



HUMAN RESOURCES

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~~ their supervisor. This cycle applies to all administrators, including principals, assistant principals, cabinet members, directors, managers, supervisors and specialists.

Goal Setting Meeting

The goal setting meeting ~~to discuss and approval of~~ the administrator's annual performance goals should be ~~completed~~ conducted between the administrator and ~~his/her~~ their 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~~ their 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~~ their 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~~ their 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~~ **their** 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. **The goal setting approval of the administrator's annual performance goals will be completed between the administrator and their supervisor by the first Friday in December each year.**

Mid-cycle Review (Annual Goals Progress Report)

The second evaluation conference should be conducted between the administrator and ~~his/her~~ **their** supervisor ~~by~~ **at** the conclusion of January but will occur no later than February 1~~5~~ of each year.

The administrator and ~~his/her~~ **their** 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~~ **their** supervisor. Some questions that may be discussed:

- In what areas does the administrator feel most confident about ~~his/her~~ **their** performance thus far? Is that perception shared by the supervisor? Are the administrator and ~~his/her~~ **their** 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~~ **their** 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~~ **their** 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~~ **their** 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~~ **their** supervisor perceive performance in each ~~criteria~~ **criterion**? 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~~ **their** 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:

- Criterion 1.** ~~Creating a school culture; Influence, establish, and sustain a school culture conducive to continuous that promotes the ongoing improvement of learning and teaching~~ for students and staff;
- Criterion 2.** ~~Demonstrating commitment to closing the achievement gap~~ **Ensuring School Safety: Lead the development and annual update of a comprehensive safe schools plan that includes prevention, intervention, crisis response, and recovery;**
- Criterion 3.** ~~Providing for school safety~~ **Planning with Data: Lead the development, implementation and evaluation of the data-driven plan for improvement of student achievement;**
- Criterion 4.** ~~Leading the development, implementation and evaluation of a data-driven plan for increasing student achievement, including the use of multiple student data elements~~ **Aligning Curriculum: Assist instructional staff in aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local learning goals;**
- Criterion 5.** ~~Assisting instructional staff with alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment with state and local school district learning goals~~ **Improving Instruction: Monitor, assist, and evaluate staff implementation of the school improvement plan, effective instruction, and assessment practices;**

- Criterion 6.** ~~Monitoring, assisting, and evaluating effective instruction and assessment practices~~ **Managing Resources: Manage human and fiscal resources to accomplish student achievement goals;**
- Criterion 7.** ~~Managing both staff and fiscal resources to support student achievement and legal responsibilities~~ **Engaging Communities: Communicate and partner with school community members to promote student learning;** and
- Criterion 8.** ~~Partnering with the school community to promote student learning~~ **Closing the Gap: Demonstrate a commitment to closing the achievement gap.**

All principals and assistant principals who supervise the operation and management of a school will be assessed through ~~a rubric based on the most recent version of the~~ Association of Washington School Principals (AWSPP) 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~~ **their** supervisor has determined the comprehensive evaluation warranted will be evaluated using the comprehensive format.

III. Evaluation of Cabinet

The deputy superintendent, regional superintendents, chiefs and executive directors who are part of the superintendent's cabinet will be assessed through 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 are:

1. Visionary leadership;
2. Instructional leadership;
3. Effective management;
4. Inclusive practice; and
5. Ethical leadership.

The human resources department will maintain a document aligning the district evaluative standards with the evaluative criteria set forth in [RCW 28A.405.100](#). Some standards may be reflected in more than one evaluative criterion.

IV. Evaluation of Other Administrative Staff (directors, managers, supervisors and specialists)

The performance of administrative staff other than principals, assistant principals and cabinet members will be evaluated at least once per year. These administrative staff include directors, managers, supervisors and specialists. The evaluative criteria are:

1. Leadership;
2. Administration and management;
3. School finance;
4. Professional preparation and scholarship;
5. Effort toward improvement when needed;
6. Interest in students, staff, patrons and subjects taught in schools; and
7. Evaluation of staff.

Other administrative staff shall receive a performance rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

Cross references: [Board Policy 5250](#)
[Procedure 5250.1P](#)

Evaluation of Staff
Evaluation of Staff

Adopted: August 2016
Updated: February 2018
Updated: November 2019
Updated: September 2020
PROPOSED: December 2020