

SUBJECT: DIRECTOR EVALUATION

The Saskatchewan League of Educational Administrators, Directors, and Superintendents believes that a properly conducted program for evaluation of the director of education benefits the director, enhances the relationship between the director and the board, ensures accountability, assists the board of education to provide quality educational service, and models the importance of systematic assessment throughout the school division. (See Board/CEO Review prepared by SELU, October, 1996)

RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

1.0 Rationale

- 1.1 To provide objective information regarding the director's performance.**
- 1.2 To increase the board's awareness of the state of education in the school division, and to determine the directions in which it wishes to proceed.**
- 1.3 To help the board to perceive its own performance and organizational behavior more clearly.**
- 1.4 To help the board and director of education agree on what is expected of each other, enabling the board to function as policy-maker and the director as chief executive.**
- 1.5 To provide a basis for commending, rewarding, and reinforcing good work.**
- 1.6 To sensitize the board to the challenges and pressures inherent in the position of the director of education.**
- 1.7 To provide dialogue and feedback on progress achieved between successive (e.g. annual) evaluations.**

2.0 Characteristics of the Program

- 2.1 It should be co-operatively planned and carried out.**
- 2.2 It should be more diagnostic than judgmental.**
- 2.3 It should provide for clear, constructive and personalized feedback.**
- 2.4 It should be current, reflecting the best of relevant research.**
- 2.5 It should enhance the self-image and self-respect of each individual involved.**
- 2.6 It should provide a forum in which the director can respond to the evaluation.**
- 2.7 It should be a regularly scheduled event.**
- 2.8 It should promote self-assessment by board members and the director of education alike.**
- 2.9 It should include an opportunity for periodic follow-up between formal evaluation processes.**
- 2.10 It should provide direction for self-improvement for the director and the board.**

2.11 It should celebrate the growth and accomplishments of the director.

3.0 Planning for the Evaluation

3.1 The method and standards by which the director's performance is to be judged are to be mutually developed and understood by both the director and the members of the board.

3.2 A mutually agreeable time and place for the evaluation shall be set by the board and the director.

3.3 The board will agree that no other matters of business will be on the agenda for this meeting.

3.4 The board will agree that all of its members will attend.

3.5 The board and director will not limit themselves to those items which appear on the particular form being used, since no form or set of guidelines can encompass the totality of the director's responsibilities. The board and director may choose to focus on one specific aspect of the director's performance in a given year with more comprehensive reviews occurring less frequently.

3.6 All board members will agree that their individual assessments of the director will be compiled into a final written, composite evaluation which will be discussed between the director and the whole board.

3.7 Each judgment should be supported by as much objective documentation as possible; one board member's opinion will not be the sole basis for judgment on an appraisal item.

3.8 There will be an understanding between the parties that, in some cases, a judgment criterion might be deleted from the process because extenuating circumstances might have prevented the director from performing that function.

3.9 The final evaluation will be signed by both parties.

4.0 Materials Vital to the Process

4.1 Statement of Goals and Priorities
The board should compile such a statement which takes into account board policies, its statement of educational philosophy, all applicable laws or regulations, and the desires of the community.

4.2 Director's Position Description
The board must have clearly stated the roles and responsibilities of the chief executive officer in carrying out board goals and priorities. The position description should determine how much actual authority the director has to complete his/her work. A fair evaluation must be defined by the limits of the job summary.

4.3 A Written Evaluation Procedure
The board and its director must arrive at an agreeable structure for evaluation including timetables, procedural mechanics, and the criteria under which judgment will be made.

5.0 Follow-up/Review

5.1 Review

The final evaluation should be followed up by timely review(s) by the parties to the evaluation.

5.2 Impact on Compensation

The evaluation follow up outcomes might be attached to compensation as defined within the contract of the L.E.A.D.S. member.