

SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION MANUAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview	3
Policy Governance® Evaluation Model	4
Evaluation Process	6
Appendix	
CEO Evaluation Guide	8
Trustee Evaluation Worksheets	12
Annual Summative Evaluation of the Superintendent	13

OVERVIEW

An effective working relationship between the Superintendent and the Board is essential to a successful operation of the school district. The development and maintenance of such a relationship can be assured by an annual review of the Superintendent's direct responsibilities, accompanied by the appraisal of his/her performance.

Conducted properly, the evaluation appraisal will benefit the instructional program of the school district by:

1. Enhancing the chief administrator's effectiveness;
2. Assuring the Board that its policies are being carried out;
3. Strengthening the working relationship between the Board and the Superintendent; and
4. Providing the Superintendent with specific expectations and feedback regarding his/her performance.

Although the evaluation of the Superintendent has several purposes, the ultimate objective is to assure educational excellence through effective governance and management of the system.

THE POLICY GOVERNANCE EVALUATION MODEL

(Taken from excerpts of John Carver's handbook called, "Board Assessment of the CEO," pages 4 and 5; Copyright© 1997 by Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA.)

Conventional Board governance approaches the task of Superintendent evaluation on a once-a-year event during which the individual's actual performance is compared to a long list of duties and responsibilities. In contrast, the policy governance approach focuses on organizational performance not on the performance of one individual. In other words, did the organization produce what it was supposed to produce?

The steps Carver recommends first in conceptualizing and then carrying out Superintendent evaluation are reproduced below:

1. Determine what is required for Board accountability. Begin by thinking about what is required for the Board, not the CEO, to be accountable. Starting with the CEO is like starting a story in the middle instead of the beginning.
2. Set executive performance criteria. If the Board does not do its job first, evaluating the CEO will not make sense. Since the Board must see to it that the organization performs, it must first define the desired performance. Criteria for executive performance are established in Policy Governance by policies on Ends and Executive Limitations.
3. Establish method and frequency of monitoring. Performance is an ongoing and often inconstant affair, so the Board must stay continually informed. To do so, set a monitoring method and frequency for each Ends policy and each Executive Limitations policy.
4. Treat monitoring data as judgmental rather than informative. As the monitoring data roll in, treat the data as the Board's continual, topic-by-topic evaluation of the organization's performance. For example, a monthly monitoring of financial information is not done to become informed about finances in some general way but to judge whether the Board's expectations are being met.

**APPENDIX
Superintendent Evaluation Manual
(Continued)**

Board of School Trustees

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

5. View the organization's performance as the CEO's performance. Treat the organization's performance on Ends and Executive Limitations as a direct reading of the CEO's performance, as if the organization and CEO is the exact same thing. Organizational performance or nonperformance is CEO performance or nonperformance.

6. Plan discussions of cumulative monitoring data. Periodically have a summary discussion about how the monitoring data have looked over, say, the past year. The data used are simply an accumulation of what the Board has already received – and reacted to, if appropriate – in the interim. As with regular monitoring, of course, be careful not to permit non-criteria items into the discussion except for the purpose of questioning Board policy itself. This annual discussion takes the place of the traditional formal CEO evaluation. Annual CEO evaluation in the absence of a rigorous monitoring system based on stated Board criteria is largely window dressing that conceals poor governance.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Contractual agreement and Board policy stipulate that the Superintendent's job performance be evaluated at least semi-annually using a performance based evaluation system developed by the Board and agreed to by the Superintendent.

The Board has agreed to conduct two evaluations of the Superintendent using the Policy Governance® Evaluation Model. Specifically, prior to July 1, of each school year, a formative session will be held and shall consist of a dialogue between the Board and the Superintendent. Prior to February 1, of each school year, a second evaluation session will be held culminating in a written evaluation. This requirement will be comprised of the following steps:

1. By the end of February of each year the Board will meet with the Superintendent to review the evaluation criteria for the next school year and make any revisions of the evaluation process. This will include a discussion of Ends and Executive Limitations.
2. By April, the Board will meet with the Superintendent to review the evaluation instrument. The evaluation instrument consists of the following documents:
 - Monitoring report data for the current school year developed by the Superintendent.
 - A summary developed by the Board, presented in a public meeting and placed in the Superintendent's file.

Additionally, Board members may refer to their confidential worksheets containing their individual notes and assessments to facilitate discussion.

- A summary evaluation letter developed by the Board.
3. Monitoring of Superintendent performance will be conducted throughout the year in the method and frequency directed by policy B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance, accordingly:

**APPENDIX
Superintendent Evaluation Manual
(Continued)**

Board of School Trustees

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

- Monitoring reports will be rated when presented, if reasonably interpreted, and proven with data including exceptions or commendations.
 - Monitoring reports are judgmental not informational and once rated there is no need to rate them again during the evaluation process. A summative form will be provided that outlines the ratings of all monitoring reports for the current evaluation cycle.
4. By April, of each year, review and discuss ground rules for using the evaluation instrument. Accordingly, the Board will:
- Review the rating guidelines outlined in B/SL-5, #4 and determine if guidelines should change.
 - Review, in advance, the rating process that will be used.
5. The formal annual evaluation will be conducted by January 30th of each year and will consist of the following steps:
- Prior to the scheduled evaluation session, individual Board members will complete a summary confidential worksheet independently. These completed worksheets and the ratings from the monitoring reports form the basis for arriving at consensus.
 - During a closed session of the Board and district Board counsel, trustees will discuss their confidential worksheets containing their individual notes and assessments including each Ends and Executive Limitation policy (as information only) and discussion on recommendations for the Superintendent. The Superintendent will then join the closed session to review and discuss the findings.
 - The Superintendent and the Board president sign and date the completed Superintendent appraisal following the performance evaluation conference.

APPENDIX A

CEO EVALUATION GUIDE

(The following is taken from excerpts of John Carver's handbook called, "Board Assessment of the CEO," pages 1, 2, 4, 10-13, 16, 17, and pages 20-22, Copyright© 1997 by Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA.)

- No single relationship in the organization is as important as that between the Board and its chief executive officer (CEO). That relationship, well conceived, can set the stage for effective governance and management.
- The job of CEO is to ensure the (1) achievement of a reasonable interpretation of the organizational results, beneficiaries, and cost of those results as described in the Board's ends policies, and (2) avoidance of a reasonable interpretation of the unacceptable conditions and actions described in the Board's executive limitations policies.
- The best way for Boards to approach the topic of CEO evaluation is not to think of evaluating the CEO at all but to think of evaluating whether the organization has achieved what should have been achieved and avoided what should have been avoided.
- The way the Board expresses criteria for CEO performance should simultaneously support optimal Board leadership and optimal executive prerogatives.
- Pre-established criteria are required for good monitoring for the following reasons:
 1. Pre-established criteria save the Board time. Each judging actions will take more people and more time if the criteria are unclear. Boards can rush through the traditional process with little real inspection, of course but if rubber - stamping is to be avoided, each judging action will consume material Board time repeatedly.

2. Criteria save the staff time. Time is lost when staff proposals are based on considerations later found to be unacceptable.
 3. Judgment is simply not fair without criteria. Many CEOs have received unearned harsh judgment from Boards whose values became clear only after executive initiative had been taken. Such Boards find it easier and safer to shoot down staff action than to struggle with and déclassé their own values at the outset. Conversely, CEOs have received undeserved Board favor when a more rigorous test of their performance would have led to correction or even to termination.
 4. A Board does a far more creditable job of judging staff performance if it does so in two distinct steps rather than in one.
 5. A two-step process leads to a far better product. Board members debate and decide at the outset those group values that will be codified in Ends and Executive limitations polices.
- **Monitoring CEO Performance**
 1. **Executive Report.** The CEO makes available a report that directly addresses the policy being monitored.
 2. **External Audit.** The Board selects an external resource to measure staff compliance with respect to a specific policy.
 3. **Direct Inspection.** The Board assigns one or more Board members to check compliance with a specific policy. This monitoring method should not be used unless the Board role and discipline are in excellent order, lest it deteriorate into meddling.
 - The only judgment to take place in monitoring is whether reasonable persons believe that actual performance matches the pre-established criteria.

- Monitoring organizational or executive performance is a continual process. The Board may wish to punctuate this continuity with an annual CEO performance appraisal. That is fine as long as the Board understands that the ongoing evaluation is the most important element.

- What Not to Do in Your CEO Evaluation
 1. Don't make CEO evaluation a popularity contest, whether popularity with Board members, staff, clientele, or public.
 2. Don't use a prefabricated CEO evaluation form you've found in a book, workshop, or magazine. The only fair evaluation of a person is based on what he or she has been told ahead of time are the criteria for that evaluation. Prefabricated forms contain someone else's idea of what a CEO should be like or should accomplish.
 3. Don't evaluate the CEO on whether he or she accomplished her personal objectives for the year. The CEO's objectives are of no concern to the Board. Whether the CEO accomplishes criteria found in the Board's policies is the only legitimate test.
 4. Don't commission a group of citizens to evaluate your CEO for you.
 5. Don't ask staff, public, customers, clients, patients, or students what they think of your CEO's performance. The CEO doesn't work for the staff or the public but for the Board. Boards sometimes want others to do their work for them. *
 6. Don't ever, ever; ever evaluate the CEO on criteria that have not been created in writing by the Board ahead of time. And even then, give the CEO room to use any reasonable interpretation of the Board's criteria.

* Note: It is legitimate to query groups such as those mentioned in Item 5 if the Board is genuinely monitoring criteria that call for data that such groups can give.

- Summary
 1. Define what should be achieved (Ends) and what should be avoided (Executive Limitations).
 2. Fix the point of accountability on the CEO.
 3. Check regularly that Ends are achieved and Limitations are not violated.
- As a Board focuses on how to optimize CEO evaluation, it is important that the evaluation is not an End in itself. The most important purpose of evaluation is to make the future better, not to produce a report card.
- CEO evaluation may be difficult or easy to conduct, or may be precisely or crudely conducted. Ease and numerical precision are not the important factors, however. The most important value of CEO evaluation is that it enables the Board to serve its central purpose that of seeing that the organization achieves what it should while avoiding unacceptable situations.
- Influencing an organization to produce in the future what it should, for whom it should, and in the amount per dollar it should is the central task of evaluating the CEO. Influencing an organization to conduct itself in the future within the bounds of acceptability is the secondary task of evaluating the CEO.
- “A crude measure of the right thing beats a precise measure of the wrong thing.”

**APPENDIX
Superintendent Evaluation Manual
(Continued)**

Board of School Trustees

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

APPENDIX B

TRUSTEE EVALUATION WORKSHEETS

Annually, Appendix B will be updated to reflect the Board's current evaluation worksheets.

The worksheets are located in the Appendix following this section.

**ANNUAL SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE
SUPERINTENDENT**

Clark County School District

The Board shall evaluate the Superintendent's performance at least semiannually. Specifically, prior to July 1st of each calendar year, a formative evaluation session shall be held. This formative evaluation shall consist of a dialogue between the Superintendent and the Board, discussing the Superintendent's performance in relation to the Performance Evaluation document. Prior to February 1st of each calendar year, a second evaluation session shall be held culminating in a formal written summative evaluation of the Superintendent, by the President of the Board of School Trustees. The Superintendent and the Board will review the document.

The purpose of the annual evaluation of the Superintendent is to summarize the actions previously taken by the Board as it monitored Executive Limitations and Ends (results) policies during the year and to draw conclusions on the basis of that on-going monitoring process relative to organizational performance and consequently the Superintendent's performance.

During the preceding year, the following Executive Limitations and Ends (results) policies were monitored by the Board, with acceptance of Monitoring Reports considered to be evidence of satisfactory organizational and Superintendent performance.

**APPENDIX
Superintendent Evaluation Completion Form
(Continued)**

Board of School Trustees

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Executive Limitations

	Executive Limitations	Date Accepted	Ratings	Initialed by Board President & Superintendent
EL-1	Global Executive Constraint			
EL-3	Treatment of Students and Their Families			
EL-4	Treatment of Staff			
EL-5	Financial Planning/Budgeting			
EL-6	Financial Condition and Activities			
EL-7	Emergency Superintendent Succession			
EL-8	Asset Protection			
EL-9	Compensation and Benefits			
EL-10	Communication & Support to the Board			

APENDIX
Superintendent Evaluation Completion Form
(Continued)

Board of School Trustees

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Ends (results)

	Ends	Date Accepted	Ratings	Initialed by Board President & Superintendent
E-1	Global Mission			
E-2	Academic Achievement			
E-2A	Academic Achievement – Defined			
E-3	Essential Skills			
E-3A	Essential Skills – Defined			
E-4	Responsible Citizenship			
E-4A	Responsible Citizenship - Defined			

Copies of each Monitoring Report are appended *

* The reports are appended during the evaluation(s) and are not included in the policy manual.

**APPENDIX
Superintendent Evaluation Manual
(Continued)**

Board of School Trustees

CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Signed _____, President

Date _____

Received _____, Superintendent

Date _____

Sample Language for annual written evaluation

Based upon the Board's acceptance of these reports and the ongoing monitoring of the organization's and the Superintendent's performance during the preceding year, the Board reaches the following conclusions relative to the Superintendent performance:

Ends

The Board finds the Superintendent has _____ on achieving the Global Mission of the Clark County School District.

The Board finds the Superintendent has _____ on End,
E-2: Academic Achievement.

The Board finds the Superintendent has _____ on End,
E-3: Essential Skills.

The Board finds the Superintendent has _____ on End,
E-4: Responsible Citizenship.

Executive Limitations

Approval with respect to the Superintendent's performance on meeting the Executive Limitations the Board has set for him, it is moved that the Board find as follows:

The Superintendent _____ regarding his performance on EL-1:
Global Executive Constraint.

The Superintendent _____ regarding his performance on EL-2:
Instructional Program; EL-3: Treatment of Students and Their Families; EL-4: Treatment of Staff; EL-5: Financial Planning/Budgeting; EL-6: Financial Condition and Activities; EL-7: Emergency Superintendent Succession; EL-8: Asset Protection; EL-9: Compensation and Benefits; EL-10: Communication and Support to the Board; EL-11: Facilities.

Contract

Approval for the Board to approve modification of the Superintendent's Employment Contract as follows:

Sample Language for the annual dialogue

The Board President states that the Board and the Superintendent met in closed session to discuss his performance with respect to the Executive Limitations and the Ends the Board had set for him/her, as measured by the Means and indicators he/she had developed. We as Board members, and the Superintendent agreed that the dialogue was constructive, and a valuable tool to help guide the Superintendent and to help both the Board and the Superintendent prepare for his performance evaluation, which would be held prior to February 1 of each year. This session was intended for dialogue and discussion only; the Board did not take action.