed between the administrator and his/her supervisor by October 15, but must conclude no later than October 30 each year.

Goal Setting Preparation

Prior to the goal setting meeting, the administrator and his/her supervisor will reflect on the previous year's evaluation and possible performance goals. The administrator should review the evaluation rubric, the strategic plan, the annual operating plan, and his/her personal professional growth plan to identify target areas for personal growth and district improvement, and to draft goals for the coming year. The supervisor will review the evaluation rubric, strategic plan, and annual operating plan to identify possible areas of emphasis and performance goals for the coming year.

Goal Setting Conversation

During the goal setting meeting, the administrator and his/her supervisor will discuss their priorities for the coming year, appropriate areas of emphasis and desired outcomes, specific performance goals, and the evidence that might be used for evaluation. They may also discuss the resources and support needed to accomplish the goals. Some questions that may be discussed during the conversation include:

- In terms of the district strategic plan, which areas of performance are most important to address in the coming year? Why?
- In terms of the administrator's own professional growth needs, which areas of performance are most important? Why?
- What forms of evidence are most likely to provide reliable information on the administrator's performance?
- Are there any areas in which accomplishment of specific performance goals is required for attaining the "proficient" level?
- Are there any areas in which policies, practices, or other issues are likely to hinder attainment of proficiency? What support is available to help overcome these possible obstacles? Are there professional development opportunities that would assist the administrator?

Goal Setting Outcome

By the end of the meeting, the administrator and his/her supervisor should have a clear understanding of priority performance outcomes, as well as the key evidence that will be used to evaluate the administrator at the end of the year.

Mid-cycle Review (Annual Goals Progress Report)

The second evaluation conference should be conducted between the administrator and his/her supervisor by the conclusion of January, but will occur no later than February 1 of each year.

The administrator and his/her supervisor will periodically discuss progress to date and resolve any questions or issues that have arisen. The administrator may share samples of the evidence being collected and the supervisor has an opportunity to raise questions and provide feedback. These discussions will typically occur during the regular meetings between the administrator and his/her supervisor. Some questions that may be discussed:

- In what areas does the administrator feel most confident about his/her performance thus far? Is that perception shared by the supervisor? Are the administrator and his/her supervisor interpreting the rubric in the same way?
- In what areas are there questions, issues, or ambiguities?
- What does the evidence look like at this point? Are there areas in which evidence has been difficult to collect? What alternatives are available?

End-of-cycle Review (Summary Rating Format)

The final evaluation conference should be conducted between the administrator and his/her supervisor by the conclusion of May, but must occur no later than June 29.

Final Evaluation Preparation

Prior to the meeting, the administrator will provide his/her supervisor with a summary of outcomes of the performance goals, as well as evidence pertaining to the standards. The supervisor reviews the materials.

Final Evaluation Conversation

During the final evaluation conference, the administrator and his/her supervisor will discuss their perceptions of the events and outcomes of the past year and review the related evidence. Some questions that may be discussed:

- How do the administrator and his/her supervisor perceive performance in each criteria? If there are differences in views, is this because of how the rubric is being interpreted or because of how the evidence is being viewed?
- If there are areas in which performance is less than proficient, what specific actions would be needed to bring it to proficiency?
- What are the implications for next year's goal-setting?

Final Evaluation Outcome

The supervisor prepares a written summary of the evaluation and shares it with the employee.

Begin Next Cycle

The results of the evaluation will influence the following year's evaluation process.

Based on the current-year experiences, the administrator may wish to add or remove some goals from his or her Professional Growth Plan or propose new performance goals. Similarly, the supervisor may wish to propose new goals or focus on different standards, or may decide to concentrate on issues identified during the evaluation.

II. Evaluation of Principals and Assistant Principals

The performance of principals and assistant principals will be evaluated at least once per year in accordance with the requirements of state law.

The evaluative criteria for certificated principals and assistant principals are:

1. Creating a school culture that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and teaching for students and staff;
2. Demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap;
3. Providing for school safety;
4. Leading the development, implementation and evaluation of a data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements;
5. Assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local school district learning goals;
6. Monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices;
7. Managing both staff and fiscal resources to support student achievement and legal responsibilities; and
8. Partnering with the school community to promote student learning.

All principals and assistant principals who supervise the operation and management of a school will be assessed through a rubric based on the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP) leadership framework and receive a performance rating. The four levels of performance are unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. Two formats for evaluation, comprehensive and focused, will be used as defined by statute. Principals in their first three years in the position; principals in their first year in the district previously employed a minimum of three consecutive years as a principal in another school district in the state of Washington; and any principal who received a comprehensive summative evaluation performance rating of unsatisfactory or basic in the previous school year, or any principal for whom his/her supervisor has determined the comprehensive evaluation warranted will be evaluated using the comprehensive format. All principals must receive a comprehensive evaluation at least once every six (6) years.

III. Evaluation of District Administrators

The assistant superintendent, executive directors, program directors, assistant directors, and classified supervisors will be evaluated using a leadership rubric and receive a performance rating. The four levels of performance are unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. Two formats for evaluation, comprehensive or focused, will be used. The evaluation will result in a comprehensive summative performance rating.

The evaluative standards for teaching and learning leaders, including administrators responsible for Teaching and Learning, Student Support, and Categorical Programs are:

1. Effective Leadership;
2. Quality Instruction and Learning;
3. Planning with Data for System-Wide Improvement;
4. Creating a Culture of Clear and Collaborative Relationships;
5. Ensuring Compliance and Safety;
6. Managing Resources;
7. Engaging the Community and External Environment; and
8. Closing Achievement Gaps and Removing Barriers

The evaluative standards for operations leaders, including administrators responsible for Human Resources, Finance, Technology, Facilities, Transportation & Nutrition Services are:

1. Creating a Culture;
2. Ensuring Compliance and Safety;
3. Planning with Data;
4. Aligning the Work;
5. Improving Departmental Performance;
6. Managing Staff and Fiscal Resources;
7. Engaging Internal and External Stakeholders
8. Overcoming Systemic Barriers to Success

The Alignment of District Leadership standards to those outlined in RCW28A.405.100 follows.

Alignment of District Leadership Frameworks with RCW 28A.405.100

Criteria Listed in RCW 28A.405.100	Alignment with District Leadership Framework for <i>Teaching & Learning Leaders</i>	Alignment with District Leadership Framework for <i>Operations Leaders</i>
1. Knowledge of, experience in, and training in recognizing good professional performance, capabilities, and development	Criterion: 2 - Quality Instruction and Learning 8 - Closing Achievement Gaps and Removing Barriers	Criterion: 5 - Improving Departmental Performance
2. School administration and management	Criterion: 5 - Ensuring Compliance and Safety 6 – Managing Resources	Criterion: 2 - Ensuring Compliance and Safety 6 - Managing Staff and Fiscal Resources
3. School finance	Criterion: 6 – Managing Resources	Criterion: 6: Managing Staff and Fiscal Resources
4. Professional preparation and scholarship	Criterion: 1 – Effective Leadership 2 – Quality Instruction and Learning 3 – Planning with data for system wide improvement 6 – Managing Resources 8 – Closing achievement gaps and removing barriers	Criterion: 1 - Creating a Culture 2 - Ensuring Compliance and Safety 3 - Planning With Data 5 - Improving Departmental Performance 6 - Managing Staff and Fiscal Resources 8 - Overcoming Systemic Barriers to Success
5. Effort toward improvement when needed	Addressed in criterion ratings	Addressed in criterion ratings
6. Interest in pupils, employees, patrons, and subjects taught in school	Criterion: 2 - Quality Instruction and Learning 7 - Engaging the Community and External Environment 8 - Closing Achievement Gaps and Removing Barriers	Criterion: 1 - Creating a Culture 7 - Engaging Internal and External Stakeholders
7. Leadership	Criterion: 1 - Effective Leadership	Criterion: 1 - Creating a Culture 3 - Planning With Data 4 - Aligning the work 8 - Overcoming Systemic Barriers to Success
8. Ability and performance of evaluation of school personnel	Criterion: 1 - Effective Leadership	Criterion: 5 - Improving Departmental Performance

With the exception of district office and program administrators in their first three years of employment in their position, and any district office and program administrators who received a comprehensive performance rating of Level 1 or 2 in the previous year, district office and program administrators must receive a comprehensive evaluation at least once every six years. The focused evaluation is designed to target one leadership criterion, identified collaboratively by the district office and program administrator and their supervisor, for professional growth. While the criterion selected will be the focus of the evaluation, the supervisor must rate all eight leadership criteria on the administrator's year-end evaluation.