ISBA

INDIANA SCHOOL BOARDS
ASSOCIATION

IAPSS

Indiana Association of
Public School Superintendents

Indiana Superintendent Evaluation Guide

A JOINT PROJECT BY

THE INDIANA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

&

THE INDIANA ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

APPROVED:
JUNE 2012

REVISED:
JUNE 2015

REVISED:
SEPTEMBER 2020

Revised:
AUGUST 2024

INDIANA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION
One North Capitol Avenue, Suite 1215
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-639-0330

INDIANA ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
One North Capitol Avenue, Suite 1215
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317 639-0336

Table of Contents

Forward

The evaluation tool created by the Indiana Association of School Superintendents (IAPSS) and the Indiana School Boards Association (ISBA) has been the standard for superintendent evaluations since its inception in 2013. Although it has undergone multiple revisions—the most recent in 2020, the basis for the evaluation rubric has remained the State Standards for School Leaders – District Level.

This 2024 revision maintains the original structure outlined in the first iteration of the tool while focusing on making the instrument more user-friendly and approachable for both school boards and superintendents. Indiana legislation does not mandate the use of a specific tool. Still, it is essential that school boards and superintendents agree and collaborate on a comprehensive tool that allows for a fair and objective evaluation method, paving the path for more robust communication and continuous improvement.

This manual is intended to provide a common understanding of how to best use this evaluation instrument and process for success.

The 2024 Revision Committee

ISBA: Steve Horton – Director of Board Services
Lisa Tanselle, Esq. – General Counsel
Andy Maletta – Board Member, Portage Township Schools
Jack Russell – Board Member, Center Grove Community School Corporation
Kami Wait – Board Member, Concord Community Schools
IAPSS: Dr. Robert Taylor – Executive Director
Dr. David Chapman – Superintendent, South Vermillion Community School Corporation
Dan Funston – Superintendent, Concord Community Schools
Dr. Amanda Alaniz – Superintendent, Portage Township Schools

Purpose and Value of Evaluation

The superintendent evaluation is a fundamental responsibility for the school board, but one of the most challenging tasks to do well. The most effective evaluation process allows each board member to provide feedback fairly and objectively. That requires a high level of communication between the board and superintendent, information sharing, and data analysis. Conducting an annual evaluation that allows the leadership team to focus on student outcomes and provides an opportunity for continuous improvement, requires an intentional effort and collaboration on the part of the board and superintendent, as well as a continual process throughout the year that is not just a one-time occurrence at the end of the school year.

With the enactment of IC 20-28-11.5-4, regarding annual performance evaluations for certificated employees, there is an even greater reason for careful consideration when selecting an evaluation instrument, as well as how the entire evaluation process is conducted. Critical to this exercise is a mutual understanding of the value and overall purpose of the evaluation process.

This manual provides both school boards and superintendents a structure they may follow and an evaluation instrument that satisfies the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) expectations that are defined in the "Indiana Content Standards for Educators: School Leader – District Level" (See Appendix A). The purpose of the newly revised evaluation tool is to maintain the original benchmark standards, with a focus on the attributes necessary for an effective superintendent, but also one that more easily allows superintendents to provide relevant evidence of their work in each of the six benchmarks so their boards can be better connected and in a better position to evaluate that work fairly.

The Indiana School Boards Association (ISBA) and the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (IAPSS) endorse the IDOE position regarding superintendent evaluation which stresses that,

> **The development of robust superintendent evaluations is important because the success of the evaluation of Indiana's teachers and principals may depend on strong accountability for district leaders. Superintendents can make a better case for holding educators to high levels of accountability when they themselves are being judged based on student outcomes and Indiana's educators are more likely to accept strong accountability when they see themselves as being part of a broader system that has rigorous criteria built into it from top to bottom.**

An evaluation instrument adopted by a local school board may cover a range of attributes in several categories; however, every evaluation instrument must minimally be able to show compliance with the State Standards for School Leaders – District Level. To that end, the proposed evaluation process contains performance benchmarks that address the following state standards:

1. Human Capital Management
2. Instructional Leadership
3. Personal Behavior
4. Building Relationships
5. Culture of Achievement
6. Organizational, Operational, and Resource Management

This evaluation is *formative* in substance, identifying areas where job performance can be improved through intentional activities that support and enhance the superintendent's job performance. The evaluation is not simply a *summative* review of what did or did not happen according to plans. Consequently, it is crucial to allow for some flexibility in the process, remembering to differentiate between those goals that are reasonably expected to be achieved and those goals that are more subject to circumstances beyond the superintendent's ability to control.

The school board should strive to accomplish the following objectives through the evaluation process:

1. To clarify the superintendent's role as seen by the board
2. To develop a harmonious working relationship between the board and the superintendent
3. To encourage job performance improvement and development
4. To establish goals and objectives for the future

Strengthening the board/superintendent relationship is vital to a school's leadership team's health and productivity. The superintendent should be an active participant in evaluating and establishing performance goals and a method of monitoring and reporting progress to the board at regular intervals throughout the year.

The evaluation process is not an exercise that can be accomplished without considerable thought and effort. Board members and superintendents must become familiar with it and adapt and apply the performance criteria to the superintendent's expectations and responsibilities and the school corporation's needs and character. A good evaluation process, carefully administered and completed, is not only a record of annual performance but also a necessary and constructive accountability tool for school boards and superintendents.

Different Evaluation Instruments

The school board is responsible for choosing an evaluation instrument that meets the school corporation's needs. Developing or selecting the proper evaluation form is as important as writing a comprehensive job description. Indeed, the board should select an evaluation instrument that best represents both the board and the superintendent's interests, but it must also meet the criteria for evaluation of certificated employees established by IC 20-28-11.5-4 (see Appendix C).

The goal of the evaluation instrument should be to objectively measure performance characteristics that reflect the priorities jointly established by the board and superintendent and to assess a superintendent's performance in critical areas of job performance. Additionally, the evaluation instrument should be reasonably easy to use.

It is important to remember that the purpose of the superintendent's evaluation is to determine how the superintendent performs his or her duties and responsibilities as objectively as possible, nothing else.

The board should <u>always</u> include the superintendent in the evaluation process. It is not unusual for a superintendent to complete a self-evaluation using the same evaluation instrument as the board, with the results shared with the board after their assessment is completed.

Selecting the best evaluation form that meets the board's purposes, is mutually acceptable, reasonably easy to use, and worth spending the time necessary to choose or develop. Many types of instruments are readily available; however, most do not meet the current intent of evaluations as defined in Indiana statute (see Appendix C). If an evaluation instrument meets your corporation's requirements, it is perfectly acceptable to use it *as is*. However, it is permissible and sometimes preferable to customize a form to reflect the mission of your individual school corporation more accurately.

Choosing the correct evaluation form and type should not be done solely by the board or the superintendent. The evaluation instrument and performance criteria must be chosen as a joint activity between the board and superintendent. Each has a vested interest in the tool, and if all parties are comfortable with the procedure, the evaluation results will be more beneficial and will focus on ways to enhance job performance.

Various evaluation instruments have been commonly used in the superintendent evaluation process, and school boards are responsible for choosing the evaluation type and process that best fits their purposes and the criteria that are now in statute. The more common of these evaluation types are explained below:

The Rubric Instrument

An increasingly popular evaluation method is a rubric evaluation instrument. Classroom teachers commonly utilize this method for objective course and assignment evaluations. More recently, IDOE has modeled the rubric style of assessment in their RISE rubric evaluation, an instrument for school corporations' use in teacher and principal evaluations.

The merit of using a rubric instrument is that each indicator, question, skill set, or attribute is assigned values describing various performance levels or compliance levels. It is scored similarly to the Likert scale models. Still, instead of a number or letter with a subjective value, each performance level has an accompanying description that clearly defines the performance attributes that should be present for each indicator being assessed.

The rubric provides excellent formative evaluation information, especially beneficial to continuous improvement goals.

The Likert Scale Instrument

The Likert Scale instrument is one of the more common approaches used in superintendent evaluations. In this summative process, the evaluation consists of a list of responsibilities and tasks to be ranked using a scale to indicate the superintendent's performance. Often there is a space for comments at the end of each category to permit the board to describe performance areas where they would like to see improvement and to identify areas where they believe the superintendent excels. This counters feelings that the evaluation is based on subjective opinions. The board can complete this evaluation instrument individually and then average it or as a group by reaching a consensus. Some of the advantages of the checklist instrument are:

1. It allows board members to use a numerical scale to evaluate how well the administrator is performing his or her duties;
2. It allows board members to give a priority ranking to the various tasks; and
3. It helps the board reach consensus regarding satisfactory or unsatisfactory assessments.

Some instruments have an additional scale for each category, asking board members to indicate their level of understanding or proficiency in each evaluation category. This adds an element of fairness to the evaluation by allowing a board member who does not thoroughly understand a particular performance category to be exempted from assessing the superintendent's skills in that area. Similarly, the additional scale may be used to evaluate a board member's perception of a category's value to the superintendent's overall job performance. This allows performance in areas deemed more critical to receive a stronger focus in the evaluation.

The Attribute Instrument

The short question and answer format consists of a few simple questions or statements that focus on the superintendent's basic responsibilities and how well he or she is fulfilling these responsibilities. Some questions frequently used are:

1. What are the primary responsibilities of the superintendent?
2. Which of these responsibilities has the superintendent done well?
3. What could the board do to help the superintendent improve job performance?
4. What could the superintendent do to improve the school system?

Board members should have the superintendent's job description to review as they answer these questions to assure their assessments reflect the responsibilities assigned by the job description.

Having the superintendent complete the evaluation from his or her perspective is also valuable for discussion purposes when the superintendent meets with the board to discuss the evaluation.

In this format, a designated board representative should act as the evaluation chairperson to record board consensus regarding job performance and targets for the superintendent in the upcoming year.

The Narrative Instrument

The narrative instrument requires the superintendent to write an assessment of his or her performance for the past year, relying on all the major performance responsibilities contained in the superintendent's job description.

The board is responsible for reviewing the assessment and responding with its own report, emphasizing areas of agreement and outlining any disagreements, including proposing areas for improved job performance.

The Indiana Superintendent Evaluation Process

The ISBA/IAPSS Superintendent Evaluation Process has two primary components:

1. The Evaluation Rubric
2. Superintendent Goals and/or Objectives (Minimum of two per year)

Most importantly, this evaluation process completely meets the requirements of the General Assembly's intent in IC 20-28-11.5-4.

Setting the Evaluation Process Percentages

The evaluation metrics are critical to the process and must be taken seriously. The percentages represent the weight that is to be given to each of the two evaluation categories: Those should be entered into the Composite Rubric Scoring Tool, Process Percentages (see figure 1). Obviously, if the entire process represents 100%, then each of these categories individually represents a value less than the total. Both percentages must have a combined total of 100%.

Process Percentages

for school year:

Date Established

Rubric

Superintendent Goals / Objectives

Total =

figure 1 – Process Percentages

ISBA and IAPSS advise that the greater weight of evaluation should always be placed with the rubric. Additionally, it is also recommended that no category receive an inconsequential weight. The evaluation is about superintendent performance and school board member's responsibility to evaluate that performance. As such, it is never advisable to misrepresent the importance of key performance measures to unfairly skew evaluation

results. However, it is recognized that flexibility is important; it will be important for some boards to place a greater weight on their superintendent to fulfill personal goals and/or performance objectives in particular years, especially if the superintendent's traditional rubric performance is high.

Consequently, it is imperative that every school board and superintendent spend some time discussing the merits of each category to arrive at a defensible position for the weight that will be applied to each category. **Category weighting should be determined at the beginning of each evaluation period and not be altered without official board action.**

The Evaluation Rubric

The rubric consists of six performance benchmarks, each with between two and five performance indicators that describe a specific attribute or task being evaluated. Each indicator has four performance descriptions that correspond with Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective (see figure 1).

figure 1 – Rubric indicators and performance descriptions

The board member reads the indicator and, after reviewing the objective evidence of performance provided by the superintendent, marks the appropriate level of performance on the corresponding Individual Rubric score sheet (see figure 2). The score sheet is configured as a fillable PDF to allow the responses to be saved and shared electronically.

figure 2 – Individual Rubric score sheet

The Composite Rubric Scoring Tool

When the board members complete their individual evaluation rubrics, they are typically passed to the board president or often to an impartial third party to input the responses into the Composite Rubric Scoring Tool, which is designed to automatically calculate the average of the individual scores for both the rubric and goals portion of the evaluation instrument.

The first step is to enter the information specific to the school corporation in the General Data tab, (see figure 1)

figure 1 – Rubric score sheet General Data

It is important to enter the weight the board and superintendent decided upon for the Rubric and Superintendent Goals/Objectives (see figure. 2, Setting the evaluation process percentages).

figure 2 – Rubric score sheet Process Percentages

The individual scores from each board member for the rubric benchmarks and indicators are then inputted into the Rubric Indicator Summary tab (see figure 3)

1.0 Human Capital Manager – The superintendent uses the role of human capital manager to drive improvements in building leader effectiveness and student achievement.									Standard Score
									3.7

					Board Members					
Indicator	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Indicator Score
1.1	3	4	4	4	4					3.8
1.2	4	3	3	3	3					3.2
1.3	4	4	4	4	4					4.0

figure 3 – Rubric score sheet Rubric Indicator Summary

The next step is to input the board member scores into the Supt. Goals & Objectives tab, (see figure 4).

Superintendent Goals / Performance Objectives

School Corporation: XYZ

*Number of Goals / Objectives: 3

Exceeds all goals	HE=4
Meets all goals, may exceed in some	E=3
Meets half of goals	I=2
Meets less than half of goals	IN=1

					Board Members					
Goal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Goals/Objectives Score
1	4	4	4	4	4					4.0
2	3	3	3	3	3					3.0
3	4	4	4	4	4					4.0
4										
5										
6										

Goals/Objectives Score = 3.7

*recommended number of goals/objectives is three, but no more than six

figure 4 – Rubric score sheet Supt. Goals & Objectives

When the rubric scores and goals/objectives scores have been entered, the tool will automatically complete the Evaluation Summary (see figure 5). This portion of the evaluation should be signed by the board members and placed in the superintendent's file after the process is completed.

Superintendent Evaluation Summary

		Raw Score	Weight	Final Score
	School Year			2024
Superintendent				
Mr. Superintendent	Date:			8/1/2024
		Raw Score	Weight	Final Score
Rubric Score (Leadership Outcomes)		3.82	80%	3.06
Superintendent Goals/Objectives Score		3.67	20%	0.73
			TOTAL	3.79
Annual Evaluation Rank		**HIGHLY EFFECTIVE**		
Comprehensive Effectiveness Rating				

figure 5 – Rubric score sheet Evaluation Summary

Superintendent Goals / Performance Objectives

Formalized evaluations allow boards to provide guidance to their superintendents regarding desired changes in job performance and the reinforcement of existing strengths that serve the school corporation. They are also an opportunity for the superintendent and school board to discuss formative improvements.

Everyone must be working toward the same goals. School boards and superintendents cannot achieve corporation goals if they work at cross purposes or if the superintendent does not have a clear vision of where the school corporation should be headed. What are the priorities? What are the guidelines? What are the expected outcomes?

It is most effective if the board and superintendent work collaboratively on goals and objectives before the next school year starts. That is the ideal time to reach a consensus on the weight of the goals vs. the rubric and set that in the evaluation tool for the coming academic year. This allows the board and superintendent to work together and focus on improved student outcomes. An effective evaluation process suggests the importance of individual objective and goal performance and includes it as an integral part of the overall evaluation process.

Be sure the objectives and/or goals are:

❖ **Written**
  This is the only way to ensure future reference to the goals and to avoid disputes

regarding what was said. The goals should be stated to allow the board to monitor the superintendent's progress. Be as specific as possible regarding what you want to achieve. Avoid generalities and broad, sweeping statements.

❖ **Measurable**
When and how will you know the superintendent has achieved the established performance targets?

❖ **Attainable**
Do the goals you are asking the superintendent to achieve relate to the overall mission of the school corporation? Goals that are unimportant or irrelevant, defeat
the purpose of performance evaluations. Do not ask the superintendent to spend time pursuing something that is not important to your strategic plan.

❖ **Established with reasonable timeframes for completion**
When does the board expect the goals to be achieved? Establish deadlines and ask for periodic progress reports to determine whether the action plan is proceeding as planned. However, do not over-burden the superintendent to the degree that goal- reporting interferes with his or her normal duties and do not expect all goals to be completed at the same time. Some goals are and

need to be ongoing. For those goals that may be extended for more than one evaluation period, it is critical that planned progress towards goal completion be monitored, and the evaluation be based on that progress.

The superintendent should report progress at various intervals throughout the year and evidence of the work is provided before the annual evaluation. The process recommends a minimum of three goals and/or objectives per evaluation cycle, but the evaluation process form allows for up to six (see figure 1). Each goal and/or objective is evaluated as Highly Effective (exceeding its target), Effective (met its target), Needs Improvement (met a portion of its target), Ineffective (failed to meet its target), after which it is scored based on a scale of 1-4, with 4= Highly Effective, 3= meeting all targets, perhaps exceeding in some, 2= meeting half of the targets, and 1= meeting less than half of the targets. The final score (1-4) is placed in the box next to the Goals/Objectives Score.

Superintendent Goals/Objectives					
Goal/Objective	Highly Effecitve (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)	
1		X			
2	X				
3		X			
4					
5					
6					

figure 1 – Superintendent Goals/Objectives

The goals and/or objectives and their measurement criteria must be defined sufficiently to eliminate any subjectiveness in the assessment regarding completion or progress to completion. Vague goals and/or objectives or insufficient milestones to mark progress

towards completion will hinder the process and drive subjectiveness into the evaluation, making scoring difficult, if not impossible, to justify.

The Superintendent Goals/Objectives worksheet computes a rating for each goal based on the average of all board members' scores. The numerical value of the ratings is calculated in the Goals/Objectives Score, and the results are tabulated in the Composite Scoring Tool (see Figure 4 – The Composite Scoring Tool Supt. Goals & Objectives).

Superintendent Preparation

Preparation for the evaluation should be an ongoing activity, beginning at the start of the evaluation period and concluding at the formal review. This format may be foreign to some administrators, but especially to those who have not been accustomed to regular evaluations or have only received verbal affirmation of their performance from year to year.

Communication is vital to the effectiveness of the evaluation process. If there are areas

within the rubric where it is unclear what documentation the superintendent should provide as evidence of performance, those areas should be thoroughly discussed, and a consensus should be reached regarding the evidence the board will accept. Tangible

evidence must be supplied. Verbal reporting is excellent for ongoing communication but

is not a defendable performance measurement. Tangible evidence is always preferable. Finally, the superintendent and board should discuss and agree upon the method of providing supporting evidence for the final evaluation. One suggestion is for the superintendent to maintain a performance portfolio and provide links to the relevant evidence in the Evidence Links cell included with each indicator in the evaluation tool. These can be updated throughout the year rather than just at the end of the year.

Another method is for the superintendent to report regularly throughout the year, offering tangible evidence that can be added to an annual portfolio review. Many superintendents

include references to the relevant benchmarks and indicators as part of their weekly updates to the board, lessening the burden on the board at the end of the year.

Nothing precludes a school board or a superintendent from engaging in a mid- year evaluation. In fact, it is strongly recommended if the superintendent is new to the corporation or to the position. An informal, mid-term evaluation is an effective means of providing good feedback regarding performance, making sure that goals and/or objectives are progressing to expectation, or to address specific concerns or questions by either the superintendent or the school board. However, mid-year evaluations of the rubric criteria are not practical except to answer questions or to mutually determine the value of evidence for a particular indicator.

Most importantly, once the evaluation criteria have been established and the evaluation

period begins, the criteria should not be changed without the express consent of both the superintendent and the school board.

Board Member Preparation

The key to preparing a high-quality evaluation is the conscientious participation of every school board member. Furthermore, it is impossible to conduct a thorough and complete superintendent evaluation without members' intentional preparation and the allocation of more than a few brief minutes to conduct the evaluation. Board members should be prepared to thoroughly review the superintendent's performance evidence against the rubric descriptions and/or agreed-upon criteria for each indicator and each goal or objective in the evaluation.

It is important that the board clearly establish expectations regarding how the evidence of performance is to be presented to the board for its review at the <u>beginning</u> of the evaluation period. To facilitate this process, the board and superintendent should work collaboratively to develop the review criteria to ensure there are no misunderstandings regarding how and when the superintendent will provide the performance evidence to the board for this annual evaluation.

Keep in mind that the goal of this evaluation is to yield an objective, formative evaluation. To that end, the rubric instrument helps to ensure that the superintendent is being evaluated against objective criteria supported by documentation representing the evidence of his or her performance. In today's educational climate and with ever-increasing demands for greater transparency and accountability, the superintendent's evaluation is one of the most effective ways for the school board to validate its support of the superintendent's leadership of the local school corporation.

Lastly, the annual evaluation process should not reveal any *surprises* to either the superintendent or the school board. School board members should not attempt to use the evaluation process to forward a personal agenda or to subjectively rank the superintendent's performance to the evaluation criteria for ulterior motives. There is little room, if any, for subjective interpretation of objective data.

The Evaluation Schedule

The evaluation frequency has been defined by statute to occur annually, but the actual time of the year can be set that mutually aligns with the board's and superintendent's schedules. Most boards utilize the time between school dismissal in the spring and the beginning of the fall term to conduct the evaluation. This timeframe also allows the school corporation to provide evaluation information to the IDOE as required by IC 20-28-11.5-9. Regardless, once the annual time for evaluation has been established, every effort to maintain that schedule should be taken.

The following are suggested steps for a complete and productive evaluation process:

 Step 1: Create a policy. The full board must embrace the evaluation process and

create a policy that clearly states the use of the ISBA/IAPSS superintendent evaluation tool and the steps outlined in this guide document.

Step 2: Ensure that all board members are familiar with the Superintendent Evaluation Manual and the accompanying evaluation tools. The board president should distribute the Benchmark and Indicator workbook and Rubric Score Sheet to each member. These are used for the formative and summative evaluations.

Step 3: Plan a mid-summer board retreat. July is an excellent time for a planning retreat for the board members and superintendent. This sets the stage for the work of the next school year. Note that these retreats often include key members of the superintendent's administrative cabinet. Some agenda items might include:

1. Review your strategic plan, the work done year to date, and plans for the upcoming year.
2. Review current data, critical issues, and needs.
3. The Board and superintendent work to identify two or three (no more than 5) areas for improvement for the next year. Those should set up the development of objectives and action steps by the superintendent and administrative team.

Step 4: Quarterly special meeting work session updates are an effective way to review data, ask questions, and stay on task throughout the year. Update sessions can be held more frequently if necessary.

Step 5: Schedule a January or February formative evaluation. This is not the final summative evaluation but is a mid-year checkup for the leadership team. Where are we now, and are we headed in the right direction?

Step 6: Schedule the summative evaluation. This often occurs in June after the end-of-year activities and schedules are complete. The board and superintendent should come together in an executive session to review the aggregate scores and finalize the process. A copy of the evaluation should go into the superintendent's file.

It is understood that the evaluation process will have been the topic of a thorough discussion between the superintendent and the school board at the beginning of the evaluation cycle, that superintendent goals and/or performance objectives were identified at that time, and nothing is being *invented* immediately before conducting the evaluation.

Every board member should dedicate sufficient time to complete the evaluation process. It is important to remember that the purpose of the evaluation is two-fold:

1. To provide the superintendent with a formative, objective evaluation of his or her performance.
2. To promote the accountability of both the school board and the superintendent through the evaluation process.

This requires more than a cursory overview, yet board members do not need to be

educators to understand and perform the superintendent's evaluation responsibly and effectively. Likewise, a superintendent who is unaccustomed to evaluations that incorporate rubric performance categories will need to acquire a more deliberate process for providing performance evidence. Ultimately, the process should become second-nature; it will become part of the ongoing work of the superintendent and school board as a leadership team.

APPENDIX A

Indiana Department of Education

Indiana Content Standards for Educators

SCHOOL LEADER–DISTRICT LEVEL

The School District Leader standards reflect the most current research on effective educational leadership and advance a new and powerful vision of superintendent effectiveness. The standards define those skills and abilities that district leaders must possess to produce greater levels of success for all students. Bringing significant improvement to student achievement and building leader effectiveness requires an unapologetic focus on the superintendent's role as driver of student growth and achievement.

The standards provide a basis for professional preparation, growth, and accountability. However, the standards should not be viewed as ends in themselves; rather, they provide clarity for district leaders about the actions they are expected to take in order to drive student achievement and building leader effectiveness outcomes.

December 2010

Table of Contents

The Indiana standards for School Leader—District Level consist of "core" and "supplementary" content and skills. In this document, content and skills considered "core" are indicated with bold text. Supplementary content and skills are indicated with nonbold text. It should be noted that all of Standard 6 is supplementary, including both the standard and the essential elements of knowledge within the standard.

Standard 1: Human Capital Management

School district leaders use their role as human capital manager to drive improvements in building leader effectiveness and student achievement.

Standard 2: Instructional Leadership

School district leaders are acutely focused on effective teaching and learning, possess a deep and comprehensive understanding of best instructional practices, and continuously promote activities that contribute to the academic success of all students.

Standard 3: Personal Behavior

School district leaders model personal behavior that sets the tone for all student and adult relationships in the district.

Standard 4: Building Relationships

School district leaders build relationships to ensure that all key stakeholders work effectively with each other to achieve transformative results.

Standard 5: Culture of Achievement

School district leaders develop a districtwide culture of achievement aligned to the district's vision of success for every student.

Standard 6: Organizational, Operational, and Resource Management

School district leaders leverage organizational, operational, and resource management skills to support district improvement and achieve desired educational outcomes.

Standard 1: Human Capital Management

School district leaders use their role as human capital manager to drive improvements in building leader effectiveness and student achievement, including:

1.1   **recruiting, hiring, assigning, retaining, and supporting effective building leaders who share the district's vision/mission**

1.2   **prioritizing the evaluation of building leaders over competing commitments and using evaluation systems that credibly differentiate the performance of building leaders**

1.3   **ensuring that principals prioritize teacher evaluation over competing commitments and use teacher evaluation systems that credibly differentiate the performance of teachers**

1.4   **orchestrating aligned, high-quality coaching; workshops; team meetings; and other professional learning opportunities tuned to staff needs based on student performance**

1.5   **designing and implementing succession plans (e.g., career ladders) for every position in the district, and providing formal and informal opportunities to mentor emerging leaders and promote leadership and growth**

1.6   **delegating tasks and responsibilities appropriately to competent staff members, monitoring their progress, and providing support as needed**

1.7   **counseling out or recommending the dismissal of ineffective building leaders, and ensuring that building leaders counsel out or recommend the dismissal of ineffective teachers, carefully following contractual requirements**

1.8   **strategically assigning building leaders and other staff to support district goals and maximize achievement for all students**

Standard 2: Instructional Leadership

School district leaders are acutely focused on effective teaching and learning, possess a deep and comprehensive understanding of best instructional practices, and continuously promote activities that contribute to the academic success of all students, including:

2.1   **cultivating commitment to and ownership of the district's instructional vision, mission, values, and organizational goals, and ensuring that all key decisions are aligned to the vision**

2.2   **planning, organizing, supervising, and supporting a rigorous district instructional program based on research-supported best practices regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment**

2.3   **using student performance data to evaluate instructional quality, and regularly providing school leaders and staff with prompt, high-quality feedback aimed at improving student outcomes**

2.4   **establishing a culture of collaboration in which teamwork, reflection, conversation, sharing, openness, and problem solving about student learning and achievement are aligned to clear instructional priorities**

2.5   **ensuring the use of practices with proven effectiveness in promoting academic success for students with diverse characteristics and needs, including English Learners and students with exceptionalities, including high-ability and twice exceptional students**

2.6   **promoting the sanctity of instructional time, and ensuring that every minute is maximized in the service of student learning and achievement**

Standard 3: Personal Behavior

School district leaders model personal behavior that sets the tone for all student and adult relationships in the district, including:

3.1   **modeling professional, ethical, and respectful behavior at all times and expecting the same behavior from others**

3.2   **establishing yearly, monthly, weekly, and daily priorities and objectives, relentlessly keeping the highest-leverage activities front and center**

3.3   **actively soliciting and using feedback and help from all key stakeholders in order to drive student achievement**

3.4   **going above and beyond typical expectations to attain goals, taking on voluntary responsibilities that contribute to district success, and taking risks to achieve results**

3.5   **using reflection, self-awareness, ongoing learning, and resiliency to increase effectiveness in leading district improvement efforts**

Standard 4: Building Relationships

School district leaders build relationships to ensure that all key stakeholders work effectively with each other to achieve transformative results, including:

4.1   establishing an organizational culture of urgency in which building leaders, students, parents/guardians, teachers, staff, and other key stakeholders relentlessly pursue academic and behavioral excellence

4.2   skillfully and clearly communicating district goals, needs, plans, and successes (and failures) to all stakeholders (e.g., school board members, building leaders, students, teachers, parents/guardians, the central office, the community, businesses) using a variety of means (e.g., face to face, newsletters, Web sites)

4.3   using effective strategies to forge consensus for change, manage and monitor change, and secure cooperation from key stakeholders in planning and implementing change

4.4   working collaboratively with individuals and groups inside and outside the system, striving for an atmosphere of trust and respect but never compromising in prioritizing the needs of students

4.5   demonstrating awareness of the public and political nature of the school district leader position, and deftly engaging the public in addressing controversial issues

Standard 5: Culture of Achievement

School district leaders develop a districtwide culture of achievement aligned to the district's vision of success for every student, including:

5.1   empowering building leaders, teachers, and staff to set high and demanding academic and behavior expectations for every student, and ensuring that students are consistently learning

5.2   establishing rigorous academic goals and priorities that are accepted as fixed and immovable

5.3   orchestrating high-quality team collaboration to analyze interim assessment results and formulate action plans for immediate implementation

5.4   implementing systems to promote and enforce individual accountability for results

5.5   ensuring all students full and equitable access to educational programs, curricula, and available supports

5.6   ensuring the use of positive and equitable behavior management systems and the consistent implementation of rules and routines

5.7   guiding building-level staff to build productive and respectful relationships with parents/guardians and engage them in their children's learning

5.8   developing family and community partnerships that increase access to resources (e.g., classroom volunteers, funds, equipment), as long as they clearly align with and do not distract from the district's goals for student growth and achievement

Standard 6: Organizational, Operational, and Resource Management

School district leaders leverage organizational, operational, and resource management skills to support district improvement and achieve desired educational outcomes, including:

6.1 **using data to identify needs and priorities within the organization and to address organizational barriers to attaining student achievement goals**

6.2 **using technological tools and systems to facilitate communication and collaboration, manage information, and support effective management of the organization**

6.3 **overseeing the use of practices for the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the district's physical plant, equipment, and auxiliary services (e.g., food services, student transportation)**

6.4 **planning, managing, and monitoring district budgets aligned to district improvement goals, and creatively seeking new resources to support district programs and/or reallocating resources from programs identified as ineffective or redundant**

6.5 **managing and supervising compliance with laws and regulations, such as those governing building management and reporting; human resource management; financial management; school safety and emergency preparedness; student safety and welfare; and the rights and responsibilities of students, families, and school staff**

State and National Standards and Curriculum Frameworks

1. Indiana Department of Education. (2010). Principal effectiveness rubric (draft).

2. Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2008). Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008. http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Leadership_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf

3. National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). (2002). Standards for advanced programs in educational leadership. http://www.npbea.org/ELCC/ELCCStandards%20_5-02.pdf

4. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2009). National board core propositions for accomplished educational leaders. http://www.nbpts.org/products_and_services/nationalboardcertifica

5. International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). (2008). National educational technology standards for teachers. http://www.iste.org/Libraries/PDFs/NETS_for_Teachers_2008_EN.sflb.ashx

6. Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2009). Framework for 21st century learning. http://www.p21.org/documents/P21_Framework.pdf

Sources on School Leader–District Level

7. Marshall, K. (2010, January). Principal evaluation rubrics. The Marshall Memo. http://www.marshallmemo.com/articles/Prin%20Eval%20Rubrics%20Jan%2026,%2010.pdf

8. New Leaders for New Schools. (2009). Principal effectiveness: A new principalship to drive student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and school turnarounds. New York: Author.

9. Porter, A., Murphy, J., Goldring, E., & Elliott, S. N. (2008). Vanderbilt assessment for leadership in education (VAL-ED). Nashville, TN: Discovery Education.

10. Wilmore, E. L. (2008). Superintendent leadership: Applying the educational leadership constituent council (ELCC) standards for improved district performance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

11. Earl, L. M., & Katz, S. (2006). Leading schools in a data-rich world: Harnessing data for school improvement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

12. Fiore, D. J. (2006). School-community relations (2nd ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education, Inc.

13. Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. C. (2006). Leaders for productive schools. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University. http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/Documents/pdf/LSI/VALED_Leaders_ProductiveSchools.pdf

14. Schmoker, M. (2006). Results now: How we can achieve unprecedented improvements in teaching and learning. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

15. Cambron-McCabe, N., Cunningham, L. L., Harvey, J., & Koff, R. H. (2005). The superintendent's fieldbook: A guide for leaders of learning. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

16. Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). School leadership that works: From research to results. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

17. Zmuda, A., Kuklis, R., & Kline, E. (2004). Transforming schools: Creating a culture of continuous improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

18. Reeves, D. B. (2004). Accountability for learning: How teachers and school leaders can take charge. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

19. Marzano, R. J. (2003). What works in schools: Translating research into action. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

20. Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP). (1994). KIPP leadership competency model. http://www.kipp.org/school-leaders/training-and-development/leadership-competencies

21. Reeves, D. (2009). Leadership performance matrix. Blairsville, PA: iObservation.

Indiana Educator Standards for School Leader—District Level	Indiana Department of Education Principal Effectiveness Rubric (Draft)	CCSSO ISLLC Educational Leadership Policy Standards	NPBEA Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership	ISTE National Educational Technology Standards
Standard 1: Human Capital Management **School district leaders use their role as human capital manager to drive improvements in building leader effectiveness and student achievement.**	2.1.1 2.1.2 2.1.3 2.1.4 2.1.5 2.1.6	1.D 2.F 3.B, D 5.D	2.3.a, b 2.4.a, b 3.1.b, c 3.3.a, b	
Standard 2: Instructional Leadership **School district leaders are acutely focused on effective teaching and learning, possess a deep and comprehensive understanding of best instructional practices, and continuously promote activities that contribute to the academic success of all students.**	2.2.1 2.2.2 2.2.3	1.A, B, C, D, E 2.A, B, D, E, F, G, I 3.E 5.E	1.3.a, b 1.4.b 2.2.a, b 2.3.a, b, c, d 2.4.a, b 3.1.a, c, d	
Standard 3: Personal Behavior **School district leaders model personal behavior that sets the tone for all student and adult relationships in the district.**	3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.1.4	5.B, D	1.5.a 2.4.c 3.1.c 4.1.a 5.1.a 5.2.a 5.3.a	

Indiana Educator Standards for School Leader—District Level	Indiana Department of Education Principal Effectiveness Rubric (Draft)	CCSSO ISLLC Educational Leadership Policy Standards	NPBEA Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership	ISTE National Educational Technology Standards
Standard 4: Build Relationships **School district leaders build relationships to ensure that all key stakeholders work effectively with each other to achieve transformative results.**	3.2.1 3.2.2 3.2.3	1.A 2.A 4.C, D 6.B	1.2.c 1.3.a 1.5.a 3.2.a, b 4.1.b, c, e, g, h 4.2.b 6.2.c	
Standard 5: Culture of Achievement **School district leaders develop a districtwide culture of achievement aligned to the district's vision of success for every student.**	3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3	1.B, C, D, E 2.A, B, E, I 4.B, C, D 5.A, C, E	1.3.a, b 1.5.a 2.1.a 2.2.b 3.1.b, d, e 3.2.d 4.1.a, b, c, d, h 4.3.a 6.3.b	
Standard 6: Organizational, Operational, and Resource Management **School district leaders leverage organizational, operational, and resource management skills to support district improvement and achieve desired educational outcomes.**		1.B 3.A, B, C 4.A 5.D	1.4.b 2.2.b, d 3.1.a, b, c, d, e 3.2.b 3.3.a, b, d 4.3.c 5.1.a 5.3.a 6.1.a, c, f	3c, 4e

APPENDIX B

Indiana Department of Education

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

To: K-12 District Superintendents

From: Dr. Rebecca Estes, Assistant Secretary for Educator Talent

Date: July 5, 2024

Subject: Staff Performance Evaluation Plan Submission for SY 24-25

Each school corporation must develop or adopt a plan for **annual** performance evaluations for each certificate employee. A school corporation may adopt the Indiana Department of Education's (IDOE's) model plan or adopt or establish any other staff performance evaluation plan.

The plan must include an annual designation of each certificated employee in one of the following rating categories:

1. Highly Effective
2. Effective
3. Improvement Necessary
4. Ineffective

The requirements for designation in each rating category are to be determined by the school corporation. Please note, Senate Enrolled Act 486 (2023) removed the requirement to include a definition for negative impact in the staff performance evaluation plan.

Submission
Each school corporation **must** submit its staff performance evaluation plan to IDOE via Jotform by Friday, September 13, 2024. Staff performance evaluation plans for all certified employees, including teachers and administrators, must be combined into a single document and submitted in PDF format via JotForm. Other formats will not upload.

Please contact eel@doe.in.gov with questions.

APPENDIX C

IC 20-28-11.5-4 Staff performance and evaluation plans
Sec. 4. (a) Each school corporation shall develop or adopt a plan for annual performance evaluations for each certificated employee. A plan must include performance evaluations for all certificated employees, conducted at least annually.

    (b) A plan under this section must include an annual designation of each certificated employee in one (1) of the following rating categories:

        (1) Highly effective.

        (2) Effective.

        (3) Improvement necessary

        (4) Ineffective

The requirements for designation in each rating category must be determined by the school corporation.

    (c) The plan must:

        (1) be in writing:

        (2) be explained to the governing body in a public meeting;

before the evaluations are conducted. Before explaining the plan to the governing body, the superintendent of the school corporation shall discuss the plan with teachers or the representative, if there is one. This discussion is not subject to the open door law (IC 5-14-1.5). The plan is not subject to bargaining.

    (d) The evaluator shall discuss the evaluation with the certificated employee.

    (e) After a school corporation has assigned an evaluator to perform a certificated employee's evaluation, the certificated employee may request the school corporation to assign an evaluator other than the evaluator assigned to perform the certificated employee's evaluation.

APPENDIX D

Indiana Department of Education

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

Submission of Evaluation Plans Frequently Asked Questions

Number	Question	Answer
1	**Why do I need to submit my evaluation plan to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE)?**	Indiana Code 20-28-11.5-8 established the requirement for each school corporation to submit its staff performance evaluation plan to the department.
2	**Which employees does the evaluation plan need to cover?**	The law requires that school corporations develop a plan for annual evaluations of each certificated employee. Certificated employees are those employees whose contract with the school corporation requires they hold a license from the Indiana Department of Education.
3	**I have heard that some corporations have submitted evaluation plans that are hundreds of pages long. Does IDOE expect such a large plan?**	No. IDOE has received plans that address all necessary requirements of the law in as few as 16 pages. In these shorter documents, the bulk of the plan tends to describe the teacher evaluation system, and then they contain appendices explaining modifications made for other certificated employees.
4	**What will IDOE do with the plan that I submit?**	Indiana Code 20-28-11.5-8 requires the publication of staff performance evaluation plans on the department's website.
Technical Questions		
1	**How do I submit my school corporation's evaluation plan?**	Evaluation plans for all certificated employees, including teachers and administrators, must be combined into a single document and submitted in PDF file format via JotForm. Other formats will not upload.
2	**I have uploaded my school corporation's evaluation plan, but I have since made a few changes. How do I upload the updated evaluation plan?**	Name your document something simple, like "hickory.pdf" and re-upload your document. Please send an email to ELL@doe.in.gov to let us know your new plan has been uploaded.

References

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation Retrieved May 18, 2012, from http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartIII.pdf

North Carolina State Board of Education. (2010). North Carolina Superintendent Evaluation Process Retrieved May 18, 2012, from http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/profdev/training/superintendent/eval-manual.pdf

Reeves, D. (2011). Reeves' Leadership Performance Matrix. Retrieved May 18, 2012, from The Leadership and Learning Center http://usny.nysed.gov/rttt/teachers-leaders/practicerubrics/Docs/HoughtonMifflin_PrincipalRubric.pdf