2018

A State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Analysis

Tracey L. Schneider
College of William and Mary - School of Education, tlschneider1024@gmail.com

A STATE-LEVEL SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION POLICY ANALYSIS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Education

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Educational Policy, Planning & Leadership

By

Tracey L. Schneider, J.D.

September 17, 2018

A STATE-LEVEL SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION POLICY ANALYSIS

By

Tracey L. Schneider, J.D.

Approved September 17, 2018 by

Steven R. Staples, Ed.D.
Chairperson of Doctoral Committee

Michael F. DiPaola, Ed.D.
Committee Member

Jennifer Parish, Ed.D.
Committee Member

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the people who have impacted me throughout my life, both personally and professionally, and helped support my journey to this point. I am blessed to be able to say that there are too many individuals to acknowledge by name. I always hope that I have shown and continue to show these individuals how very much they mean to me and how I could not have taken this journey without them.

The most recent part of my journey has been this research and my dissertation. For that, I am honored to acknowledge my committee: Dr. Steven Staples, Dr. Michael DiPaola, and Dr. Jennifer Parish. As part of my research, I identified an expert panel, but the truth is my committee members are the experts. Your knowledge, feedback, and support were beyond compare and heightened the quality of my inquiry to a level I could never have otherwise imagined I could reach. Dr. Staples, I truly appreciate the endless hours of your time, attention, and guidance that you provided to me throughout the research and writing process, in addition to our previous work together in this program as we integrated law and education. I have learned so much from you about how to make a valuable contribution to the scholar and practitioner community. Dr. DiPaola, I truly mean what I have always said, that all good things that have happened to me throughout my Ph.D. program have happened because of you. You have not only taught me what educational leadership means, you have shown me through your words and actions. I hope that I am able to pay forward all that I have learned from you in the years to come. Dr. Parish, your insight and perspective into the superintendency has brought my research to a new level. Your invaluable contribution of knowledge and time has been vital to my

research and is so greatly appreciated. To all of you, I will be honored to be able to be in your company as a colleague. Thank you!

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not thank the William & Mary Law School for providing me access to the Westlaw legal research system. Anyone who has worked with this system knows its value, both its practical value in facilitating the ease of legal research and its financial value in the cost of gaining access to this research system. William & Mary Law School recognized me as a visiting scholar and their actions allowed me to ensure the most accurate and up-to-date research.

List of Tables

Abstract

It is the superintendent's complex role and ultimate leadership responsibility for all district outcomes that suggests superintendents hold the key to successful reform. Research in the wake of the federal accountability and reform movement has focused on the principal as the mediator of school reform. Consequently, there is a dearth of research focusing on the superintendent's role in school reform, superintendent performance evaluation, and the state's responsibility to ensure a fair, equitable, and high-quality superintendent evaluation process through state-level policy. This study is a comprehensive policy analysis of state-level superintendent evaluation policies nationwide using a basic content analysis methodology and a researcher-developed content-analysis rubric. The study investigated the impact of the accountability and reform movement on superintendent performance evaluations, identified the current status of state-level superintendent evaluation policies and policy coherence with the personnel evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Joint Committee), and determined whether a significant relationship exists between the breadth and depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy and a state's political culture. Results show that 34 states have superintendent evaluation policies, but states vary substantially on the depth of superintendent evaluation policies and coherence with the Joint Committee standards. More states scored higher on the utility and feasibility standards than on the propriety and accuracy standards. There was no significant relationship, however, between a state's political culture and the breadth and depth of its superintendent evaluation policy as determine by the state's total content analysis rubric score.

Keywords: accountability and reform, accuracy standard, basic content analysis, feasibility standard, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, political culture, propriety standard, superintendent evaluation policy, utility standard

A STATE-LEVEL SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION POLICY ANALYSIS

CHAPTER 1

School superintendents are leaders of the school district and bear the ultimate responsibility for all district outcomes (Saltzman, 2017). With this responsibility comes role complexity and an expansive array of performance expectations. The school accountability and reform movements over the past two decades have only served to add additional complexity and expectations. Yet, it is the superintendent's complex role and ultimate leadership responsibility for all district outcomes that suggests superintendents hold the key to successful reform (Hoyle, Bjork, Collier, & Glass, 2005).

Despite the important role of the superintendent in reform, research surrounding educational leadership performance in the wake of the accountability and reform movement focuses by-and-large on the principal as building leader (Davis et al., 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012). The principal is often identified as the mediator of school reform for teachers (Shaked & Schechter, 2017) but superintendents are the ultimate mediator for both teachers and principals. Research has not yet focused on the superintendent as mediator. Consequently, there is a dearth of research focusing on superintendent performance evaluation and more specifically, state-level superintendent evaluation policies. In fact, state-level superintendent evaluation policies have not received significant research attention since the early 2000s and have not been investigated in the context of the influential accountability movement (Mayo & McCartney, 2004).

In 2001, DiPaola and Stronge (2001b) undertook a comprehensive investigation into superintendent evaluation policies nationwide. DiPaola and Stronge's research focused on the inclusion of student achievement and academic progress as a criterion used by states in superintendent evaluation. Perhaps their research foreshadowed the efforts to hold educational leaders more accountable for student achievement as part of the accountability reform efforts yet to come. Regardless, no such investigation of state-level superintendent policies continued post-accountability reform.

Instead, the limited superintendent evaluation research conducted since the early 2000s focuses on perceptions of the superintendent evaluation process at the local-level (Kowalski, McCord, Peterson, Young, & Ellerson, 2011; McMahon, Peters, & Schumacher, 2014; Reeves, 2008; Jacques et al., 2012), not the state-level. Research on perceptions of the evaluation process at the local-level provides insight into superintendent and board of education relations and identifies superintendent evaluations as having the potential to take one of two widely divergent paths. One path is a path of "mutual respect and improvement" and the other is a path of "political game playing" (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999, p. 405). In other words, the superintendent evaluation process can contribute to a positive working relationship between the superintendent and the board of education, potentially positively impacting the district. In the alternative, the superintendent evaluation process can contribute to the breakdown of the relationship between the superintendent and board of education, potentially negatively impacting the district (Hendricks, 2013).

Hoyle and Skrla's (1999) use of the word "political" (p. 405) is fitting and relevant. The superintendent role is inextricably tied to politics. In fact, the

superintendent reports to the public and is, essentially, a political figure. Elected superintendents report directly to the public. Though appointed superintendents technically report to the board of education, the board of education is the elected or appointed representative of the public. Thus, elected or appointed, superintendents report to public, either directly or indirectly, and serve as political figures.

Moreover, as Hoyle and Skrla noted, politics can easily corrupt the crucial relationship between the superintendent and the board of education. To effectively lead a school district, the superintendent must have a strong relationship with the board, a relationship that can rise above the politics. The superintendent evaluation process can facilitate this positive relationship when it is fair, equitable, and of high quality. State-level superintendent evaluation policy can help to ensure that a fair, equitable, and high-quality process is in place to protect the superintendent and board relationship and to buffer the political game playing. Given the critical role of the superintendent in ensuring successful district outcomes and the importance of the superintendent/board of education relationship, research is needed to thoroughly investigate the superintendent evaluation process. Research must determine the appropriate state-level superintendent evaluation policy structures that can serve to support and facilitate the path of positive relationships and successful outcomes.

This study will be a comprehensive policy analysis of state-level superintendent evaluation policies nationwide. This study will place an intentional focus on the past 15-20 years (early 2000s to date) to investigate the impact of the accountability and reform movement on superintendent performance evaluations and to identify the current status of state-level superintendent evaluation policies. In doing so, this policy analysis study will

evaluate the content of state superintendent evaluation policies as well as the role of influential policy actors and political cultures. It is only by studying the overlap of leadership, policy, and political culture that research can begin to explain and inform how states and local schools respond to and implement accountability and reform initiatives (Louis, Thomas, Gordon, & Febey, 2008) and the extent to which states are able to establish fair, high-quality superintendent evaluation procedures. The results will fill the gap in superintendent performance evaluation policy research and further inform the state-level superintendent evaluation policy development process.

Statement of the Problem

School superintendent responsibility encapsulates a host of educational leadership responsibilities, not the least of which is responsibility for all major district improvement efforts, including school accountability and reform. Accountability reform has overtaken school systems since the early 1990s. It has received the most significant attention with the adoption of large-scale federal accountability and reform legislation and grants. In 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) placed stringent performance requirements and benchmarks upon school districts (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005; No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2001). Schools were required to ensure all teachers were highly qualified, that all students reached the proficient level on state testing within a ten-year period, and that all schools made adequate yearly progress toward goals (NCLB, 2001). After NCLB, Race to the Top (RTTT) manifested a direct link between accountability and educational leadership by incentivizing evaluations of individual educators, including school-level leaders, based on student performance (Jacques et al., 2012; McGuinn, 2012; United States Department of Education, 2015). Most recently, the Every Student

Succeeds Act (ESSA) furthered the accountability movement but began to shift responsibility for outcomes from the individual school level to the school district level (Cohen, Spillane, & Peurach, 2018; Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act [ESSA], 2015). ESSA removed the focus from student or school-based requirements, instead focusing on state plans for district or system-based requirements like hiring, professional learning, and evaluation. Improvement efforts for low-performing schools are developed by the local education agency, the school district. By doing so, the system-based requirements and responsibility apply not only to teachers and school leaders but also to district leaders (Learning Forward, 2017).

Federal accountability and reform legislation, in turn, required states to develop accountability and reform systems that implement the federal legislation on the state and local level. Yet, such legislation, ESSA specifically, declines to mandate an educational leader (including principal supervisors or superintendents) evaluation system (ESSA, 2015). Thus, states are not required, and often pay little attention, to the evaluation systems that are designed to provide the necessary feedback and influence the district-level leader's performance (Reeves, 2008). After new accountability standards, licensure and preparation standards are researched and sometimes updated (Finnan et al., 2015; Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005; Kowalski & Glass, 2002) but evaluation systems rarely receive the same attention. District-level leader performance evaluation policies must be updated and developed alongside accountability and reform efforts. As Reeves (2008) expressed "while the transformation of an accountability system represents an enormously important step toward improved system performance, the process remains

incomplete unless leadership evaluation becomes as multifaceted and constructive as the best accountability systems" (p. 13).

States have begun to recognize the need to incorporate accountability and reform efforts into the educational leader evaluation process as it relates to school-level leadership (principals) but not as it relates to district-level leadership (superintendents) (Björk, Kowalski, & Browne-Ferrigno, 2005; Davis et al., 2010; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Mayo & McCartney, 2004). Even for principals, evaluation policies have certainly not developed alongside accountability and reform efforts. There has been a significant delay from the start of the accountability and reform movements to the incorporation of those movements into the principal evaluation process. Jacques, et al. (2012) conducted a comprehensive analysis of state principal evaluation legislation and found that state principal evaluation legislation emerged only in the wake of RTTT, in 2009 through 2012. This timeframe represents a decade lag from the start of significant school accountability and reform, NCLB, to the adoption of principal evaluation policy. Superintendents cannot afford the same decade lag before states incorporate superintendent expectations for accountability and reform into the superintendent evaluation process.

States must ensure that superintendent performance is fairly and comprehensively measured to evaluate progress toward school accountability and reform outcomes. In doing so, states must recognize that accountability and reform efforts are realized through superintendents and boards of education working together to adopt and implement reform measures in school districts. Superintendent evaluation is said to be evidence of the strength of the relationship between a board of education and a superintendent, a

relationship that can be tenuous and fragile (Eadie, 2004). Fair, consistent, and transparent superintendent performance evaluations can be used to facilitate and sustain such relationships by underscoring the trust between superintendent and board of education (Henrikson, 2018) and proactively uncovering potential relational breakdowns before they occur.

State-level superintendent evaluation policy is the starting point for helping to ensure districts undertake a fair, consistent, and transparent superintendent evaluation process. Well-formed state superintendent evaluation policies provide the structure that supports the board of education and superintendent relationship, ensures fair and high-quality superintendent performance evaluation, protects against "political game playing" (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999, p. 405), and improves the district's ability to grow and, if necessary, reform (Henrikson, 2018). A structured performance evaluation can potentially provide district-wide benefits of improved communication, budgeting, planning, accountability, and overall school improvement and reform (DiPaola & Stronge, 2001a, 2001b, 2003; Mayo & McCartney, 2004). Conversely, poorly-formed or non-existent state superintendent evaluation policies can lead to the breakdown of the board of education and superintendent relationship, the invasion of "political game playing" (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999, p. 405), rapid superintendent turnover, and the deterioration of goals and policies necessary for school reform (Alsbury, 2008; Grady & Bryant, 1989).

Well-formed state superintendent evaluation policies can also serve as a vehicle to develop a coherent, consistent, state-wide system that ensures boards of education and superintendents are devoting necessary attention to this vital process. The superintendent

evaluation process is like no other professional, executive evaluation. The superintendent reports to an elected or appointed board of education, representatives of the general public within that community. To be elected or appointed and to evaluate the superintendent, board members are not required to have a background or specialized knowledge of education. Without a state requirement, board members need not even have training on how to conduct the superintendent's performance evaluation.

Unfortunately, current data shows that boards of education may not be recognizing the unique nature of the superintendent evaluation process and may not be paying adequate attention to conducting the superintendent's evaluation. As noted, there is a scarcity of research on superintendent evaluations. However, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) conducts a survey of the status of the superintendency every 10 years, which includes data on superintendent evaluations (American Association of School Administrators [AASA], 2007; T. Glass, 2007)[1]. In the 2010 decennial survey, 80% of the approximately 2000 superintendents surveyed, reported being evaluated once annually. Still, 3% of school boards did not even evaluate the superintendent annually. Additionally, the AASA survey results showed that most superintendent evaluations do not have a formative and summative evaluation component. In fact, only 13% of superintendents surveyed reported receiving any mid-year evaluation (Kowalski et al., 2011).

Not only does the frequency of evaluation point to the importance placed on the superintendent evaluation process, it also serves as evidence that boards of education are not paying attention to ensuring evaluations are methodologically sound. Evaluations should include formative components throughout the year to supplement the summative

component and to serve evaluation goals of facilitating professional growth and evaluating performance (Kowalski et al., 2011). Despite some improvements in the evaluative process since the AASA's 2000 survey and 2006 mid-decade update, including a 25% increase in the number of superintendents formally evaluated, critical components of a methodologically sound, quality, fair evaluation process are still not present. AASA's 2010 survey results demonstrated limited use of multiple data sources, with less than 20% of superintendents reporting evaluative input from key stakeholders such as other administrators, teachers, or parents/community members (Kowalski et al., 2011). Further, though the majority of superintendents indicated that they were evaluated based upon agreed upon criteria, only a minority of the surveyed superintendents identified state or national performance standards as the selected criteria (Kowalski et al., 2011). Unfortunately, this is consistent with other studies indicating that individual board members are providing subjective narratives that are not tied to standards (Costa, 2004; DiPaola, 2007); that evaluations overwhelmingly lack school and district improvement as an evaluative component; and that even if where criteria exist, such criteria were not being used (AASA, 2007; T. Glass, 2007; Mayo & McCartney, 2004).

Although boards of education are not following standards for a methodologically sound evaluation process, such evaluation standards exist. In 1975, a committee of professional associations interested in personnel evaluation in the United States and Canada joined together to create the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Joint Committee). The Joint Committee met in 1988 and 2008 to identify and refine standards for evaluation of all educational personnel and published such standards in 1988 and 2009 (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009). Though these standards

exist, quite simply, there has been no comprehensive research to determine the level of coherence between superintendent evaluations and the Joint Committee standards, particularly considering the impact of the school accountability and reform movement.

Given lack of research on the coherence of superintendent evaluation policies with the Joint Committee standards and the overall lack of state-level research on superintendent evaluation policies, there is certainly a potential risk that superintendent evaluation policy may face the same policy development lag, if not a greater lag, and the one faced by principal evaluation policy. Given the role of superintendents as ultimately responsible for district reform, the ESSA's shift in focus from the school-level to the district-level reform, the unique structure of the superintendent evaluation process, and the unique political nature of the superintendent/board of education relationship, superintendent evaluation policies cannot afford to experience the same lag as principal evaluation policies. To wait another 10 years from the passage of ESSA would mean state-level superintendent evaluation policies would not be evaluated for coherence with the Joint Committee methodological quality standards or updated to reflect accountability and reform efforts until approximately 2025. States and school districts cannot afford to wait. In fact, states are starting to introduce legislation that at least touches upon district-level performance evaluation and development (Scott, 2017). Nevertheless, many of those states have only introduced, but not enacted the legislation. Of those enacted, some merely reference district-level performance evaluation and others merely establish a task force to review the issue further (Scott, 2017). The time has come to determine the status of state-level superintendent evaluation policies, whether the states have adopted more

stringent requirements in the post-accountability reform era, and whether certain key characteristics of effective performance evaluations are included.

Determining the status is the first step in understanding state-level superintendent evaluation policy. A crucial second step to ensuring superintendent evaluation policy does not experience the same 10-year delay post accountability and reform, is to understand the role of state-level policy actors and political culture. There is a wide range of policy actors with interest in influencing educational policy (Björk & Gurley, 2005; Fowler, 2013; Kraft & Furlong, 2018). In fact, early superintendent evaluation research of the 1980s was conducted by two national associations, the AASA and the National School Boards Association (NSBA). These organizations attempted to bring the issue of superintendent standards and evaluations to light (AASA, 1980). Still today, AASA is the primary provider of what little superintendent evaluation research exists. State affiliates of these two associations remain involved in developing superintendent evaluation policy at the state-level (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003). The most recent AASA survey of superintendents found that the majority of superintendents perceived state school boards associations as either very influential or somewhat influential in board of education policy decisions (Finnan et al., 2015).

Moreover, the role of policy actors is often driven by political cultures (Elazar, 1966; Fowler, 2013). Political culture is the collection of expressed attitudes and patterns of behavior of both individuals and groups within a defined geographical context. Political culture persists over time and influences how states address policy issues (Louis et al., 2008).

The defined geographical context of political cultures inevitably means that political cultures vary across geographic regions, thus grouping states by shared political culture. Nationally, states are described as belonging to one of three political cultures: traditionalistic, moralistic, and individualistic (Elazar, 1966). The Upper South, Lower South, and Southwest states, typically adopting a traditionalistic culture, see policy actors limited to the elite with the social connections and personal relationships that influence policy. The New England, Mid-Western or Near West, Northwest, and the Far West, typically adopting a moralistic culture, see policy actors embedded within all aspects of society, leading to significant participation in government and policy development. The Middle Atlantic and Pacific states, as well as one state in the Far West and one state in the Southwest, typically adopting an individualistic culture, view policy actors as trying to minimize government regulation and influence policy through mutual obligation (Elazar, 1966; Fowler, 2013).

The differing roles, levels of involvement of policy actors, and extent of influence within in each of these cultures necessarily influences the policy initiation and policy change process. Change within the policy process is less likely when states are tightly coupled or surrounded by a tightly coupled network, meaning that policy actors in states with similar political cultures are working closely together within and among states to influence the policy process and limit or moderate the change (Roach, Smith, & Boutin, 2011). The rate of change, whether slow or fast, is magnified when dealing with policies impacting politically charged, wide-scale reform initiatives. Superintendent evaluation policies that are connected to school reform are just the type of policy that can magnify the rate of change (Keedy & Björk, 2002). Thus, it is crucial to determine whether there

is a dependence between state-level superintendent evaluation policy development and political culture to understand and begin to project the trajectory of future state-level superintendent evaluation policy.

Conceptual Frameworks

Three conceptual frameworks guide this analysis. First, superintendents are school personnel whose evaluations should follow the overarching guidelines for fair and effective personnel evaluations (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009). Yet, there are special considerations given the unique role and functions of the superintendency, as well as the unique political nature of the relationship between the board of education and the superintendent. Second, superintendent evaluations are inextricably intertwined with and influenced by the accountability and reform framework. This framework will explore the impact of federal accountability and reform movements on the unique role and functions of the superintendency and inform the manner in which superintendent evaluations should be updated and refined in light of this accountability movement (Owen & Ovando, 2000). Finally, state-level superintendent evaluations policies are developed, adopted, and implemented within the overarching state education governance framework (Kraft & Furlong, 2018; Railey, 2017). This state education governance framework acknowledges and recognizes the role of the state government in education policy as well as the influence of state-level policy actors (Railey, 2017).

Research Questions

1. How does the content of superintendent evaluation policies compare across states?
    a. To what extent do states mandate superintendent evaluation?

b. To what extent and frequency do states update superintendent evaluation policies with changes in the accountability and reform movement?
c. To what extent do states meet the propriety standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?
d. To what extent do states meet the utility standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?
e. To what extent do states meet the feasibility standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?
f. To what extent do states meet the accuracy standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?

2. How do state-level superintendent evaluation policies compare within geographic regions of the United States with differing political cultures?

Significance of the Research

This study will contribute to the gap in the research that fails to inform superintendent evaluations, and, in particular, state-level superintendent evaluation policy. The study has the potential to transform practical action by several groups: state policy actors (both those that make and influence policy), national and state educational leadership and governance associations, and local boards of education and superintendents. By understanding the varying frameworks across states, state policy actors can work to improve the breadth and depth of superintendent evaluation regulations that are more tailored to informed practice. Likewise, with a deeper understanding of informed superintendent evaluation regulatory frameworks, national and state educational leadership and governance associations can support boards of

education and superintendents in evaluation formats and procedures. Finally, by bringing awareness to the importance of the superintendent evaluation process, boards of education and superintendents can make informed decisions on their own local evaluation process. For all groups, by better understanding the progression of superintendent evaluation regulations in the wake of an increased focus on accountability, the vital role of superintendent in accountability, student achievement, and educational reform can be explored.

Definition of Terms

Abductive analytic arguments: Abductive arguments are a component of the basic content analysis. The researcher uses descriptive literal content to create inferential links to evaluate and explain the data (Krippendorff, 2013).

Accountability and reform movement: For the purposes of this study, the accountability and reform movement is broadly defined as the collection of federal legislation and initiatives that seek to hold schools and educational leaders accountable for improvements in student achievement and district-wide school reform.

Accuracy Standard: The accuracy standard is one of the four Joint Committee standards for quality evaluations. The accuracy standard ensures that evaluations are technically accurate, based on data that can be documented, and that conclusions are linked logically to data. The accuracy standard does this through the following components: validity orientation, defined expectancy, analysis of context, documented purposes and procedures, defensible information, systemic data control, bias identification and management, analysis of information, justified conclusions, and meta-evaluation (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

American Association of School Administrators (AASA): A national association representing the voice and interests of school district leaders. They advocate for school district leadership issues at the federal level. The AASA is also known as The School Superintendents Association (AASA, 2018).

Basic Content Analysis: The "basic content analysis" (Berelson as cited in Drisko & Maschi, 2015, p. 3), to be employed in the present research, is a process whereby the researcher uses a literal coding approach to extricate quantitative data that describes the document (the policy).

Chi-Square: The Chi-Square test of association/independence is a statistical procedure that compares observed frequencies to expected frequencies to determine if there is a significant relationship or dependence between group membership on two variables (Warner, 2013)

Criteria Standard: A rubric element for analyzing state-level superintendent evaluation policies that is based on the quality evaluation standards developed by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009).

Criteria Category: A rubric element for analyzing state-level superintendent evaluation policies that falls within the Joint Committee standards and further categorizes each standard for unique application to superintendent evaluations based on research by DiPaola (2010) and Jacques et al. (2012).

Criteria Indicator: A rubric element that asks a specific question to determine the presence or absence of a particular category and standard in a state-level superintendent evaluation policy.

Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies: An online database developed by the American Institutes for Research that contains nationwide evaluation criteria and evaluation data used by states in teacher and principal evaluation policies (American Institutes for Research, 2018).

Educational Leader: An individual who provides leadership in a school setting, including both school-level leaders, principals, and district-level leaders, superintendents. Where distinction is appropriate, the level of educational leadership, whether school-level or district-level, is noted. This definition recognizes that school leader is typically associated with principal or school-level leadership for the purposes of policy. Educational leader provides a broader definition.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): ESSA is federal legislation that is part of the accountability and reform movement and is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Among other things, ESSA removed the focus from student or school-based requirements, instead focusing on state plans for district or system-based requirements like hiring, professional learning, and evaluation (ESSA, 2015).

Feasibility Standard: The feasibility standard is one of the four Joint Committee standards for quality evaluations. The feasibility standard ensures that evaluations are easy to implement, efficient, and adequately funded through practical procedures, political viability, and fiscal viability (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Joint Committee): A committee started in 1975 and convened in 1988 and 2008 (published in 2009) to identify standards for evaluation of all educational personnel. Committee members include

professional associations in the United States and Canada interested in personnel evaluation quality (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

National School Boards Association (NSBA): A national association representing the voices of school board leadership and advocating for equity and excellence in school issues at the federal level (NSBA, 2018).

No Child Left Behind (NCLB): Federal legislation enacted in 2001 that is part of the accountability and school reform movement. Among other requirements, NCLB placed stringent performance requirements and benchmarks upon schools (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005; NCLB, 2001). NCLB required schools to ensure all teachers were highly qualified, that all students reached the proficient level on state testing within a ten-year period, and that all schools made adequate yearly progress toward goals (NCLB, 2001).

Performance Standards: Criteria developed to identify the expectations of educational leader performance.

Political Cultures: Political culture is the collection of expressed attitudes and patterns of behavior of both individuals and groups within a defined geographical context (Elazar, 1966). Political culture persists over time and affects how states address policy issues (Louis et al., 2008). Political cultures describe the norms and context surrounding the policy process, including beliefs about the role of government and the level of public involvement in the political and policy development process. States are described as belonging to one of three political cultures: traditionalistic, moralistic, and individualistic (Elazar, 1966; Fowler, 2013).

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: A set of performance standards governing school-level and district-level leaders developed by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015). The standards were formally known as the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards.

Propriety Standard: The propriety standard is one of the four Joint Committee standards for quality evaluations. The propriety standard ensures that evaluations are legal, ethical, and consider the welfare of the employee, through the following components: service orientation, appropriate policies and procedures, access to the evaluation, interactions with the employee, comprehensive elements, consideration of conflicts of interest, and legal viability (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

Race to the Top (RTTT): A federal grant program developed in 2010 that provided funding to states as grant recipients. Among other grant provisions, RTTP directly linked school accountability and personnel evaluations by incentivizing evaluations of individual educators, including school-level leaders, on the basis of student performance (Jacques et al., 2012; United States Department of Education, 2015).

Rubric Scores: Fully Present, Partially Present, Not Present. Fully present is defined as the policy clearly containing the mandated presence of a particular indicator. Partially present is defined as the policy containing the permissive presence of a particular indicator. Not present is defined as the policy containing no language related to the presence of a particular indicator.

State Associations of School Administrators: State-level associations that are affiliated with or connected to the AASA. They represent the voice and interests of school district leaders and advocate for school district leadership issues at the state-level.

State School Board Governance Associations: State-level associations that are affiliated with the NSBA. They represent the voice and interests of school board leadership and advocate for school equity and excellence issues at the state-level.

Student Performance Measures or Outcomes: The measure of student performance and/or student growth within a state or local school district. This can be narrowly defined as student standardized test scores or more broadly defined to incorporate multiple measures of student performance and growth.

Superintendent Evaluation Policies: Collectively, the state statutes, state board of education regulations, and state board of education guidance documents mandating the existence and content of superintendent evaluations.

Utility Standard: The utility standard is one of the four Joint Committee standards for quality evaluations. The utility standard ensures that evaluations are informative, timely, and influential, through the following components: constructive orientation, defined uses, evaluator quality measures, explicit criteria, functional reporting, and follow up professional learning and development (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

Westlaw legal research system: Westlaw legal research system is an electronic system for researching primary and secondary legal resources owned and operated by Thompson Reuters (Thompson Reuters, 2018).

CHAPTER 2

Superintendents are educational leaders whose evaluations should follow the overarching guidelines for fair and effective school personnel evaluations (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009). When educational leader evaluations are designed to meet standards of quality, not only are the evaluations effective in assessing superintendent performance and designing incentives for superintendent compensation, the evaluations are also effective in facilitating collective, organizational accountability (Goldring, Porter, Murphy, & Elliott, 2009). Yet, superintendent evaluations can only be effective in facilitating accountability when the evaluations acknowledge the influence of the accountability movement on the unique role and expectations of the superintendent. The accountability and reform movement has altered the role and expectations of all educational leaders. However, the influence has served to make the role of superintendent and principal more divergent. Superintendent performance evaluation policies, to ensure fairness, equity, and the critical link to implementation of accountability reform, require their own criteria, analysis, and implications for informed policy development.

State-level superintendent policies must ensure that local boards of education are meeting the standards of quality, fairness, and effectiveness in both process and content. Yet, the state-level policy process is influenced by policy actor input and political culture. Analyzing state-level superintendent evaluation policies requires investigation into the content and the extent of these influences to determine the status of state progress

towards ensuring high quality superintendent evaluation standards and the incorporation of accountability and reform movement outcomes.

Educational Leader Evaluations

Educational leader evaluations, like all personnel evaluations, are held to a certain set of standards to ensure quality, fairness, and equity. The Joint Committee (1988, 2009) identified four practice standards for evaluation of all educational personnel: propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy (DiPaola, 2010; Joint Committee, 1988, 2009). Each standard further identifies components that should be present in evaluation instruments to ensure the standard is met. The propriety standard ensures that evaluations are legal, ethical, and consider the welfare of the employee. The propriety standard provides this assurance through the following components: service orientation, appropriate policies and procedures, access to the evaluation, interactions with the employee, comprehensive elements, consideration of conflicts of interest, and legal viability. The utility standard ensures that evaluations are informative, timely, and influential. The utility standard provides this assurance through the following components: constructive orientation, defined uses, evaluator quality measures, explicit criteria, functional reporting, follow up professional learning and development. The feasibility standard ensures that evaluations are easy to implement, efficient, and adequately funded. The feasibility standard provides this assurance through practical procedures, political viability, and fiscal viability. The accuracy standard ensures that evaluations are technically accurate, based on data that can be documented, and that conclusions are linked logically to data. The accuracy standard provides this assurance through the following components: validity orientation, defined expectancy, analysis of

context, documented purposes and procedures, defensible information, systemic data control, bias identification and management, analysis of information, justified conclusions, and meta-evaluation (DiPaola, 2010; Joint Committee, 1998, 2008).

While many factors of educational leader evaluations are similar to any other personnel evaluation, there are certain features that add an additional layer of complexity. In 2002, the Center for Performance Assessment conducted the *National Leadership Evaluation Study* to analyze the evaluation instruments of educational leaders, in a variety of positions nationwide (Reeves, 2008). Reeves (2008) identified several features of educational leadership that makes evaluation particularly complex. First, the definition of school or educational leadership is widely varied and covers a multitude of positions, which in turn, leads to widely varied and ambiguous standards for performance and performance expectations. Second, the evaluation continuum is ambiguous, using vague terminology to determine whether the leader "meets" or "exceeds" expectations (Reeves, 2008).

Given the complexity of educational leader evaluations, it is incredibly difficult for local boards of education to develop evaluation instruments that meet these standards for quality evaluation procedures. Local boards of education may be aware that they should develop evaluation instruments and processes that comply with the Joint Committee standards or risk an unfair, biased educational leader performance evaluation system that does not produce useful results. Unfortunately, on the whole, boards of education "lack the will and training to develop and implement a comprehensive evaluation process" (DiPaola, 2010, p. 23).

The analysis must, therefore, take place at the state level to ensure the fairness and consistency demanded by the Joint Committee. State-level policy can serve to mandate a particular process that conforms to the Joint Committee standards. While mandates run the risk of local boards of education taking a minimal compliance-only stance, when state-level policy has breadth and depth, it is able to inform and provide guidance to local boards of education in the implementation of the evaluation process (Fowler, 2013; Jacques et al., 2012; Kraft & Furlong, 2018).

Superintendent Evaluations

Superintendent evaluations can and should serve as a key tool to improve educational performance (Marzano & Waters, 2009). To do so, superintendent evaluations must be held to the same standard of quality assurance. Research shows superintendent evaluations are not held to that standard of quality, which Glasman and Fuller (2002) infer to be a result of the unique structure and challenges of the superintendent position and evaluation process. To fully understand how the Joint Committee standards manifest themselves within superintendent evaluation policy, it is essential to define the superintendent's role and position, which, in turn, informs performance expectations to be measured in the evaluation.

Defining the Superintendent's Role

Defining the superintendent's role is a complex task. The superintendent's role has significantly evolved throughout the 20th century as superintendent autonomy increased and superintendents needed to respond to the public demand for efficiency and for an increased public connection to the schools (Owen & Ovando, 2000). Thus, fully

understanding the superintendent's role requires an understanding of how the superintendent's role has changed over time.

History of the superintendency. The superintendent position originated in the late 1830s (Kowalski, 2005), though school administrators first became a recognized profession, separate from teaching, in the late 19th century (Glasman & Fuller, 2002). The evolution of the superintendency has passed through four, arguably five, stages (Callahan, 1966). Although these stages may not have had a distinct start and end date, the first, occurred generally between the years of 1850-1900, and found the superintendent as a scholarly leader. The second, occurred generally between the years of 1900-1930, and found the superintendent as a business manager. The third, occurred generally between the years of 1930-1950, and found the superintendent as an educational statesman. The fourth, occurred generally between the years of 1950-1967, and found the superintendent as a social scientist (Callahan, 1966). A fifth was championed in 2003 by Theodore J. Kowalski and found the superintendent as a communicator.

The stages of the superintendent role development correspond directly to the five essential components of the superintendent position: teacher-scholar, manager, democratic leader, applied social scientist, and communicator (Callahan, 1966; Kowalski, 2005). Interestingly, those essential role components remain quite similar today, even if referred to by different terms (Björk, Browne-Ferrigno, & Kowalski, 2014; Björk, Kowalski, & Browne-Ferrigno, 2005). Within each of these essential role components, the skills and standards required of the superintendent position significantly evolved

throughout the 20th century and there is no question that the superintendency is a role that requires continuous adaptation to a multitude of societal changes (Björk et al., 2014).

Over time and as the superintendent role adapted and changed, superintendents experienced increased autonomy. That autonomy is tied to a responsibility to respond to the public demand for efficiency and for an increased public connection to the schools (Owen & Ovando, 2000). The autonomy also came with the ultimate responsibility for all positive and negative school achievements and an increased level of public scrutiny. As public confidence in public officials decreases, so does public confidence in the schools, and in turn, superintendents.

All of this scrutiny sets the stage for increasing expectations on the superintendent both externally and internally. External expectations come from legal decisions (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005), accountability laws, and the public (both directly and through the board of education). Internal expectations come from students, school employees, and from the superintendent's employer, the board of education (Owen & Ovando, 2000). These expectations are not always congruous. Expectations on the superintendent as an administrator, operational manager, instructional leader, politician, champion for the staff, students, community, often compete, leaving the superintendent's position complex to say the least (Fusarelli, Cooper, & Carella, 2002). In the AASA's 2010 Decennial Study of the American Superintendent survey and the mid-decade update, every single role and function of the superintendent, except for the superintendent as an applied scientist, was considered very important to the majority of boards of education (Finnan et al., 2015). Thus, changes in the superintendent's role do not serve to narrowly tailor expectations placed upon superintendents. Instead, superintendents are

expected to continue to perform to high standards and expectations in every role and facet of their position.

The complexity of the superintendent's role necessitates a complex set of areas of expertise as well as the possession of specific skills. No one individual can possess every expertise and every skill. In fact, boards of education may have fluctuating demands for superintendents with particular expertise and skills for particular reasons at particular times, depending on the context and circumstances of the particular school district (Fusarelli et al., 2002). Superintendents must interpret their respective board of education's view of the superintendent's role and corresponding demand for expertise, skills, and performance (Finnan et al., 2015). Evaluations are, at their very core, the mechanism through which expected expertise/skills are compared to possessed expertise/skills.

The expectations for expertise and skills are translated into specific superintendent tasks to be evaluated (Glasman & Fuller, 2002). These tasks have been defined in a wide variety of ways. Early scholars identified four key tasks: instructional program, personnel administration, funds and facilities management, and interpreting schools to a variety of public stakeholders (Glasman & Fuller, 2002; Griffiths, 1966).

Accountability and school reform. The evolution of the superintendent position continues into the 21st century. At the turn of the 21st century, the key roles of the superintendent were defined as areas of leadership responsibility, specifically the superintendent as a political leader, managerial leader, and educational leader (Owens & Ovendo, 2000). However, the 21st century has brought with it several significant

national school accountability and reform efforts that substantially alter the nature of the superintendent's role, nationwide.

The first significant national school accountability and reform effort was the 2002 federal legislation, No Child Left Behind (NCLB). NCLB placed stringent performance requirements and benchmarks upon school districts (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005; NCLB, 2001). Though not explicitly stated, the superintendent, as the school district leader, bears the ultimate responsibility for school district operations, including NCLB performance standards (Johnstone, Dikkers, & Luedeke, 2009). Thus, NCLB impacted the superintendent in the role areas of instructional program, personnel administration, and stakeholder engagement.

After NCLB, the second significant accountability and reform effort was a 2010 federal grant program called Race to the Top (RTTT). RTTT manifested a direct link between accountability and evaluations by incentivizing evaluations of individual educators, including school-level leaders, on the basis of student performance (Jacques et al., 2012). RTTT's focus on student performance meant that the link to educational leader evaluation was to the school- level leader, the principal (Canole & Young, 2013; Jacques et al., 2012). Still, there was no recognition of the district-level leader, the superintendent, and accountability for student performance (Holliday, 2013; Learning Forward, 2017). Thus, despite RTTP's impact on the superintendent in the role area of personnel administration (with a direct link to instructional program), RTTP maintained a school-based focus.

As standards-based systemic reform started to place increased accountability demands on schools, autonomy over instruction began to shift from individual schools to

the school system or school district-level (Cohen et al., 2018). Naturally, that shift led to a corresponding shift in responsibility for meeting the accountability demands from the principal to the superintendent.

The third, and most recent, significant reform effort has been the 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. ESSA promoted a combination of evidence-based initiatives with state flexibility in educational leadership practices and interventions, including performance evaluation (Herman, Gates, Chavez-Herrerias, & Harris, 2016). ESSA's flexibility was specifically directed to the state-level and district-level, not only the school-level emphasized by its predecessors (Young, Winn, & Reedy, 2017). For example, the local educational agency, the school district, is responsible for developing plans for low performing schools and stakeholder engagement (Aragon, Griffith, Wixom, Woods, & Workman, 2016; ESSA, 2015). ESSA has marked a clear focus on district-level accountability initiatives (Whitehouse, 2017). Thus, ESSA has impacted the superintendent in every role area while also shifting the focus from the school-based focus to the district-based focus.

All educational leaders, principals and superintendents included, faced intense increased scrutiny in the wake of the accountability and reform movements over the past twenty years. The principal, as the school building leader, was first to receive the intense focus. The focus of principal evaluation is on instruction and the principal's ability to increase student achievement (Jacques et al., 2012). For principals, reform implementation is more directly tied to instruction and includes implementation of curricular reform such as the Common Core State Standards and classroom digital

innovation. In fact, much of the discussion surrounding accountability reform, including NCLB and RTTT, has centered on the principal (Fullan, 2014). In response to RTTT's focus on the principal's role in accountability, states began to pass legislation that emphasized individual principal accountability as part of a broader strategy to improve principal preparation, licensure, and evaluation (Jacques et al., 2012). Despite these initial legislative attempts, it still took more than 10 years for state legislatures to align school-level accountability expectations with principal evaluations.

It was not until after RTTT and the implementation of the ESSA, that the focus began to shift from the individual school-level to the school district-level (Jimenez & Sargrad, 2017). The post-accountability and reform scrutiny on superintendents is not limited to instructional leadership and increasing student achievement as it is with school principals. Historically, the superintendent's role, though varied in function as it transitioned from business manager, to educational statesman, to social scientist, and to communicator, was always described as an expansion of the principal's role for each function. In other words, the principal served each of the same functions, simply to a lesser degree than the superintendent. This description is no longer applicable (Owen & Ovando, 2000). Certainly, at the district level, the reform measures of the past two decades have forced an increased focus on the superintendent's role in instructional leadership, curriculum development, and assessment (Bredeson & Kose, 2007), much like the principal. Unlike the principal, the superintendent is more significantly impacted by additional heightened expectation to balance legal and political external demands. Superintendent performance expectation criteria and evaluation policy has lagged behind the accountability movement (Mayo & McCartney, 2004) and even further behind

principal performance expectation criteria and evaluation policy. These heightened expectations have not been clearly incorporated into evaluation performance standards (Bredeson & Kose, 2007).

Performance standards. In the late 20th century, setting performance standards and incorporating those standards into evaluation criteria began to garner attention. During the 1980s, the Association of School Administrators worked to define a set of performance goals, competencies, and standards for all educational leaders (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005). The result, *Skills for Successful School Leaders*, identified eight leadership outcome goals: (1) defining, implementing, and evaluating school climate; (2) building support for schools; (3) developing school curricula; (4) conveying instructional management; (5) evaluating staff; (6) developing staff; (7) allocating resources; and (8) engaging in research, evaluation, and planning (Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1990). In 1990, the Educational Research Service in its report, *Evaluation of Superintendents and School Boards*, generated a list of criteria via a survey methodology that were most common to superintendent evaluations in a majority of school districts (Robinson & Bickers, 1990). However, the Educational Research Service's list of criteria was just that, the commonly used criteria and not a set of research-based professional standards.

Again in 1993, the AASA accepted recommendations of the Commission on Professional Standards for the Superintendency ("Commission"; AASA, 1993). The Commission outlined eight professional standards for superintendents: leadership and culture, policy and governance, communication and community relations, organizational management, curriculum planning and development, institutional management, human

resources management, and values and ethics of leadership (AASA, 1993; DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Glasman & Fuller, 2002).

Despite the Commission's recommendations, there is no universally accepted set of superintendent performance standards. DiPaola and Stronge (2003) outlined several standards frameworks upon which superintendents are evaluated. These include the ISSLC standards (now the PSEL standards), AASA standards, NSBA standards. Each set of standards touches upon similar performance expectations, but each uses different terminology and emphasis. The most recently adopted and updated standards are the PSEL standards adopted in 2015, which include the following standards: mission, vision, and core values; ethics and professional norms; equity and cultural responsiveness; curriculum, instruction, and assessment; community of care and support for students; professional capacity of school personnel; professional community for teachers and staff; meaningful engagement of families and community; operations and management; and school improvement (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015). Though AASA was involved in shaping the PSEL standards, AASA still maintains the *Professional Standards for the Superintendency*, adopted in 1993 (AASA, 1993). Likewise, the National School Boards Association maintains its own set of standards for superintendents adopted in 2000, which include: vision, standards, assessment, accountability, alignment, climate, collaboration and continuous improvement (National School Boards Association [NSBA], 2000).

Yet, overwhelmingly, superintendents report that because there are no universally accepted standards, superintendents are left with overlapping criteria that lack clarity, lack relevancy, lack a results-based focus, and lack consistency (Mayo & McCartney,

2004). There are questions about the extent to which these standards align with the commonly accepted domains of superintendent performance: policy and governance, planning and assessment, instructional leadership, organizational management, community relations, and professionalism (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003).

Efforts to determine congruence, if not alignment, have been promulgated in the years since, with Björk, Kowalski, and Browne-Ferrigno (2005) finding that the AASA standards and the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) standards (the predecessor to the PSEL standards) were congruent. However, the ISSLC standards were replaced by the PSEL in 2015 and it is unclear if such congruence remains.

Moreover, there is nothing that requires a state to formally adopt these standards as required educational leader standards. In fact, some states, like Texas, have developed their own standards (Hendricks, 2013). Texas places emphasis on three domains for its superintendent standards: educational leadership, district management, and board and community relations (DiPaola, 2010; Texas Association of School Boards, 2007). When states adopt their own standards, it only adds to the complexity of potential divergence of expectations of superintendent performance. As an example, Texas' selection of three broad domains lends the potential for much variation within each domain.

These questions manifest themselves in superintendent perceptions of policy actor influence in the superintendent evaluation process. Forty-one percent of the superintendents surveyed in AASA's 2010 survey indicated that guidelines of either the state school board association or the state administrators association served as a factor in the superintendent's performance evaluation (Kowalski et al., 2011).

Performance outcome expectations. Inherent in the accountability movement, is the idea that superintendents are responsible to the public to ensure efficient and effective school operations and student achievement. The focus on the role of educational leaders in ensuring and improving institutional effectiveness reached a key point in the mid-1980s with a number of national reports for varying administrative associations. These included the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration: *A Nation at Risk*, *Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools*, and *Time for Results*; National Policy Board for Educational Administration: *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform*; and *The Governors' 1991 Report on Education* (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005; Morgan & Peterson, 2002). Though these reports spoke of leadership generally, the focus on instructional leadership lent more directly to immediate resulting reforms that focused on school-building level reform through principals. Over time, research indicated that district-level leaders, superintendents, given their direct role in implementing board of education policy, were in a better position to influence institutional effectiveness in student achievement and instructional leadership (Morgan & Peterson, 2002).

To be clear, the superintendent is not expected to step into the classroom to directly influence instruction. Though Waters and Marzano (2006) found a statistically significant positive correlation between superintendent leadership at the district level and an increase in student achievement, the correlation was weak (r=.24). Perhaps this was recognition that the superintendent behaviors that contribute to that positive correlation are indirect behaviors of goal setting, resource allocation, and tenure as a superintendent in the state (Plotts & Gutmore, 2014) or even within the school district (Simpson, 2013).

Instead of directly influencing student achievement and instruction, the superintendent is expected to facilitate internal relationships (Plotts & Gutmore, 2014; Waters & Marzano, 2006) and external relationships and champion policies that support and advance instruction (G. J. Peterson & Barnett, 2005; Waters & Marzano, 2006). The true impact of the reform movement on the superintendency is not simply a focus on instruction, but it is a politically influenced focus on instruction. The superintendent is expected to ensure and increase effectiveness by focusing on instruction while balancing the external and internal pressures (G. J. Peterson & Barnett, 2005; Brown, Swenson, & Hertz, 2007).

Despite the added focus on instructional effectiveness, superintendents were never relieved of their other role for managerial and organizational efficiency. In fact, reform movements towards institutional effectiveness and accountability increased pressure to distribute resources appropriately towards student achievement and instruction, the measures of institutional effectiveness created by the reform movement (Browne-Ferrigno & Glass, 2005).

Unique Structure and Challenges of Superintendent Evaluation

Understanding the nature of superintendent's role is an essential step in providing for fair, accurate, and useful performance evaluation. Yet, the complexity of the position, which incorporates managerial, educational, political, and often intangible (Goens, 2009; Mayo & McCartney, 2004) functions is difficult and controversial to measure (Glasman & Fuller, 2002). Further, accountability reform has deepened the level of ambiguity associated with the superintendent's role (Hendricks, 2013; Moody, 2011). While the accountability movement made instructional leadership a clear performance goal for principals, the accountability movement did not present a similar clear performance goal

for superintendents. Performance goals and expectations may differ based on the superintendent as well as the individual district context, such as locale and size. Superintendent evaluation policies should reflect those potential differences.

Beyond the challenges presented by the nature of the superintendent's role, there are also challenges presented by the unique structure of the superintendent position with the board of education as evaluators. Superintendent evaluations are unique in that there is no one single evaluator. Superintendents are evaluated by a board of education, a collective set of five, seven, or nine board members (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003). Moreover, membership on a school board frequently rotates. This rotation and the continual introduction of new membership, new personalities, and new educational and evaluation philosophies makes development of consistent and meaningful evaluation criteria extremely difficult (Mayo & McCartney, 2004). Moreover, publicly elected boards of education are ultimately responsible to the public and community. Thus, superintendents need not only meet the expectations of the elected board members, they must also meet the expectations of the public (Owen & Ovando, 2000). Those linkages between community and elected board of education expectations have been found to influence and explain superintendent role behavior (Björk & Gurley, 2005).

Finally, there are challenges presented by the structure of the superintendent's path to the superintendent position. Superintendent licensure requirements and paths to the superintendency vary by state. Some states have elected superintendents. Some have minimal educational requirements like Tennessee that only requires a bachelor's degree. Still others sanction alternate routes to licensure, for example, via business and not education (Kowalski, 2005). The variation in paths to the superintendency and

requirements to take the position certainly make consistent and coherent requirements for evaluation of superintendent performance more complicated.

State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy

The source of superintendent evaluation policies is state, not federal or local. Though the federal government has weighed in, education policy is largely within the purview and control of the states (Fowler, 2013; Kraft & Furlong, 2018). Even when the federal government weighs in, as it has with accountability and school reform, such efforts do not become systemic until states enact the reforms with detailed policy (Parker, 1995). The current federal accountability and reform legislation, ESSA, intentionally declines to dictate that states adopt a particular teacher or educational leader evaluation system. Thus, leaving the responsibility for educational leader evaluation systems squarely at the state-level or local-level (ESSA, 2015).

States enact statutes, regulations, and administrative policy guidance that implements federal accountability and reform initiatives and guides state and local-level boards of education (Björk et al., 2014; Louis et al., 2008). While the pendulum can swing towards either state or local government control and boards of education are granted local control, local board of education capacity is still dependent on state policies to condition that capacity to act (Björk et al., 2014). Thus, while superintendent evaluation may seem localized, it is or can be governed at the state level for consistency and coherence (DiPaola & Stronge, 2001a) and to serve as the connecting link between federal accountability and school reform initiatives and localized action.

State policy control over educational reform received even more significant support in the wake of *A Nation at Risk*. State governments limited the school district's

role in policy and increased the workload and bureaucratic structures surrounding the superintendency. These structures manifested themselves in the form of standards for school operation and development of more stringent state-level policy (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005).

Since the time of *A Nation at Risk* and the subsequent tightening of control over policy at the state level, the pendulum has begun a slight shift back to the local government in the form of efforts towards state deregulation (Björk, Kowalski, & Young, 2005). Impact of state deregulation transferred some of the responsibility for the definition of the superintendent's role to the local board of education (Kowalski & Glass, 2002). Local boards did not always welcome such responsibility; some continue to seek the support and direction that state policy can provide (Keedy & Björk, 2002). Moreover, if the accountability and reform movement, specifically with the passage of ESSA, has highlighted the need to shift expectations from the school-level to the district-level, with oversight at the state-level, performance evaluations systems should evolve from a local-level analysis to a state-level analysis.

Without such a state-level analysis, increased local control can have a significant impact on superintendent evaluation policies because of their unique structure and presence in a politically influenced environment. Tenure in the superintendent position is directly related to the superintendent's ability to understand board of education's political and power structures (Boyd, 1976; Keedy & Björk, 2002). If a superintendent does not respond or adjust to board of education expectations, even those that are politically motivated, the superintendent's tenure is likely to be cut short. Whereas, if states retain a strong voice in superintendent evaluation policies, limiting autonomy of the local board

of education, superintendents may not need to adjust or mold to sometimes politically motivated local evaluation expectations.

Those in support of local control would argue that state-level policy must recognize the existing differences between, and the interdependency within, school systems within certain political and geographic environments (Cohen et al., 2018). State-level superintendent evaluation policy runs the risk of local boards of education merely conducting evaluations to satisfy a legal requirement (DiPaola, 2007). A well-formed state-level superintendent evaluation policy can adjust for such geographic distinctions. Identifying the breadth and depth of state superintendent evaluation policies helps to determine whether boards of education have to merely conduct an evaluation to satisfy a legal requirement or whether boards of education have to elevate the evaluation process to a higher level to meet the quality and standard expected by the state and demanded by the accountability and reform movement.

Criteria Congruent with the Joint Committee Standards

The Joint Committee recommendations for personnel evaluations in education have not always been applied directly to the superintendent position. Perhaps this is a result of the unique intricacies of the superintendent's position, including the political nature of the position or the nature of the board of education as evaluators (Glasman & Fuller, 2002). Yet the same standards of propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy must apply equally to all educational leader evaluations. At the broader state-level, to conform to the Joint Committee guidelines, the superintendent evaluation process should have a statement of purpose, performance criteria, standards of performance, data collection

procedures, methods to summarize performance, and methods for use of evaluation results (DiPaola, 2010).

In light of the reluctance to apply the Joint Committee standards to the unique superintendent's position, state-level evaluation policy criteria do not yet exist for analysis of superintendent evaluation policies. Instead, criteria can be borrowed, in part, from analyses of other state-level educational leader evaluation policy analyses. The American Institutes for Research conducted a nationwide policy analysis of principal evaluation policies and developed a comprehensive framework of components and indicators for a thoroughly designed and implemented evaluation system (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques et al., 2012). Using that framework, Jacques et al. (2012) refined the components and indicators to four essential components for designing a state-level principal evaluation system. Those four components include: selecting and training evaluators, data integrity and transparency, using principal evaluation results, and evaluating the system.

However, as previously established, principal and superintendent roles differ to a sufficient level that warrants divergence from the principal evaluation model in certain key areas. In a national survey in 2000, superintendents reported their role diverging significantly from that of the principal (T. E. Glass, Björk, & Brunner, 2000; Kowalski & Glass, 2002). Superintendents attributed such differences to the expanding distance between superintendents and internal, building-based issues, like instruction. The superintendency is no longer an expansion of the principalship, the superintendency now focuses on the external aspects of the role, including the politics, resource development,

communications with taxpayers, and board of education relations (Kowalski & Glass, 2002).

Prior to determining criteria for congruence of state-level superintendent evaluation policy and the Joint Committee standards, the first determination is the existence of a state-level policy that governs or mandates superintendent evaluations. In 2001, DiPaola and Stronge found that eight states reported not having state policies, guidelines, or even recommendations for superintendent evaluation processes.

Once it is determined that a state-level superintendent evaluation policy exists, the extent of that policy's congruence with the Joint Committee Standards can be investigated through carefully designed criteria drawn from prior superintendent evaluation policy research (DiPaola, 2010) and borrowed from principal evaluation policy research (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques et al., 2012).

Propriety standard. First, the Joint Committee sets a propriety standard for school personnel evaluation policies. Recall that the propriety standard ensures that evaluations are legal, ethical, and consider the welfare of the employee. The propriety standard does so through the following components: service orientation, appropriate policies and procedures, access to the evaluation, interactions with the employee, comprehensive elements, consideration of conflicts of interest, and legal viability (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

The propriety standard triggers consideration of both data collection procedures and some methods for use of results (DiPaola, 2010). Specific indicators would include whether the state-level policy requires exclusion of evaluators with conflicts of interest, whether the state-level policy mandates oversight over and training of evaluators to

ensure evaluation fidelity and bias reduction, whether the state-level policy requires confidentiality of the evaluation results, and the extent of stakeholder and policy actor involvement.

The superintendent evaluation presents a very unique evaluation process in that the primary evaluators, the board of education, do not, by design and state law, play an active role in the daily operations of the school district (Henrikson, 2018). Yet, the board members that comprise the collective board of education are often called upon as the sole evaluation data source. The propriety standard requires those board members be free of improper influence and conflicts of interest. Board members are members of the community, often with business and personal ties to the school that may influence opinions and perceptions of the superintendent. Take, for example, a board member whose spouse is an employee in the school district. The board member's spouse would be supervised by the superintendent. This board member and superintendent connection may improperly influence how board member evaluates the superintendent. The propriety standard would consider whether the state would require such a board member to be exempted from the evaluation process.

Often the very employee being evaluated, the superintendent, is the individual informally training the board of education on how to conduct the evaluation (DiPaola, 2010; Henrikson, 2018). Board members often do not receive formal training on "evaluation literacy" (Henrikson, 2018, p. 27) and are therefore unprepared for the superintendent evaluation process (Dillon & Halliwell, 1991). Further, evaluations are often written in educational terminology, of which some board members may be unfamiliar (Reeves, 2008), and which undermines the validity of the evaluation process.

Training for board members helps to reduce bias to ensure valid, reliable evaluations. In short, training helps to fulfill the Joint Committee's criteria that evaluations be conducted fairly and consistently.

The propriety standard requires a balance of confidentiality of personnel evaluated with the purpose of the position. The superintendent position is unique in that the role is of a public official with responsibility to the community (Hall & McHenry-Sorber, 2017). Ensuring a fair and equitable process that acknowledges the role of public stakeholders presents a discussion of transparency of superintendent evaluation results (Reeves, 2008). The majority of superintendent evaluations are presented to the superintendent in a closed, non-public session (AASA, 2007; T. Glass, 2007). Though the propriety standard may not require absolute confidentiality for superintendent evaluation, the standard would require recognition of the superintendent's general welfare and privacy.

In addition to acknowledging the public stakeholders within the community, the propriety standard also considers the general welfare of the employee (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009) to the extent that employee professional associations may play a role as policy actor stakeholders in the superintendent evaluation process. The superintendent evaluation process should be collaborative with input from both the superintendent and the board of education (Callan & Levinson, 2011; Hendricks, 2013). Yet, there are separate professional associations that represent the interests of either the superintendent or the board of education, but not both. Thus, the propriety standard would require the state to recognize and balance the input of both superintendent and board of education professional associations.

Utility standard. Second, the Joint Committee sets a utility standard for school personnel evaluation policies. Recall that the utility standard ensures that evaluations are informative, timely, and influential. The utility standard does so through the following components: constructive orientation, defined uses, evaluator quality measures, explicit criteria, functional reporting, follow up professional learning and development (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

The utility standard triggers consideration of the evaluation purpose and performance criteria and standards of performance (DiPaola, 2010). Specific indicators would include whether the state-level policy identifies evaluation system goals and the congruence of those goals to evaluation criteria, accountability and reform efforts, and preparation and licensure standards. Specific indicators also include whether state-level policy identifies or mandates performance criteria and standards upon which the superintendent is to be evaluated. Finally, specific indicators would also include whether state-level policy identifies data sources and whether the state-level policy permits use of evaluation results in contractual and human resource decisions.

The utility standard requires that superintendent evaluation serve a meaningful purpose and fulfill system goals. Superintendent evaluation, like any evaluation, should serve two goals: accountability and professional growth (Gore, 2013; Henrikson, 2018). It is anticipated that accountability would take the forefront in the wake of two decades of accountability and reform efforts, including ESSA's most recent shift from the school-level to the district-level. Unfortunately, superintendents do not perceive evaluations as effective in identifying strengths and weaknesses for continued improvement (Dillon & Halliwell, 1991) or serving to fulfill any accountability and reform purpose. To help

change this perception, the relationship between evaluator and employee should define the beliefs, attitudes, and expectations of the evaluation process (McMahon et al., 2014). Thus, the state-level policy should define the goals of evaluation and should require that local boards of education have provisions for shared superintendent performance goal-setting.

The utility standard places heavy emphasis on performance criteria and standards (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009). Superintendent evaluation policies must identify the criteria to be utilized in the evaluation process (Callan & Levinson, 2011; Weber, 2007). Without those criteria, bias and unclear expectations may be introduced into the evaluation process (Borba, 2010; Hendricks, 2013). Too often, superintendents express perceptions that they are evaluated on interpersonal relationships with board members rather than criteria tied to job descriptions and duties (Henrikson, 2018). This perception is a result of board-developed criteria, often without the joint-involvement of the superintendent and without any state-level policy guidance on the selection of appropriate criteria. Even when agreed-upon criteria exist, approximately two-thirds of the superintendents perceive the board to have strayed from the agreed-upon criteria in the evaluation process (AASA, 2007; T. Glass, 2007). At a minimum, superintendent evaluation policy must dictate that superintendent evaluations be based on job descriptions or a clearly delineated set of job duties (DiPaola, 2010) and not subjective impressions (DiPaola, 2007). More valuable than a minimal reference to a job description is a reference in the superintendent evaluation policy to a set of evidence-based standards for superintendent performance.

DiPaola and Stronge (2003) outlined several criteria frameworks upon which superintendents are evaluated. These include the PSEL standards, AASA standards, NSBA standards. Yet, overwhelmingly, superintendents report these overlapping criteria as lacking clarity, lacking relevancy, lacking a results-based focus, and lacking consistency (Mayo & McCartney, 2004). There is question about the extent to which these standards align with the commonly accepted domains of superintendent performance: policy and governance, planning and assessment, instructional leadership, organizational management, community relations, and professionalism (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003) and the extent to which states are choosing to develop their own standards.

Murphy, Louis, and Smylie (2017) caution that standards are developed on paper but only enacted through incorporation into training, certification, and development programs. Though Murphy et al.'s point is well taken, the absence of enactment of standards via performance evaluation is noteworthy. It is possible that formal professional standards are being enacted, in part, through performance evaluations but such is occurring informally and therefore, not documented. It is equally possible that formal professional standards are not being enacted because evaluation policy does not identify professional standards as a required part of performance evaluations.

In light of the accountability reforms and the efforts to hold all leaders accountable for student achievement, state-level superintendent evaluation policies may also dictate whether or not student performance measures are a required aspect of superintendent evaluations. This is not to pass judgment as to whether including student performance data is necessary for a comprehensive superintendent evaluation or whether

it is appropriate as part of a fair and unbiased superintendent evaluation (DiPaola, 2007). This is simply to investigate the extent to which states are mandating such provisions within state superintendent evaluation policies.

In order for superintendent evaluation systems to be a criteria/standards-based dialogue between the superintendent and multiple stakeholder evaluation sources, the utility standard would also require the superintendent evaluation to be a continuous and ongoing process, not a singular event (J. Glass, 2014) with singular evaluation measures that come from a singular data source (Henrikson, 2018). The process should be collaborative with input from both the superintendent and the board of education (Callan & Levinson, 2011; Hendricks, 2013).

Feasibility standard. Third, the Joint Committee sets a feasibility standard for school personnel evaluation policies. Recall that the feasibility standard ensures that evaluations are easy to implement, efficient, and adequately funded. The feasibility standard does so through practical procedures, political viability, and fiscal viability (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

The feasibility standard triggers consideration of the data collection procedures (DiPaola, 2010). The specific indicator would be whether state-level policy dictates the frequency of the superintendent evaluation. As a result of boards of education not being involved in the daily operations of the school district, superintendent performance evaluation can occur more infrequently than other professional evaluations. The AASA 2010 *Study of the American School Superintendent* survey results confirmed that the majority of districts only formally evaluated the superintendent annually and a low minority of 13% was evaluated more than once per year (Kowalski et al., 2011).

Evaluation frequency determinations may be set by state superintendent evaluation policy and its mandate of the school district governance model or special provisions for superintendents with differing levels of experience. For example, if a school district employs, whether by choice or by state mandate, the traditional governance model, the superintendent is only evaluated at certain distinct points, once or twice per year. On the other hand, if the school district employs the policy governance model, then the superintendent is evaluated continuously throughout the year (Namit, 2008). Additionally, a state may or should require more frequent evaluations for novice or first-time superintendents (G. J. Peterson, Fusarelli, & Kowalski, 2008).

The feasibility standard, as a means of measuring efficiency and effectiveness in implementation efforts, would also require some type of data tracking mechanism. A state would not be able to determine if and how it is meeting this standard without requiring districts to report data on the superintendent evaluation process.

Accuracy standard. Finally, the Joint Committee sets an accuracy standard for school personnel evaluation policies. Recall that the accuracy standard ensures that evaluations are technically accurate and that conclusions are linked logically to data. It does this through the following components: validity orientation, defined expectancy, analysis of context, documented purposes and procedures, defensible information, systemic data control, bias identification and management, analysis of information, justified conclusions, and meta-evaluation (Joint Committee, 1988, 2009).

The accuracy standard triggers consideration of the data collection procedures and methods to summarize and use results (DiPaola, 2010). The specific indicators would be whether state-level policy identifies and requires multiple evaluators, multiple sources of

data, or a specific evaluation form. Additional indicators would be whether the state-level policy identifies a system for meta-evaluation, in other words, evaluation of its own evaluation policy and whether the evaluation system makes consideration of district-specific demographics.

When superintendent evaluations only include informal, singular sources of data, there is a greater likelihood for superficial evaluations based on a few loud voices. To meet the accuracy standard, superintendent evaluation data collection requires a multi-tiered, multi-source approach (DiPaola, 2010). Data sources must be logical, reliable, fair, and legal (DiPaola, 2010; K. D. Peterson, 1995) and can include performance goals, document review, client or stakeholder feedback (formal, not informal gossip; DiPaola, 2010). To do so, data must be collected in multiple, peer-reviewed forms (K. D. Peterson, 1995). Too often, evaluations are not based on any metrics and come in the form of a board member narrative (AASA, 2007; Goens, 2009). Failure to use metrics leads to speculation without evidence or attribution of things to superintendent performance that are based on another motive, past experiences with leaders, politics, and relationships, rather than performance (Goens, 2009).

As the role of the superintendent has incorporated an increased focus on communication (Björk et al., 2014) and relationship-building behaviors that support community involvement and community partnerships (Henrikson, 2018), there is a corresponding need to recognize community stakeholder input as a source of superintendent evaluation data.

Moreover, the evaluation system should have a meaningful continuum upon which to measure performance. The true nature of feedback requires more than a mere

evaluation checklist but a continuum of options that identify performance that is adequate, making progress, and exemplary progress (Reeves, 2008).

The accuracy standard is also concerned with the reliability of the evaluation results, which is directly tied to whether superintendent evaluation process considers type (e.g. rural, urban, suburban) and other district-specific demographics (e.g., student enrollment and socioeconomic status). Superintendent performance expectations and responsibilities are influenced by district-context (DiPaola, 2010). Rural districts may experience superintendent evaluation policies differently than urban districts. The rural superintendent is more attached to and embedded within the public community than urban and suburban superintendents (Hall & McHenry-Sorber, 2017). The smaller population and traditional cultural norms are such that the superintendent is not formally limited to leadership within the confines of the school. A rural community with lower student enrollment is more willing to forego formal structures because of the closer nature and relationship with the superintendent (Simpson, 2013).

Moreover, different structures exist where the superintendent may play multiple roles. In a small community, the superintendent may also act as the principal with more direct connection to teachers and students, and certainly a different set of responsibilities (Alsbury, 2008). In some communities, the superintendent may lead multiple districts. The multi-district superintendent's role may require significantly more regional consensus (Hall & McHenry-Sorber, 2017).

Context, both locale (rural, urban, suburban) and size, have a significant impact on the time superintendents allocate to daily responsibilities (Jones & Howley, 2009). In a study of 234 superintendents across four states, Jones and Howley (2009) found that

size (measured by enrollment) and location (rural, urban, suburban) were significant predictors of time spent on educational and managerial functions. This is one area where the significant difference between the roles of principal and superintendent become apparent. The principal is the leader of one building and can concentrate focus on that one building. Superintendents, on the other hand, must operate to lead at a multi-building, systems-level to ensure consistency and quality across all schools and demographics.

The impact on the superintendent's time allocation to educational and instructional functions versus managerial functions is more pronounced in the wake of the accountability movement. Superintendents in small, rural districts were more likely to spend time on managerial functions in a post-accountability era. Moreover, in one of the four states included in Jones and Howley's study, a district's socioeconomic status was a significant contributor to the time spent by a superintendent on educational functions. After all, the accountability movement, beginning with NCLB, emphasized educational accountability and improvement for all students and incentivized educational programs for districts with higher percentages of students with lower socioeconomic status. It would be no surprise that superintendent responsibilities would, therefore, adjust in the wake of the accountability movement (Jones & Howley, 2009).

Thus, the demographic makeup of a district, including the type of district (e.g., rural, urban, suburban), the size of the district's student population, and the district's socioeconomic status, all necessarily influence the performance expectations and responsibilities of the superintendent. For superintendent evaluations to be reliable and to accurately measure whether superintendent performance is meeting expectations as

required by the accuracy standard, state-level superintendent evaluation policy should incorporate different evaluation criteria and components for superintendents in districts with different types (e.g., rural, urban, suburban) and different demographics. At a minimum, state-level superintendent evaluation policy, even if not mandating such criteria, should recognize that the evaluation process may be modified based upon the demographic needs of the particular district.

Finally, for the state-level policy to meet accuracy standard, the evaluation system should also have a mechanism for assessing the system effectiveness. Teacher evaluation reform has been criticized for not establishing mechanisms for system assessment at the design stage (Toch, 2018). Similar criticisms have been expressed about principal evaluation systems and the lack of attention given to what to assess and how to assess it (Grissom, Blissett, & Mitani, 2018). Superintendent evaluation reform has the opportunity to establish those mechanisms at the state-level design or redesign stage.

Role of Policy Actors and the Influence of Political Cultures

There is a wide range of policy actors with interest in influencing educational policy content and its congruence with quality standards (Björk & Gurley, 2005; Fowler, 2013; Kraft & Furlong, 2018). Theories of public policy development acknowledge the role of policy actors and interest groups. Two particular theories are relevant in the context of public education personnel evaluation policies, group theory and political systems theory (Kraft & Furlong, 2018), which come together to explain the impact of political culture.

Group theory suggests that public policy is the result of the direct and continued involvement of organized interest groups and policy actors (Kraft & Furlong, 2018;

Baumgartner & Leech, 1998). In particular, educational association policy actors have played a significant role in development of professional standards (Björk & Gurley, 2005) and superintendent evaluation (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003).

With particular regard to state-level superintendent evaluation policies, state superintendent associations and state boards of education have historically taken an active role in assisting with the implementation of superintendent evaluations. This active role includes providing evaluation forms, timelines, and trainings (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003). In fact, two national associations to which the state-level associations are affiliated, the AASA and the NSBA, were responsible for the initial research into superintendent standards and evaluations (AASA, 1980).

Political systems theory suggests that policy is the result of government response to political and public opinion (Easton, 1965; Kraft & Furlong, 2018), thus recognizing that policy development and the role of policy actors is often driven by political cultures. Political cultures describe the norms and beliefs of a group about the political and policy process, the purpose of government, and the role of the public within the political and policy process. The three defined political cultures that differentiate and group states across geographic regions are the traditionalistic, moralistic, and individualistic cultures (Elazar, 1966, 1972; Fowler, 2013).

The first of the three political cultures is the traditionalistic culture. The traditionalistic culture values tradition and the status quo in the political and policy process. The government's role is to maintain the status quo, thus making change a slow process. Individuals and groups are only involved in the political and policy process if they are socially connected and maintain personal relationships with those with political

power, thus public participation in the political and policy process is somewhat limited. Elazar (1966, 1972) identified the traditionalistic culture as associated with states in the Upper South, Lower South, and Southwest geographic regions, including: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

The second of the three political cultures is the moralistic culture. The moralistic culture values a broad range of ideas and issues in the political and policy process. The government's role is to serve societal good. Thus, the acceptance of new ideas can make the policy process ripe for change but the breadth of ideas and the idealistic need for fairness can still slow the process. Individuals and groups welcomed and encouraged to participate in the political and policy process. Elazar (1966, 1972) identified the moralistic culture as associated with New England, Mid-Western or Near West, Northwest, and Far West states, including: California, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.

The third of the three political cultures is the individualistic culture. The individualistic culture values minimal government regulation and maintains that guiding value in the political and policy process. The government's role is to serve utilitarian and economic purposes. Thus, the existence and depth of policies can be minimal, and changes are often left to localized and/or private decisions. When change happens, it is smooth and efficient. Individuals and groups are only involved in the political and policy process if they are able to exchange favors and mutual obligations. Elazar (1966, 1972)

identified the individualistic culture as associated with the Middle Atlantic, Pacific, as well as one in the Far West and one in the Southwest: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

The differing roles, levels of involvement of policy actors, and extent of influence within in each of these cultures necessarily influence the policy initiation and policy change process (Parker, 1995). Change within the policy process is less likely when states are tightly coupled or surrounded by a tightly coupled network, meaning that policy actors in states with similar political cultures are working closely together within and among states to influence the policy process and limit or moderate the change (Roach et al., 2011). Further, the norms of the political culture influences and magnifies the rate of change, whether slow or fast.

This is particularly true when dealing with policies impacting politically charged wide-scale reform initiatives and in the absence of a national movement that defines policy at the federal level (Marshall, Mitchell, & Wirt, 1986; Parker, 1995). Superintendent evaluation policies that are connected to school reform are just the type of policy that can magnify the rate of change (Keedy & Björk, 2002). When political culture influences superintendent evaluation policy development, the traditionalistic culture may expect to see limited policy development and the involvement of only a few, if any, highly connected and highly influential policy actors. The moralistic culture may expect to see comprehensive policies with multiple data sources and broad involvement of policy actors. The individualistic culture may expect to see the least amount of policy revision, giving more control to local district-level policy development.

Conclusion

The superintendent's role and expectations have experienced significant development and change since the early 2000s and with the influence of the accountability and reform movement. Superintendent performance evaluations can measure the superintendent's ability to effect reform within the district. Yet, the focus of evaluation policy in the wake of the accountability movement has been directed towards principals. Even principal evaluation policy has been slow to fruition.

Superintendent evaluation policy needs to be developed and refined alongside accountability and reform efforts. This begins with an investigation and analysis of current state-level superintendent evaluation policy and its congruence with the Joint Committee standards. The time has come to investigate the status of state-level superintendent evaluation policies to identify models that have the breadth and depth necessary to inform fair, equitable, and useful superintendent evaluations at the local-level. This investigation will be further informed with an understanding of if and how political cultures impact the superintendent evaluation policy development process.

CHAPTER 3

This study was conducted as a policy analysis of superintendent evaluation policy documents. The policy analysis approach provided value as a research methodology as it allows for the investigation of factors that influence and inform all stages of the policy process and for existing policies, the policy change process. This includes agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation, and policy evaluation (Fowler, 2013; Kraft & Furlong, 2018).

The purpose of this policy analysis was to adopt a research focus as opposed to a local decision-making focus (Patton, Sawicki, & Clark, 2016). The main difference is that the goal of a "researched policy analysis" (p. 3) is the comprehensive investigation of a complex problem for a thorough and detailed understanding of the nature and complexities of the problem. The alternative type of policy analysis has the goal of being a quick, practical analysis to inform specific, localized decision-making.

The current study acknowledges the complex problem of state-level superintendent policy development in an era of school accountability and reform. The superintendent's role is evolving in complexity and expectation with an accountability and reform focus. State-level superintendent evaluation policy has the potential to ensure a quality, consistent, and effective superintendent evaluation process.

It is not enough to group the building leader, the principal, with the district leader, the superintendent. Differing responsibility for accountability initiatives at the school-level versus the district-level and unique consideration of superintendent evaluation

requires different processes. While research already investigates principal evaluation, there was a delay from the time of the accountability focus on principal evaluation to the time of research on principal evaluation. Superintendent evaluation research cannot afford the same delay. This research investigated state-level superintendent evaluation policy in content and process, specifically the influence of policy actors and political cultures.

Research Questions

1. How does the content of superintendent evaluation policies compare across states?
    a. To what extent do states mandate superintendent evaluation?
    b. To what extent and frequency do states update superintendent evaluation policies with changes in the accountability and reform movement?
    c. To what extent do states meet the propriety standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?
    d. To what extent do states meet the utility standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?
    e. To what extent do states meet the feasibility standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?
    f. To what extent do states meet the accuracy standard set forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?
2. How do state-level superintendent evaluation policies compare within geographic regions of the United States with differing political cultures?

Method

Research question number one was investigated on a systematic, state-by-state basis, using a six-step policy analysis: (1) verify, define, and detail the problem; (2) establish evaluation criteria; (3) identify alternative policies; (4) assess alternative policies; (5) display and distinguish among alternatives; and (6) implement, monitor, and evaluate policy (Kraft & Furlong, 2018; Patton et al., 2016).

Policy Analysis Step One: Verify, Define, and Detail the Problem

Step one of the policy analysis occurred within chapters one and two of this research. Recall that the problem under investigation is the status of state-level superintendent evaluation policy. School superintendents are ultimately responsible for all district outcomes (Saltzman, 2017) and some researchers argue that superintendents hold the key to successful reform (Hoyle et al., 2005). That same accountability and reform movements for which the superintendent is ultimately responsible, has substantially changed and made the superintendent's role more complex. While state-level evaluation policies can help to facilitate measurement of superintendent performance and provide formative feedback for development, state-level superintendent evaluation policies have not received significant research attention since the early 2000s and have not been investigated in the context of the influential accountability movement (Mayo & McCartney, 2004) and in light of the unique intricacies of the position. This research will provide state-level superintendent evaluation policy with the necessary attention to inform future state-level policy action as well as inform the superintendent evaluation process.

The following methodology will address each of the remaining steps based on that problem verification, definition, and detail.

Policy Analysis Step Two: Establish Evaluation Criteria

Step two of this policy analysis study entailed the establishment of an evaluation criteria rubric and an analysis of state-level superintendent evaluation policy content based on the rubric. Thus, step two was conducted as a content analysis. Content analysis is a technique designed "for making reliable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter)" (Krippendorff, 2013, p. 24), in the present research, policy documents, "to the contexts of their use" (p. 24).

Content analysis can take several forms based upon the coding process and whether data analysis techniques are quantitative or qualitative. The "basic content analysis" (Berelson as cited in Drisko & Maschi, 2015, p. 3), employed in this study, is a process whereby the researcher uses a literal coding approach to extricate quantitative data that describes the document, in this case, the policy. The basic content analysis permits the researcher to "examine large amounts of data in a systematic fashion" (p. 25) clarifying and exploring problems of interest. The hallmark of basic content analysis is that the coding process is literal, looking solely to terminology as it exists in the document with little or no interpretation. This typically produces descriptive data for quantitative analysis (Drisko & Maschi, 2015).

The literal coding approach of basic content analysis relies upon a predetermined or *a priori* coding scheme. When based, at least in part, on research-based criteria or codes, the *a priori* coding scheme can serve to increase the validity of the content analysis (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). The criteria selected for evaluation are set forth in the

State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Content Analysis Rubric (rubric) in Appendix A.

The criteria follow the Joint Committee's 2008 standards, which were published in 2009. The Joint Committee is a group of professional evaluation associations in the United States and Canada, convened to establish standards that ensure high quality, fair, equitable evaluation of all educational personnel. The Joint Committee's standards include: propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy. The propriety standard ensures evaluations are legal, ethical, and consider the welfare of the employee. The utility standard ensures that evaluations are informative, timely, and influential. The feasibility standard ensures that evaluations are easy to implement, efficient, and adequately funded. The accuracy standard ensures that evaluations are technically accurate and that conclusions are linked logically to data.

The criteria were further delineated into categories identified by DiPaola (2010) that implement the Joint Committee Standards: statement of purpose, performance criteria, standards of performance, data collection procedures, methods to summarize performance, and methods for use of evaluation results. Each of DiPaola's categories was associated with a Joint Committee standard. Data collection procedures and methods for using results were associated with the propriety standard. Evaluation goals and purposes, data collection procedures, system structure, and methods for using results were associated with the utility standard. Data collection procedures were associated with feasibility standards. Finally, data collection procedures and methods for summarizing results and system structure/evaluation were associated with the accuracy standard.

The categories were further defined by subcategories adapted from a policy analysis framework conducted on principal evaluation policies by Jacques et al. (2012) and as contained in the *Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies* (American Institutes for Research, 2018). DiPaola's (2010) categories of data collection procedures, methods for using results, methods for summarizing results, and system structure/evaluation were subcategorized by goals, stakeholder input and communications, measures and performance criteria, system structure, evaluators, data integrity, use of results, and system assessment. Jacques et al. found these subcategories "critical to system design" (Jacques et al., 2012, p. 8).

Finally, to conduct the content analysis, the standards and categories were developed into indicators. These indicators were adapted from Jacques et al.'s (2012) principal evaluation policy analysis framework as contained in the *Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies* (American Institutes for Research, 2018). Within each of the broad indicators is a series of indicator questions that identify an aspect of the depth of the state's evaluation policy. The language of the indicators was designed by the American Institutes for Research (2018) to identify the state's level of control over local evaluation policy. As such, the indicators were posed to inquire as to whether a state mandates or permits certain aspects of the local evaluation process (American Institutes for Research, 2018). The indicators provide a means of implementing the basic content analysis literal coding approach (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). The indicators, were, however, developed for analysis of state principal evaluation policy. Any indicators that did not fit the role and position of the

superintendent were eliminated or revised based upon prior superintendent evaluation research summarized in Chapter 2.

Since the *a priori* codes were not adopted, in whole, from the research-based criteria utilized by Jacques et al. (2012) and as contained in the *Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies* (American Institutes for Research, 2018), this study employed an additional form of content validity (Drisko & Maschi, 2015), an expert panel. In addition to the expansive research-based and practice-based expertise provided by the members of this dissertation's committee (a former state superintendent of public instruction and former superintendent; a former superintendent and current researcher in the area of superintendent evaluation; and a current superintendent), the criteria or codes were presented to a panel of five additional outside experts for feedback. The panel of experts included: Dr. Rosa Atkins, a current superintendent; Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr., a former superintendent, a former state superintendent of public instruction, and a former board of education member; Dr. Steven Constantino, a former superintendent and former acting state superintendent of public instruction; Dr. Howard Kiser, a former superintendent and current executive director of a state association of school superintendents; and Dr. Patrick Russo, a former state superintendent in four states.

Three of the five outside experts responded and provided feedback. The outside expert feedback, in aggregated summary form, suggested movement of certain criteria indicators to different criteria standards. Specifically, the outside expert panel recommended moving two indicators in methods for using results (Does the state mandate or permit superintendent contractual provisions based upon evaluation results?

and Does the state mandate or permit evaluation results to be used for development of a professional growth plan or other human resource decision?) from the propriety standard to the utility standard. The outside expert panel also recommended moving the data collection procedures: stakeholder involvement and communication (Does the state require or permit involvement of professional educational associations in development of the superintendent evaluation policy?, along with the two follow-up questions, and Does the state require or permit non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation?) from the utility standard to the propriety standard. Third, the outside expert panel recommended moving the system structure: recognition of district-specific demographics (Does the state differentiate between type of district in the superintendent evaluation process? and Does the state differentiate between any district demographics in the superintendent evaluation process?) from the utility standard to the accuracy standard. Fourth, the outside expert panel recommended moving methods for summarizing results and system evaluation (Does the state maintain a superintendent evaluation process data tracking system?" from the accuracy standard to the feasibility standard. Finally, the outside expert panel recommended adding an indicator "Does the state require districts to report superintendent evaluation results to the state?" to the feasibility standards. It was determined the additional recommended indicator was substantially similar to the intent of the newly moved feasibility indicator "Does the state maintain a superintendent evaluation process data tracking system?" Thus, instead, the additional recommended indicator was used to further explain the existing indicator rather than creating a new indicator.

The feedback from the outside experts was combined with the dissertation committee members' expert feedback and used to refine and revise the criteria and rubric. The resulting specific criteria standards, categories, and indicators are set forth in Tables 1 through 4 and Appendix A.

Table 1

State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Criteria Propriety Standard

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Propriety Standard	**Data Collection Procedures: Evaluators**	Does the state mandate exclusion of evaluators who may have a conflict of interest within the superintendent evaluation process?			
		Does the state mandate training for evaluators in conducting the superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state mandate any additional oversight to ensure evaluators implement the superintendent evaluation system with fidelity?			
	Data Collection Procedures: Stakeholder Involvement & Communication	Does the state require or permit involvement of professional educational associations in development of the superintendent evaluation policy?			
		If so, which professional educational associations are involved (e.g., national or administrator associations; national or state school boards associations)? ***Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.***			
		If so, what roles do professional educational associations play, advisory or authoritative? ***Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.***			
		Does the state require or permit non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation?			
	Methods for Using Results	Does the state mandate confidentiality of the superintendent evaluation?			

Table 2

State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Criteria Utility Standard

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Utility Standard	**Evaluation Goals & Purposes**	Does the state identify a goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation?			
		If so, what does the state identify as its goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation (e.g., accountability, Every Student Succeeds Act, coherence with preparation and licensure, coherence with locally developed goals and purposes)? ***Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.***			
	Data Collection Procedures: Selected Performance Criteria and Measures	Does the state mandate particular superintendent evaluation criteria or components?			
		Do the mandated criteria or components directly name any existing professional educational standards or reflect at least 75% of any existing professional educational standards even if such standards are not directly named?			
		If so, which professional educational standards are specifically referenced (e.g., AASA, NSBA, PSEL, state-developed standards)? ***Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.***			
		Does the state identify evaluation components that specifically reference the goals or purpose for superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state mandate inclusion of student performance measures in the superintendent evaluation?			
	Methods for Using Results	Does the state mandate or permit superintendent contractual provisions based upon evaluation results?			
		Does the state mandate or permit evaluation results to be used for development of a professional growth plan (or similar			

Table 3

State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Criteria Feasibility Standard

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Feasibility Standard	**Data Collection Procedures: Frequency of Evaluation**	Does the state dictate frequency of superintendent evaluation?			
	Data Collection Procedures: Reporting	Does the state maintain a superintendent evaluation process data tracking system? (i.e., Does the state require districts to report superintendent evaluation results to the state?)			

Table 4

State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Criteria Accuracy Standard

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Accuracy Standard	**Data Collection Procedures: Data Integrity**	Does the state mandate that multiple sources of data must be used in the superintendent evaluation process?			
		Does the state assign different weights to different sources of superintendent evaluation data?			
		Does the state mandate a particular form for the superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state identify evaluators for the superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state mandate that multiple evaluator sources be used in the superintendent evaluation process?			
	Methods for Summarizing Results & System Evaluation	Does the state mandate a process to assess the state-level superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness?			
		Did the state pilot the superintendent evaluation system model process or form?			
		Does the state identify outcomes to determine overall effectiveness of state-level superintendent evaluation system?			
	System Structure: Recognition of District-Specific Demographics	Does the state differentiate between type of district (e.g., rural, urban, suburban) in the superintendent evaluation process?			
		Does the state differentiate between any district demographics in the superintendent evaluation process?			

Policy Analysis Step Three: Identify Alternative Policies

Step three of this policy analysis study reviewed each state's (and Washington DC's) superintendent evaluation policies. The first portion of step three required defining the collection of documents that constituted the policy alternatives. Policies can include a variety of instruments or policy mechanisms with different purposes. For this study, state superintendent evaluation policies were defined on three levels: statutes, regulations, and state board of education guidance documents.

The first two levels were state superintendent evaluation statutes and regulations, which are considered regulatory policy mandates (Kraft & Furlong, 2018; McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). Mandates contain two key elements: (1) a prescription of required action, and (2) a penalty for non-compliance (Fowler, 2013). Mandates are designed to encourage all members of the governed group to follow a specific set of behaviors (Fowler, 2013) and to limit or direct the manner in which local governments can conduct performance evaluations for a public official (Kraft & Furlong, 2018).

The third level was state board of education guidance documents. Specifically, state board of education guidance documents include any agency related documents (i.e., state board of education meeting minutes and presentations) as well as any policy actors' documents that are explicitly referenced by the state board of education (e.g., through regulations or on the state board of education website). The guidance documents are not mandates but are designed to support mandates because mandates often need strong political support (Fowler, 2013).

National and state school governance associations, including the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards

Association (NSBA), along with respective state-affiliated or connected associations, have taken an active role in superintendent evaluation forms and procedures (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003). Thus, state-level superintendent evaluation policy was defined as including national or state school governance associations (whether administrator or board) when statute, regulation, or state board of education guidance documents explicitly reference these associations.

Arguably, each type of policy mechanism can have a different weight. For example, a statute enacted by the legislature can hold more weight than the regulation of the administrative agency, the State Board of Education. For the purposes of this study, all of the policy mechanisms had the same weight and were considered collectively as the superintendent evaluation policy. This approach was selected because the purpose of the study is to investigate the status and consistent use of each type of policy mechanism across states and not to pass judgment or assign weights to a particular type of mechanism. Consistency in superintendent evaluation across states has been routinely called into question (Mayo & McCartney, 2004) and thus must serve as the focus of this study, not which type of mechanism is more or less beneficial.

Policy Analysis Step Four: Assess Alternative Policies

Step four of this policy analysis study entailed retrieval of state policy documents from state government websites and/or the Westlaw legal research system. Specifically, state statutes governing superintendent evaluations were retrieved from the state legislative website and/or Westlaw legal research system. Administrative code regulations governing superintendent evaluations were retrieved from the state administrative code website, the state board of education website, and/or Westlaw legal

research system. Within the Westlaw legal research system, statutes were searched separately from regulations. The State Board of Education and state school governance associations (both superintendent and board of education) documents governing superintendent evaluations were retrieved from the state board of education website and state school governance association websites.

Consistent search terms were identified and used across states. The initial search terms used included "superintendent and evaluation," "superintendent and performance review," "superintendent and performance appraisal." After the initial search of each state, it was determined that states use a variety of different names and titles for the position of superintendent. Thus, on the initial search, a collection of names for the superintendent position was compiled. A second search of each state was conducted using the new collection of terms. The second set of search terms used included "chief school administrator and evaluation," "chief school administrator and performance," "chief school officer and evaluation," "chief school officer and performance," "chief executive officer and evaluation," "chief executive officer and performance," "district leader and evaluation," "district leader and performance," "school leader and evaluation," and "school leader and performance." From the first search, it was unnecessary to include additional terms of "evaluation" or "appraisal" after "performance" as the lesser number of search terms produced broader, all-encompassing results. Further, "school leader" was used in addition to "district leader" after it was determined that some states specifically included the superintendent or specifically excluded the superintendent within its school leader (i.e., principal) evaluation policy.

A complete listing of state policy source location with annotations is contained in Appendix B.

Policy Analysis Steps Five and Six: Display and Distinguish Among Alternatives and Evaluate Policies

Research question number one was answered by conducting a basic content analysis of each state's regulations on the content analysis rubric criteria. The basic content analysis offers the appropriate approach for the present policy analysis. The basic content analysis allows the researcher to utilize the descriptive, frequency data to make abductive analytic arguments that link the descriptive data to inferential explanations or observations about the data (Krippendorff, 2013). Krippendorff (2013) and Drisko and Maschi (2015) only caution that the researcher should be clear to identify and distinguish conclusions that are empirical in nature from conclusions that are abductive or exploratory in nature.

The policy analysis framework was developed using abductive reasoning to determine the breadth and depth of the state-level superintendent evaluation policy. First, states were described as either having or not having state-level superintendent evaluation policies at each of the three levels: statute, regulation, and state board of education guidance. Tables were used to indicate the existence or non-existence of a state-level superintendent evaluation policy and frequency data was used to provide an aggregated summary.

Second, states were analyzed and described based on the specific contents of their superintendent evaluation policy and as based on the State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Content Analysis Rubric, set forth in Tables 1 through 4 and Appendix

A. Specifically, for each criteria indicator, tables were used to indicate the frequency and percentage of states that scored fully present, partially present, or not present. Summary statistical analysis using frequencies, modal data, and ranges were used to provide an aggregate summary of how states performed and compared within each criteria standard and criteria categories. In addition, the rubric contains several indicators that were not used for scoring but were used for descriptive, empirical and abductive analysis. Indicators that will not be scored are noted as such on the rubric in bold and italics. These unscored indicators as well as additional annotations provided the contextual units that served to define the *a priori* codes and make abductive inferences (Krippendorff, 2013) within the Chapter 4 analysis and the Chapter 5 discussion and implications.

Third, states were scored and ranked based on the State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Content Analysis Rubric. Each state's superintendent evaluation policy was systematically reviewed and scored on the rubric criteria indicators, set forth in Tables 1 through 4 and Appendix A. A state received one of three scores for each indicator: fully present, partially present, or not present. Fully present was defined as the policy clearly contained the mandated presence (terminology "shall," "must," or similarly defined language) of a particular indicator. States that scored fully present received one point for that indicator. Partially present was defined as to whether the state's policy contained the permissive presence (terminology "may" or similarly defined language) of a particular indicator. States that scored partially present received one-half point for that indicator. Not present was defined as the policy contained no language related to the presence of a particular indicator. States that scored not present received zero points for that indicator. These definitions were selected consistent with the American Institutes of

Research (2018) grouping of states by level of control over local evaluation procedures and the type of policy mechanism, the mandate.

Each state was given a total score based on frequency counts of rubric criteria indicators defined above. The highest possible score for each state was 25 points. States were placed in rank order by highest total score. There were 51 total participants, representing each of 50 states and Washington, DC.

Finally, in addition to states having been identified into a policy analysis framework based on the breadth and depth of their superintendent evaluation policy, states were also be grouped by their political culture (Elazar, 1966, 1972; Fowler, 2013) for the purposes of answering research question number two. A state listing by rank order and political culture is set forth in Appendix C, Tables C1 and C2.

Research question number two was answered through a Chi-Square analysis to determine if state geographic region and political culture is independent of the breadth and depth of a state's superintendent evaluation policy (as defined by total score). The Chi-Square test of association or independence is a statistical procedure that compares observed frequencies to expected frequencies to determine the significance of a relationship between group membership on two variables (Warner, 2013). This researcher used the Chi-Square test to determine whether a state's membership in a particular group on one variable, scored breadth and depth placement in the policy framework, is related to group membership in another variable, geographic region political cultures. A statistically significant Chi-Square test statistic indicates that there is a relationship or dependency between a state's breadth and depth policy framework score and the political culture of the state's geographic region.

Specifically, once the states were rank ordered by their rubric score, the ranked states were separated into quartiles as much as possible given that many states lacked a policy and could not be included in the quartile calculation. The states' observed rank placement in each quartile was compared to the expected placement based on political culture to determine whether the breadth and depth of a state's superintendent evaluation policy is independent of its political culture.

States were assigned to either the traditionalistic, moralistic, or individualistic political culture in accordance with Elazar's (1966, 1972) and Fowler's (2013) assignment. In 1984, Elazar provided an alternative approach to state assignment. Elazar's alternative approach gave each state a primary and/or secondary culture. For example, Elazar (1966, 1972) assigned California to the moralistic culture and Elazar (1984) assigned California to the moralistic/individualistic culture. Regardless, researchers, including Fowler (2013), continue to use Elazar's (1966) original state assignments. Further, for the purposes of this investigatory research via Chi-Square analysis of whether a relationship exists between breadth and depth of state-level evaluation policy and political culture, the existence or non-existence of a relationship was clarified with the three original culture assignments.

For the purposes of this study, Washington, DC, was treated as a state. Washington, DC, maintains a school system and related governing policies similar to each of the 50 states. However, Elazar (1966, 1972) and Fowler (2013) have not assigned Washington, DC, to a specific political culture. Therefore, this researcher assigned Washington, DC, to the individualistic political culture. Washington, DC, is

surrounded by the Mid-Atlantic individualistic states and Elazar's (1966, 1972) assignments were grounded in the geographic connection between states.

Ethical Considerations

There were no noted ethical considerations as this research study utilized only documents that were publicly available. As such, Institutional Review Board approval was not required (Basic Health and Human Services Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects, 2018).

Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations

A major assumption of this study is based upon a policy framework developed by Jacques et al. (2012), which was initially developed for principal and teacher evaluation policy structures. Although the framework was modified to meet the specific nature of superintendent evaluation policies, there is an implicit assumption that the evaluation frameworks underlying principal and teacher evaluations are comparable to those of a superintendent.

The delimitations of this study are contained within the selection of research questions and policy evaluation framework criteria. By selecting specific criteria, this researcher was identifying those criteria as the most relevant to superintendent evaluation policy analysis. There are certainly other criteria that could be considered.

An additional delimitation of this study is in the process of using abductive reasoning to place each state's superintendent evaluation policies into a larger policy framework based on their total rubric score as an indicator of the breadth and depth of their policy. Determinations about the breadth and depth of the policy to define policy models within the framework are within the discretion of the researcher. There are

certainly other ways to define the breadth and depth of a policy other than the model framework selected and defined by this researcher.

A limitation of this study is the availability of all three levels of the data source policy documents. Each state has a separate statutory, regulatory, and policy actor framework. As such, analysis across states may result in analyzing documents that have been collectively defined as a set of documents that make up a state's superintendent evaluation policy. It is possible to define policy as merely existing at one level of the policy analysis framework.

As second limitation of this study is the application of the rubric to states with differing governance structures. How the criteria compare, for scoring purposes, may not be exactly the same for every state. For example, one of the criteria is whether the state differentiates between types of district (e.g., rural, urban, suburban) in the superintendent evaluation process. This particular criterion would not apply to Hawaii or Washington, DC, as those states have only one superintendent and one state or territory-wide school district encompassing all types of schools.

CHAPTER 4

The basic content analysis (Drisko & Maschi, 2015) using the State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Content Analysis Rubric (Appendix A) was conducted state-by-state to determine the breadth and depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy. The resulting data was analyzed to develop a state-by-state policy analysis framework. The state-by-state policy analysis framework serves to answer research question number one: How does the content of superintendent evaluation policies compare across states? The breadth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy was determined by the existence of a superintendent evaluation policy within each state and the frequency with which states updated the superintendent evaluation policy, if such a policy existed. To recall, for the purpose of this research, superintendent evaluation policy was defined as state statutes, state board of education regulations, and state board of education guidance documents mandating the existence and content of superintendent evaluations. The breadth of state-level superintendent policy is presented in response to sub-questions a and b. The depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy was determined by the existence and score for each of the criteria standards, categories, and indicators contained on the State-Level Superintendent Policy Content Analysis Rubric. The depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy is presented in response to sub-questions c through f.

The policy analysis framework was not intended to be an evaluation of the efficacy of a state's superintendent evaluation policy. The purpose of this research study was to determine the current status of state-level superintendent evaluation policy, present findings, and make inferential observations, explanations, and comparisons from the data about the breadth and depth of such policies and policy congruence with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) quality standards. Though states were scored on different components of their policies, there was no set score that was intended to distinguish a state as having an effective or ineffective policy.

This research study, in addition to determining current status of state-level superintendent evaluation policy, sought to identify factors that may be related to, and therefore potentially influence, the development of state-level superintendent evaluation policy. To that end, a Chi-Square analysis was conducted to determine if a relationship existed between a state's political culture (traditionalistic, individualistic, or moralistic as defined by Elazar, 1966, 1972, and Fowler, 2013) and the breadth and depth (total rubric score) of the state's superintendent evaluation policy. The results of the Chi-Square analysis serve to answer research question number two: How do state-level superintendent evaluation policies compare within geographic regions of the United States with differing political cultures?

Research Question Number One: How does the Content of Superintendent Evaluation Policies Compare Across States?

States differed widely on the content of state-level superintendent evaluation policies. The comparison across states by each sub-question showed wide state divergence in the existence of state-level superintendent evaluation policy as well as state

policy coherence with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) propriety, utility, feasibility, and accuracy standards. Despite the 30-year existence of the Joint Committee standards, only one state, Virginia, explicitly linked the superintendent evaluation policy to these standards.

Table 5 presents the overall summary of each state's score on each standard as well as the total state score for the State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Content Analysis Rubric and illuminates the wide divergence. The breadth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy, measured by the existence of updated policy within a state, spans a majority of states. Yet, there were 17 states that did not have any superintendent evaluation policy at the state-level.

Moreover, of the states with superintendent evaluation policy at the state-level, the depth of Joint Committee (1988, 2009) quality indicators present in such policies varied substantially. For those states with policies, the highest rubric score was 18.5 and the lowest rubric score was 1.5 out of 25 possible points. Most states (14) scored in the top of the range, between 8.5 and the high score of 18.5. Twelve states scored in the middle of the range, between 3.5 and 8.5. The least number of states (8) scored at the bottom of the range, between the low score of 1.5 and 3.0 (Tables 5 and C1 of Appendix C).

Of the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards, the utility and accuracy standards accounted for the largest amount of divergence in policy depth. For the utility standard, 11 states had policies that contained at least six of the seven indicators and another eight states had policies that did not contain any indicator. Likewise, for the accuracy standard, while no state met all of the indicators, every state identified evaluators for the

superintendent evaluation (Indicator D). Yet, no state assigned different weights to different evaluation criteria (Indicator B); only three states, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Missouri piloted the superintendent evaluation system (Indicator G); only two states, Massachusetts and North Carolina, differentiated between district demographics (Indicator J); and only one state, Missouri, differentiated between type of district (e.g., rural, urban, suburban; Indicator I).

Of the 34 states with policies, more states scored higher on the utility and feasibility standards than on the propriety and accuracy standards. The utility standard exhibited the broadest range of scores, with some states scoring zero and other states scoring six out of a possible seven points. Ironically, the accuracy standard actually contained the most frequently exhibited indicator, identification of evaluators (Indicator D) as well as one of the least frequently exhibited indicators, assigning different weights to different evaluation sources (Indicator B). The other least frequently exhibited indicator was found within the propriety standard, states mandating the exclusion of evaluators who have a conflict of interest with the superintendent evaluation process (Indicator A).

Table 5. *Summary Rubric Results for All Standards by State*

State	Propriety	Utility	Accuracy	Feasibility	Total Score
Alabama	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0.5	0	1	0	**1.5**
Arkansas	-	-	-	-	-
California	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	1.5	0	1	1	**3.5**
Delaware	2.5	6	5.5	2	**16**
Florida	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	2	2	1.5	1	**6.5**
Hawaii	2	6	3	1	**12**
Idaho	0	3	1	1	**5**
Illinois	1.5	1	1	0	**3.5**
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	1	6	3	1	**11**
Kansas	3	6	4	1	**14**
Kentucky	1	0	1.5	0	**2.5**
Louisiana	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	4.5	6	6	2	**18.5**
Michigan	4.5	4	6.5	2	**17**
Minnesota	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	2	4.5	3	1	**10.5**
Missouri	1.5	3	3.5	0.5	**8.5**
Montana	1.5	3.5	2.5	1	**8.5**
Nebraska	1	2.5	1	1	**5.5**
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0	1	1	**2**
New Jersey	4.5	6	3	1	**14.5**
New Mexico	-	-	-	-	-
New York	1	0	1	2	**4**
North Carolina	2	4	4.5	1	**11.5**
North Dakota	0	1	1	1	**3**
Ohio	1	3.5	2.5	0.5	**7.5**
Oklahoma	0	2.5	2	1	**5.5**
Oregon	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0.5	2.5	1	0	**4.0**
Rhode Island	1	0	1	0	**2**
South Carolina	0	1	1	0	**2**
South Dakota	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	0	2	1	1	**4**
Texas	1	2	2.5	1	**6.5**
Utah	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	2.5	5	3	1	**11.5**
Washington	2	1	2	2	**7**
West Virginia	4.5	4	3	1	**12.5**
Wisconsin	0	0	2	0	**2**
Wyoming	1.5	5	3.5	1	**11**
Washington D.C.	0	0	1	1	**2**
Total Possible Point Value	**6**	**7**	**10**	**2**	**25**

The detailed comparison of state-level superintendent evaluation policy content is analyzed by research sub-questions a through f.

Sub-Question a: To What Extent do States Mandate Superintendent Evaluation?

States differed widely on the existence of state-level superintendent evaluation policies (see Appendix B). The majority of states did have some type of state-level superintendent evaluation policy. Of the 50 states and Washington, DC, the majority of the states, 67% (34 states), had a state-level superintendent evaluation policy. To recall, for the purposes of this study, state-level superintendent evaluation policy included legislatively enacted statutes, administrative agency regulations, and administrative agency guidance.

Though a minority, still 34% of states (17 states) did not have any state-level superintendent evaluation policy. States that did not have a state-level superintendent evaluation policy included Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, and Vermont. California required evaluation for the chief executive officer in a private school but did not maintain a similar requirement for the superintendent in a public school. States that did not have a state-level superintendent evaluation policy were not included in the findings related to the depth of superintendent evaluation policy and coherence with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards.

Comparisons were made between the 17 states that did not have a state-level superintendent evaluation policy to examine inferential explanations for the non-existence of such policies. No clear connections or commonalities were identified between those 17 states to explain the non-existence of superintendent evaluation policy.

Student enrollment was examined as a possible reason why these 17 states did not have a state-level superintendent evaluation policy. Much like student enrollment influences the performance expectations and daily responsibilities of the superintendent (Jones & Howley, 2009), lower student enrollment could potentially result in the decision not to have a policy. However, no discernible relationship existed in the findings between states without superintendent evaluation policies and student population (enrollment). States with high enrollment like California, with more than six million students, and states with low enrollment like Vermont, with less than 100,000 students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018), did not have policies. The same observation held true when comparing enrollment for states with and without superintendent evaluation policies. For example, Maryland and Massachusetts had similar total student enrollments, each with approximately 900,000 students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). Despite the similarity in student enrollment, the depth of their superintendent evaluation policies was drastically different. Maryland had no policy, essentially a total policy depth score of zero based on the rubric. Massachusetts had a total policy depth score of 18.5 on the rubric, the highest of any state.

In continuing to consider potential state comparisons as part of this study, a state's superintendent selection structure, whether elected or appointed, was also examined as a possible reason why these 17 states did not have a state-level superintendent evaluation policy. Elected superintendents can be seen as having their evaluation take place by election, rather than by formal evaluation procedures. However, again, there was no discernible connection in the findings between whether a state had a superintendent evaluation policy and whether a state had elected or appointed (or a combination thereof)

school superintendents. Within the superintendent evaluation policy research, six states were found that all permit the election and/or appointment of superintendents. These states included: Alabama, California, Mississippi, Florida, Georgia, and Tennessee. Of those six states, only three, Alabama, California, and Florida, did not have a state-level superintendent evaluation policy.

In addition to states that did not have any superintendent evaluation policy, there were eight states that had a policy, but the policies did not contain a large number of indicators. These states scored three or below on the total rubric score (see Table C1 of Appendix C) and included North Dakota, Kentucky, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Washington, DC, Wisconsin, and Arizona. These states were considered to technically add to the breadth of state-level superintendent evaluation and are, therefore, included in the analysis of policy depth and congruence with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards. However, they are noted here as the amount of policy breadth across states was only minimally added to by these states as the policy provides little more than a technical legal requirement for the board of education to evaluate the superintendent. These states essentially leave superintendent evaluation policy to local control, some expressly and some by implication (see Appendix B). A few states provide additional minimal direction for the responsibility of superintendent evaluation. For example, Nebraska informs the superintendent to take the lead in her or his own evaluation and Texas informs the process as a joint collaboration between the superintendent and the board of education.

Finally, in considering whether states mandate superintendent evaluation policy, consideration needs to be provided to mandatory policy provisions versus permissive

policy provisions. The distinctions between mandatory and permissive provisions were analyzed extensively across particular indicators and the congruence of policy with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards. However, of the indicators present in their policies, Delaware and Michigan mandated rather than permitted the indicators in ratios of 15:2 and 16:2, respectively. By contrast, Missouri and Ohio permitted rather than mandated the indicators in ratios of 13:2 and 11:2, respectively. Ohio even used terminology that designated its superintendent evaluation policy system as a voluntary system. Whether a state selects mandatory or permissive provisions signals its philosophy on superintendent evaluation, its philosophy on local control of education policy, and foreshadows its implementation efforts.

Sub-Question b: To What Extent and Frequency do States Update Superintendent Evaluation Policies with Changes in the Accountability and Reform Movement?

To determine the frequency with which states updated their state-level superintendent evaluation policies, the legislative and/or administrative adoption history of the state-level superintendent policy was reviewed to identify the adoption date for current policy as well as the earliest date of adoption for policy language related to superintendent evaluation, where available. To recall, the federal accountability movement experienced milestones with the 2001 passage of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the 2010 federal grant program, Race to the Top (RTTT), and the 2015 passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

A pattern emerged that suggested states adopt or revise superintendent evaluation policy loosely aligned with the federal accountability movement. Notably, only five states had any policy language governing superintendent evaluation prior to 2000 and the

passage of federal accountability legislation. These states were Arizona, Missouri, New Jersey, Oklahoma, and Rhode Island. Another eight states adopted policy language in the early to mid-2000s, following the passage of NCLB. These states included Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, New York, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. The vast majority of the remaining 16 states, of the 34 states with superintendent evaluation policies, only adopted policy language after 2010. This policy action followed RTTP and the passage of ESSA. No clear evidence of the connection between policy language adoption and federal accountability law adoption was noted. However, there is at least a presumption given the close proximity of time between the passage of the federal accountability reforms and the time when states adopted or revised policy language related to superintendent evaluation policy.

Sub-Question c: To What Extent do States Meet the Propriety Standard set Forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?

Overall, states did not exhibit depth of policy on the propriety standard. With six indicators, the maximum total possible propriety standard score by each state was six. None of the states has a policy that contained every propriety standard indicator and, therefore, no states achieved a perfect score of six. Four states, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, and West Virginia had either mandatory or permissive provisions for every indicator except one. Approximately 80% (27 of 34 states) of states with policies scored two or less on the propriety standard. Of states with superintendent evaluation policies, the most frequent score was zero, meaning that most frequently, states did not have superintendent evaluation policies that contained any propriety indicators.

Table 6 presents the frequency of rubric scores for each indicator of the propriety standard.

Table 6. *Statewide Frequency of Rubric Scores by Indicator for the Propriety Standard*

Indicator	1	0.5	0
Data Collection Procedures: Evaluators			
Indicator A: Does the state mandate exclusion of evaluators who may have a conflict of interest within the superintendent process?	0	0	34
Indicator B: Does the state mandate training for evaluators in conducting a superintendent evaluation?	9	1	24
Indicator C: Does the state mandate any additional oversight to ensure evaluators implement the superintendent evaluation system with fidelity?	9	1	24
Data Collection Procedures: Stakeholder Involvement & Communication			
Indicator D: Does the state require or permit involvement of professional educational associations in development of the superintendent evaluation policy?	3	7	24
Indicator E: Does the state require or permit non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation?	8	9	17
Methods for Using Results			
Indicator F: Does the state mandate confidentiality or public disclosure of the superintendent evaluation?	13	1	20

Note. 34 state scores are reflected. 17 states did not have a policy and were not scored.

There were three indicators that stood out as possible contributors to the overall scores. Not a single state had a policy provision that addressed the exclusion of evaluators with conflicts of interest. States more frequently included, even mandated, policy provisions that addressed the confidentiality or public disclosure of superintendent evaluation results. Even more so, compared to other indicators, states frequently included policy provisions regarding non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation process, with a fairly even split between the states' willingness to mandate or permit such participation.

States were consistently low scoring in the category of data collection procedures: evaluators. In fact, not a single state policy contained a provision for exclusion of

evaluators who may have a conflict of interest in the superintendent evaluation process (Indicator A).

States exhibited slightly more depth in this category when it came to training for evaluators (Indicator B) and state oversight to ensure implementation with fidelity (Indicator C). Ten of the 34 states with policies had provisions for board member evaluator training (Indicator B) and 10 states had provisions for state oversight to ensure fidelity in the implementation of the state evaluation system (Indicator C). For each of these indicators, the nine of the 10 states that did contain provisions make such provisions mandatory rather than permissive. Of note, one of the states that did maintain oversight in the implementation process, Kansas, directly tied such oversight to the accountability and reform movement and the state's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan. However, most oversight came in the form of state review and approval of local superintendent evaluation policy. Kentucky, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, and Texas required some form of policy review and approval. Michigan actually required the local board of education to post the superintendent evaluation policy publicly on the board's website along with the research base that supports the policy development.

States received only slightly higher scores in the methods for using results category. Fourteen of the 34 states with policies had provisions for the confidentiality or public disclosure of superintendent evaluation results (Indicator F). While this finding did not reflect a majority of states that identified whether superintendent evaluations would be subject to public disclosure or remain confidential, it was the second highest scoring indicator in the propriety standard. Almost every state that did maintain such a provision did so mandatorily rather than permissibly. Further, it is recognized that some

states may have provided for confidentiality or disclosure in statutes and regulations that were separate from state-level superintendent evaluation policy.

Although not significantly, states were incorporating stakeholder involvement and communication in the development of state-level superintendent evaluation policy. This finding was signaled by higher scores in the category of data collection procedures: stakeholder involvement and communication. Ten of the 34 states with superintendent evaluation policies provided for the involvement of professional associations in the state superintendent policy development process (Indicator D). The vast majority of professional association involvement included state affiliates or state associations connected with the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA). Most states, six of the 10 states that utilized professional associations, utilized the professional associations in an advisory manner only.

The indicator accounting for the most depth in states meeting the propriety standard was the requirement for non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation process (Indicator E). This included any non-board member participation, in other words, participation of the superintendents themselves, participation of staff, participation of students, and/or participation of the community/general public. Half (17) of the 34 states with policies had policy provisions that provided for the involvement of non-board member stakeholders. Of those 17, nine states made such involvement permissive while eight made such involvement mandatory.

A summary of each state's score on the propriety standard is presented in Table 7. Each state's propriety standard score by criteria category and indicator is set forth in Appendix D.

Table 7. *Summary Rubric Results for the Propriety Standard by State*

State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Indicator C	Indicator D	Indicator E	Indicator F	Total Score
Alabama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	0	0	.5	0	0.5
Arkansas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
California	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	.5	1	1.5
Delaware	0	1	1	0	.5	0	2.5
Florida	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0	0	.5	1	1.5
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	0	0	0	.5	.5	0	1
Kansas	0	0	1	.5	.5	1	3
Kentucky	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Louisiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	0	1	1	.5	1	1	4.5
Michigan	0	1	1	.5	1	1	4.5
Minnesota	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Missouri	0	0	0	.5	0	1	1.5
Montana	0	0	0	0	.5	1	1.5
Nebraska	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	1	.5	1	1	1	4.5
New Mexico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New York	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
North Carolina	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	0	0	0	.5	.5	0	1
Oklahoma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Oregon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	.5	0.5
Rhode Island	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Tennessee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Utah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	0	1	0	.5	1	0	2.5
Washington	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
West Virginia	0	1	1	1	.5	1	4.5
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	.5	1	0	0	0	1.5
Washington D.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Data Collection Procedures: Evaluators

Indicator A: Does the state mandate exclusion of evaluators who may have a conflict of interest within the superintendent process?

Indicator B: Does the state mandate training for evaluators in conducting a superintendent evaluation?

Indicator C: Does the state mandate any additional oversight to ensure evaluators implement the superintendent evaluation system with fidelity?

Data Collection Procedures: Stakeholder Involvement & Communication

Indicator D: Does the state require or permit involvement of professional educational associations in development of the superintendent evaluation policy?

Indicator E: Does the state require or permit non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation?

Methods for Using Results

Indicator F: Does the state mandate confidentiality or public disclosure of the superintendent evaluation?

Sub-Question d: To What Extent do States Meet the Utility Standard set Forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?

Unlike the propriety standard findings, overall, states exhibited more depth of policy on the utility standard. With seven indicators, the maximum total possible utility standard score for each state was seven. Three states, Hawaii, Kansas, and Massachusetts had a policy that contained every utility standard indicator. These three states met some indicators permissively, and therefore, did not receive a perfect score of seven. An additional eight states, Delaware, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, and Virginia had policies that contained either permissive or mandatory provisions for six of the seven indicators.

States received the widest range of scores on the utility standard. There was no clear majority of scores. Like the propriety standard, of states with superintendent evaluation policies, the most frequent score was zero, meaning that most frequently, states did not have superintendent evaluation policies that contain any utility indicators at all. However, the second most frequent state utility standard score was six. This means that most states either scored very high or very low on the utility standard.

Table 8 presents the frequency of rubric scores for each indicator of the utility standard.

Table 8. *Statewide Frequency of Rubric Scores by Indicator for the Utility Standard*

Indicator	1	0.5	0
Data Collection Procedures: Evaluation Goals & Purposes			
Indicator A: Does the state identify a goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation?	14	3	17
Data Collection Procedures: Selected Performance Criteria & Measures			
Indicator B: Does the state mandate particular superintendent evaluation criteria or components?	18	5	11
Indicator C: Do the mandated criteria or components directly name any existing professional educational standards or reflect at least 75% of any existing professional educational standards even if such standards are not directly named?	10	1	23
Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluation components that specifically reference the goals or purpose for superintendent evaluation?	6	6	22
Indicator E: Does the state mandate inclusion of student performance measures in the superintendent evaluation?	10	8	16
Methods for Using Results			
Indicator F: Does the state mandate or permit superintendent contractual provisions based upon evaluation results?	8	2	24
Indicator G: Does the state mandate or permit evaluation results to be used for development of a professional growth plan (or similar document) or other human resource decisions?	9	11	14

Note. 34 state scores are reflected. 17 states did not have a policy and were not scored.

There are four indicators that stood out as possible contributors to the overall utility standard scores as each of these indicators were met, either mandatorily or permissibly, by at least half of the states with policies. States more frequently included, even mandated, policy provisions that addressed the goals or purposes for superintendent evaluation, the inclusion of particular superintendent evaluation criteria, and the inclusion of student performance measures in the superintendent evaluation. Likewise, the majority of states with policies included provisions regarding using superintendent evaluation results for development of professional growth plans. Slightly more states did so permissively than mandatorily.

States exhibited some depth in the category of data collection procedures: evaluation goals and purposes. Half of the states, 17 of the 34 states with policies,

identified goals and purposes for the superintendent evaluation (Indicator A). The vast majority of those states identified performance evaluation, professional development/growth, and setting expectations as the goals of superintendent evaluation. Notably, eight states identified either school improvement or accountability as one of the goals and purposes of the superintendent evaluation process. Though evaluations can be a positive means of improving board and superintendent relations/communications, only three states specifically listed board and superintendent relations/communication as a goal or purpose of superintendent evaluation. Quite interestingly, one state, North Carolina, identified integration with educational leader licensure and preparation as a goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation.

States exhibited mixed results in the depth of superintendent evaluation policies on the category of data collection procedures: selected performance criteria and measures. States exhibited the most depth in this category on mandating particular superintendent evaluation criteria (Indicator B) and on mandating inclusion of superintendent performance measures in the superintendent evaluation (Indicator E). Twenty-three states identified either mandatory criteria (18 states) or permissive criteria (5 states) for superintendent evaluations (Indicator B). When combining findings from Indicator B with findings from Indicator E, it is clear that states were frequently including student performance measures within the identified criteria. Referring to Indicator E, 18 of the 23 states that identified performance criteria, included student performance measures as mandated criteria (10 states) or permissive criteria (8 states).

The findings related to the use of student performance measures in superintendent evaluation warranted further analysis. First, these findings represented a substantial

increase from DiPaola and Stronge's (2001b) research investigating the inclusion of student growth measures in superintendent evaluation policy. At that time, only three of 50 states included student growth measures in superintendent evaluation policy. Second, student performance measures may have different definitions in different states but are typically defined as student standardized test scores, assessed annually. If superintendent performance will be judged using a criterion that has its own process calendar, consideration must be given to the frequency of superintendent evaluations (feasibility standard, Indicator A) in states using student performance measures as a superintendent evaluation criterion. Third, although student performance measures are typically defined as student standardized test scores, this is not the ideal definition of an outcome measure for the purposes of performance evaluation (Harris & Smith, 2011). Student performance measures should include a variety of data sources. Accordingly, consideration must be given to a state's use of multiple sources of data in the superintendent evaluation process (accuracy standard, Indicator A) for states using student performance measures as a superintendent evaluation criterion.

While 23 states included provisions that outline goals, purposes, and criteria, states exhibited less policy depth in establishing connections between the criteria and professional standards or even between the criteria and the state's own identified goal or purpose for the evaluation. Only 11 of those 23 states either explicitly referenced professional standards or referenced standards that were substantially aligned with professional standards (Indicator C). In those 11 states where professional standards were referenced, states typically identified the standards as the state adopted standards for educational or school/district leaders with reference to or alignment with a set of

professional standards. Professional standards referenced included AASA standards, NSBA standards, Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL), and Midcontinent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) standards. Though no clear majority could be discerned for the use of a particular professional standard, there was a slight majority towards the PSEL standards. Similarly, only 12 states identified evaluation components that referenced the state's own goals and purposes for the evaluation (Indicator D).

Again, states were mixed on the depth of superintendent evaluation policies in the category of methods for using results. State superintendent evaluation policy indicated that some states linked superintendent evaluations to contractual decisions (Indicator F) but these states did not represent a majority. States more frequently linked superintendent evaluation results to professional development/growth decisions (Indicator G). In fact, in comparison, twice as many states, 20 states, used evaluations for professional development/growth decisions as compared to only 10 states that used evaluations for contractual decisions.

A summary of each state's score on the utility standard is presented in Table 9. Each state's utility standard score by criteria category is set forth in Appendix E.

Table 9. *Summary Rubric Results for the Utility Standard by State*

State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Indicator C	Indicator D	Indicator E	Indicator F	Indicator G	Total Score
Alabama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
California	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	6
Florida	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Hawaii	1	1	1	1	.5	.5	1	6
Idaho	.5	.5	0	0	.5	1	.5	3
Illinois	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	6
Kansas	1	1	1	1	.5	1	.5	6
Kentucky	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	1	1	1	1	1	.5	.5	6
Michigan	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4
Minnesota	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	1	1	1	.5	.5	0	.5	4.5
Missouri	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	3
Montana	1	.5	1	.5	0	0	.5	3.5
Nebraska	1	1	0	0	0	0	.5	2.5
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
New Mexico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	1	.5	1	.5	.5	0	.5	4
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Ohio	.5	.5	0	.5	.5	1	.5	3.5
Oklahoma	1	1	0	0	0	0	.5	2.5
Oregon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	1	0	0	.5	1	0	2.5
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
South Dakota	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Texas	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Utah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	1	1	1	.5	1	0	.5	5
Washington	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
West Virginia	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wyoming	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	5
Washington D.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Data Collection Procedures: Evaluation Goals & Purposes

Indicator A: Does the state identify a goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation?

Data Collection Procedures: Selected Performance Criteria and Measures

Indicator B: Does the state mandate particular superintendent evaluation criteria or components?

Indicator C: Do the mandated criteria or components directly name any existing professional educational standards or reflect at least 75% of any existing professional educational standards even if such standards are not directly named?

Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluation components that specifically reference the goals or purpose for superintendent evaluation?

Indicator E: Does the state mandate inclusion of student performance measures in the superintendent evaluation?

Methods for Using Results

Indicator F: Does the state mandate or permit superintendent contractual provisions based upon evaluation results?

Indicator G: Does the state mandate or permit evaluation results to be used for development of a professional growth plan (or similar document) or other human resource decisions?

Sub-Question e: To What Extent do States Meet the Feasibility Standard set Forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?

Overall, states exhibited mixed results for depth of policy on the feasibility standard, but with more depth than other standards. With only two indicators, the maximum total feasibility score for each state was only two. Approximately 79% (27 of 34 states) of states with policies satisfied at least one indicator but only five states satisfied both indicators. There was a clear explanation for these results. A majority of the states with policies dictated the frequency of the superintendent evaluation (Indicator A). Whereas only Delaware, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, and Washington maintained a superintendent process data tracking system (Indicator B).

Table 10 presents the frequency of rubric scores for each indicator of the feasibility standard.

Table 10. *Statewide Frequency of Rubric Scores by Indicator for the Feasibility Standard*

Indicator	1	0.5	0
Data Collection Procedures: Frequency of Evaluation			
IndicatorA: Does the state dictate frequency of superintendent evaluation?	25	2	7
Data Collection Procedures: Reporting			
Indicator B: Does the state maintain a superintendent process data tracking system? (i.e., Does the state require districts to report superintendent evaluation results to the state?)	5	0	29

Note. 34 state scores are reflected. 17 states did not have a policy and were not scored.

More specifically, states had high depth of policy in the category of data collection procedures: frequency of evaluation. States dictated that superintendent evaluation be conducted with some level of minimum frequency. Twenty-seven of the 34 states with policies had a provision that identified the timeframe and frequency of

superintendent evaluation (Indicator A). All but two of those 27 states mandated the frequency rather than suggesting a particular frequency. Though the majority required an annual evaluation, a limited few provided for evaluations twice per year, like North Dakota, or provided for alternate frequencies for new or probationary superintendents.

States that mandated frequency of evaluation were analyzed in conjunction with states that included student performance measures as a superintendent evaluation criterion (utility standard, Indicator E). Of the 25 states that mandated frequency of evaluation, 14 of those states included student performance measures as a criterion for evaluating superintendent performance. Since the vast majority of states mandate evaluation frequency as once per year, this means that student performance measures are being used as a summative evaluation measure.

By contrast, states had low depth of policy in the category of data collection procedures: reporting. Overwhelmingly absent from state-level superintendent evaluation policy were state-level oversight mechanisms for tracking the superintendent evaluation process and reporting results (Indicator B). Only five of the 34 states with policies required any type of data tracking or reporting to the state. Recall in the propriety standard indicators, there was an indicator to determine a state's oversight of the superintendent evaluation process to ensure it was implemented with fidelity (propriety standard Indicator C), where only 10 states had such oversight provisions. Here, even fewer reinforced that oversight with a data tracking process.

A summary of each state's score on the feasibility standard is presented in Table 11. Each state's feasibility standard score by criteria category is set forth in Appendix F.

Table 11. *Summary Rubric Results for the Feasibility Standard by State*

State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Total Score
Alabama	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	0
Arkansas	-	-	-
California	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-
Connecticut	1	0	1
Delaware	1	1	2
Florida	-	-	-
Georgia	1	0	1
Hawaii	1	0	1
Idaho	1	0	1
Illinois	0	0	0
Indiana	-	-	-
Iowa	1	0	1
Kansas	1	0	1
Kentucky	0	0	0
Louisiana	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-
Massachusetts	1	1	2
Michigan	1	1	2
Minnesota	-	-	-
Mississippi	1	0	1
Missouri	.5	0	0.5
Montana	1	0	1
Nebraska	1	0	1
Nevada	-	-	-
New Hampshire	1	0	1
New Jersey	1	0	1
New Mexico	-	-	-
New York	1	1	2
North Carolina	1	0	1
North Dakota	1	0	1
Ohio	.5	0	0.5
Oklahoma	1	0	1
Oregon	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0
South Dakota	-	-	-
Tennessee	1	0	1
Texas	1	0	1
Utah	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-
Virginia	1	0	1
Washington	1	1	2
West Virginia	1	0	1
Wisconsin	0	0	0
Wyoming	1	0	1
Washington D.C.	1	0	1

Data Collection Procedures: Frequency of Evaluation

Indicator A: Does the state dictate frequency of superintendent evaluation?

Data Collection Procedures: Reporting

Indicator B: Does the state maintain a superintendent process data tracking system? (i.e., Does the state require districts to report superintendent evaluation results to the state?)

Sub-Question f: To What Extent do States Meet the Accuracy Standard set Forth by the Joint Committee (1988, 2009)?

Overall, states exhibited the least depth of policy on the accuracy standard, a standard with the greatest number of indicators and, therefore, the highest potential score. With 10 indicators, the maximum total accuracy score for each state was 10. Yet, despite this potential score, approximately 80% of states (27 of 34 states) with superintendent evaluation policies scored three or less on the accuracy standard.

Table 12 presents the frequency of rubric scores for each indicator of the accuracy standard.

Table 12. *Statewide Frequency of Rubric Scores by Indicator for the Accuracy Standard*

Indicator	1	0.5	0
Data Collection Procedures: Data Integrity			
Indicator A: Does the state mandate that multiple sources of data must be used in the superintendent process?	8	6	20
Indicator B: Does the state assign different weights to different sources of superintendent evaluation data?	0	0	34
Indicator C: Does the state mandate a particular form for the superintendent evaluation?	3	13	18
Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluators for the superintendent evaluation?	34	0	0
Indicator E: Does the state mandate that multiple evaluator sources be used in the superintendent process?	9	6	19
Methods for Summarizing Results & System Evaluation			
Indicator F: Does the state mandate a process to assess the state-level superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness?	8	1	25
Indicator G: Did the state pilot the superintendent evaluation system model process or form?	2	1	31
Indicator H: Does the state identify outcomes to determine overall effectiveness of state-level superintendent evaluation system?	1	1	32
System Structure: Recognition of District-Specific Demographics			
Indicator I: Does the state differentiate between type of district (e.g. rural, urban, suburban) in the superintendent evaluation process?	0	1	33
Indicator J: Does the state differentiate between any district demographics in the superintendent evaluation process?	1	1	32

Note. 34 state scores are reflected. 17 states did not have a policy and were not scored.

There were several indicators that stood out as possible contributors to the overall low accuracy standard scores. Very few, if any, states assigned weights to superintendent evaluation data sources, piloted the superintendent evaluation policy system, identified outcomes to measure the effectiveness of the superintendent evaluation policy system, or differentiated between type of district (e.g., rural, urban, suburban) or any district demographic.

Perhaps the largest contributor to the overall low accuracy standard scores was the absence of indicators in the category of system structure: recognition of district-specific demographics. Only one state, Missouri, had provisions that recognized differences in the type of district (Indicator I) and only two states, Massachusetts and North Carolina, had provisions that recognized differences in district demographics (Indicator J). North Carolina identified the demographic as limiting the superintendent evaluation policy components to superintendents serving in low-performing schools. Massachusetts recognized the resulting impact that demographics would have on the job duties of the superintendent.

States varied drastically in the inclusion of indicators for the category of data collection procedures: data integrity. Data integrity is a critical part of the superintendent evaluation process and states are incorporating some data integrity measures, but the data integrity category contained both the high and low scoring indicator. Every state that had a superintendent evaluation policy identified the evaluators for the superintendent evaluation (Indicator D). However, no state assigned different weights to different evaluation criteria (Indicator B).

Despite these extremes, some states maintained other data integrity measures. While just short of a majority, 14 states had provisions for multiple sources of data (Indicator A), 15 states had provisions for multiple evaluation sources (Indicator E), and 16 provided for either a mandated or permitted evaluation form in their superintendent evaluation policies (Indicator C). In this category, there was significant overlap among states. When states included these data integrity measures, they typically included all three of the measures. Specifically, 11 states included all three of these data integrity measures in their superintendent evaluation policies. These states included: Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, and Virginia.

Data integrity measures can also have an impact on the use of particular evaluation criterion. States that included student performance measures as a superintendent evaluation criterion (utility standard, Indicator E) were analyzed in conjunction with states that included multiple sources of data (Indicator A). Of the 18 states that included student performance measures as a superintendent evaluation criterion, 13 of those states also included multiple sources of data as either a mandated or suggested/permitted element of the evaluation process. Thus, the majority of states that included student performance measures also recognized the need to use multiple data sources for evaluation criteria.

States also varied in the inclusion of the indicators for the category of methods for summarizing results and system evaluation. Nine states identified a process to assess the state-level superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness (Indicator F). Despite this willingness of some states to assess the evaluation system process, very few states

included provisions that would take steps to implement that assessment. Only three states piloted the superintendent evaluation system (Indicator G) and only two states identified outcomes to determine the superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness (Indicator H).

Only one indicator served to increase the accuracy standard scores, identification of evaluators for the superintendent evaluation process (Indicator D). Every state identified the evaluators for the superintendent evaluation process. In fact, Indicator D was the only indicator, in any standard, that was met by every single state with a superintendent evaluation policy.

A summary of each state's score on the accuracy standard is presented in Table 13. Each state's accuracy standard score by criteria category is set forth in Appendix G.

Table 13. *Summary Rubric Results for the Accuracy Standard by State*

State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Indicator C	Indicator D	Indicator E	Indicator F	Indicator G	Indicator H	Indicator I	Indicator J	Total Score
Alabama	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Arkansas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
California	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Delaware	1	0	1	1	.5	1	0	1	0	0	5.5
Florida	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	0	0	.5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.5
Hawaii	.5	0	.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Idaho	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Illinois	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	1	0	.5	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	3
Kansas	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Kentucky	0	0	0	1	0	.5	0	0	0	0	1.5
Louisiana	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	1	0	.5	1	1	1	1	0	0	.5	6
Michigan	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	.5	0	0	6.5
Minnesota	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	.5	0	.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Missouri	.5	0	.5	1	.5	0	.5	0	.5	0	3.5
Montana	0	0	.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.5
Nebraska	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
New Jersey	.5	0	.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
New Mexico	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New York	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
North Carolina	.5	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	4.5
North Dakota	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Ohio	.5	0	.5	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	2.5
Oklahoma	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Oregon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Rhode Island	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
South Carolina	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
South Dakota	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Tennessee	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Texas	0	0	.5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2.5
Utah	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	1	0	.5	1	.5	0	0	0	0	0	3
Washington	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
West Virginia	0	0	.5	1	.5	1	0	0	0	0	3
Wisconsin	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Wyoming	1	0	.5	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3.5
Washington D.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Data Collection Procedures: Data Integrity

Indicator A: Does the state mandate that multiple sources of data must be used in the superintendent process?

Indicator B: Does the state assign different weights to different sources of superintendent evaluation data?

Indicator C: Does the state mandate a particular form for the superintendent evaluation?

Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluators for the superintendent evaluation?

Indicator E: Does the state mandate that multiple evaluator sources be used in the superintendent process?

Methods for Summarizing Results & System Evaluation

Indicator F: Does the state mandate a process to assess the state-level superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness?

Indicator G: Did the state pilot the superintendent evaluation system model process or form?

Indicator H: Does the state identify outcomes to determine overall effectiveness of state-level superintendent evaluation system?

System Structure: Recognition of District-Specific Demographics

Indicator I: Does the state differentiate between type of district (e.g. rural, urban, suburban) in the superintendent evaluation process?

Indicator J: Does the state differentiate between any district demographics in the superintendent evaluation process?

Research Question Number Two: How do State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policies Compare Within Geographic Regions of the United States with Differing Political Cultures?

The total rubric score set forth in Table 5, was used to create a ranked distribution of scores for the purposes of conducting a Chi-Square test (see also Tables C1 and C2 of Appendix C). Table 14 presents the Chi-Square table of observed values by ranking and political culture classification.

Table 14. *Chi Square Table*

	Political Culture State Classification		
States ranked by highest rubric scores (20 possible points)	Traditionalistic	Moralistic	Individualistic
Group #1 (8.5-18.5 points)	4	4	6
Group #2 (3.5-7.5 points)	4	2	6
Group #3 (1.5-3.0 points)	3	3	2
Group #4 (0 points)	5	8	4

A Chi-Square Test of Independence was calculated using IBM SPSS Statistics (IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 24.0, Released 2016) to determine if there is a significant dependence of political culture on the breadth and depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy. Table 15 presents the results of the Chi-Square test of independence.

Table 15. *Chi Square Results*

Chi Square Test of Independence Calculated Value	Level of Significance/degrees of freedom	p-value
$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$	$\alpha = .05/6df$	.659

The results showed that no significant relationship existed between a state's political culture, as classified by Elazar (1966, 1972) and Fowler (2013), and the breadth and depth of a state's superintendent evaluation policy, as determined by the total score on the State Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Content Analysis Rubric (χ^2 with 6 *df* = 4.133, *p* = .659). The complete output of the SPSS analysis is set forth in Appendix H.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion & Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this research study begin to fill the gap in superintendent evaluation research and provide a picture of how superintendent evaluation policy has developed over the past 15 to 20 years in the wake of federal accountability reform. From these findings, state policy makers can assess the current status of state superintendent evaluation policy, determine whether it is meeting state policy goals for evaluating superintendent and school district performance, and make informed decisions about policy development and revision. Professional administrator and school board governance associations can advocate for the needs of their members for informed, research-based improvements to state superintendent evaluation policy. At the local level, superintendents and boards of education will be able to determine mechanisms that can help facilitate and improve their district's performance appraisal process by better understanding their own state policy, by better understanding the impact of local superintendent evaluation policy decisions, and by aligning those decisions with state policy and informed evaluation research, and by working with their professional associations to advocate for necessary policy development and revision.

States Lacking Superintendent Evaluation Policy Breadth

Despite the critical role of the superintendent to ensure successful district outcomes, a third of the states did not provide school districts with a superintendent

evaluation policy. This means that, as policy is defined in this study, those states did not offer legislatively enacted statutes,

administratively adopted regulations, or any administrative guidance to local boards of education and superintendents in how to properly conduct a superintendent evaluation. These states do not provide assurance and guidance to help districts undertake a fair, consistent, and transparent superintendent evaluation process that is aligned with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards for quality.

In addition, there were a number of states that technically had policies as that term was defined for the purposes of this research, but the policies contained only a few indicators. This means that policies in those states are doing little more than simply identifying a legal requirement to evaluate the superintendent. These states scored a three or below on the total rubric score (see Appendix C). Eight states fell into this category. The practical effect is that these states are surrendering almost complete control to the local school district. In some cases, these states expressly and intentionally surrendered this control and in some cases the state surrendered control by implication and the lack of evaluation components and indicators (see Appendix B).

Leaving important superintendent performance evaluation processes to local control has significant implications. When boards of education and superintendents are left entirely to navigate this critical process on their own, there is potential for "political game playing" (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999, p. 405), potential for the deterioration of the board of education and superintendent relationship and the resulting breakdown of school

district leadership, and potential for high superintendent turnover (Alsbury, 2008; Grady & Bryant, 1989).

The implications need not be as intentionally negative as "political game playing." Boards of education may want to implement a fair and effective superintendent evaluation process, but they simply do not know how. There is no requirement that board members have an educational background or knowledge of employee performance evaluations to serve on the board. They are representatives of the community, the public. Board members may want and need the direction that an informed, coherent state-level superintendent evaluation policy with sufficient depth can provide.

One interesting approach to ensuring superintendent evaluation does not become negatively influenced by board members who may not have the necessary background for effective evaluation or by board members who may have political motives, is that of Nebraska's policy. Nebraska's state-level superintendent evaluation policy explicitly stated that superintendents should take the lead within the evaluation process. Certainly, this can be potentially beneficial as the superintendent is certainly informed and knowledgeable about her or his own role. However, superintendents should not be left to lead this process alone. Superintendents are entitled to a fair evaluation process that is designed to formatively improve not only their own growth but also the growth of the district they lead. States who wish to grant more local control could, instead, consider the approach of Texas, wherein the process was identified as a collaboration between the superintendent and the board of education. Alternatively, states that wish to grant more local control may, instead, consider the approach of Missouri or Ohio who implemented voluntary or permissive superintendent evaluation policy processes but with guidance in

the form of superintendent evaluation policy process recommendations for local districts to follow.

It should be noted that the lack of state-level superintendent evaluation policy, as that term is defined in this study, does not suggest that superintendents are not being evaluated in these states. Further, states may have a practice of providing guidance to boards of education and superintendents, even if not in the form of policy as is it is defined in this study. However, without a state-level superintendent policy, there is no guarantee that superintendents in these states are being evaluated at all. If they are being evaluated, there is no guarantee that superintendents in these states are consistently being evaluated fairly, equitably, and accurately, in a manner that produces useful results.

Influence of the Accountability and Reform Movement

While one-third of states did not have a policy, two-thirds of states did have some form of state-level superintendent evaluation policy, albeit at varying levels of policy depth. Some states have experienced significant superintendent evaluation policy development in the past 15 to 20 years. DiPaola and Stronge (2001b) identified eight states that did not have any state-level superintendent evaluation policy, or any type of guidance provided by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) or the National School Boards Association (NSBA)[2]. These states included California, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, and Nevada. Since 2001, four of those states, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, and Nevada have adopted superintendent evaluation policies. In fact, Delaware had the third highest scoring policy, meaning that it met the greatest number of indicators for a high-quality evaluation consistent with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards. Delaware met almost every utility indicator and

every feasibility indicator. All but two of Delaware's included indicators were mandatory, indicating that not only did Delaware establish a policy in the past 15-20 years, Delaware policy makers elected to provide clear and consistent directives for how local districts must implement a fair, useful, accurate, and feasible superintendent evaluation system.

Delaware is a good example of the how policy development over the past 15-20 years has coincided with the federal accountability and reform movement (i.e., No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top, and the Every Student Succeeds Act). Delaware's policy development dates back to approximately 2011. This is consistent with the frequency with which states are updating their superintendent evaluation policies. The majority of states with superintendent evaluation policies updated their policies only since 2010. These findings present a presumption that states are adopting and/or revising superintendent evaluation policies in the wake of the federal accountability and reform movement.

Further, combining the findings surrounding updates to superintendent evaluation policies with the findings related to the lack of depth across superintendent evaluation policies, suggests that states might be updating policies in accordance with a routine policy revision cycle and not with the intent of providing significant depth and informed policy-making. This is particularly true in comparing updates to superintendent evaluation policies to updates in principal evaluation policies. Principal evaluation policy updates are thorough and extensive whereas superintendent evaluation policy updates, where present, are less extensive and reflect more surface-level updates (Scott, 2017).

Given that there is only a presumption that states are updating superintendent evaluation policies in the wake of the federal accountability and reform movement and given that there is the potential that states are just updating policies in accordance with a policy revision cycle, there continues to be a real concern that superintendent evaluation policy is not being given the attention it deserves. There is real potential, without more action in the way of superintendent evaluation policy development, that superintendent evaluation policy will certainly face the ten-year lag faced by principal evaluation policy, if not an even longer lag. One of the signals that principal evaluation policy was receiving meaningful attention and development that recognized and facilitated the principal's role in the accountability and reform movement was state legislative action to emphasize principal evaluation in conjunction with and in alignment with principal preparation and licensure (Jacques et al., 2012). These research findings indicate such a signal is not yet present for superintendent evaluation policy. The utility standard, Indicator A, where states identified the goals and purposes of superintendent evaluation policy, would be such a signal. Yet, only North Carolina identified integration of evaluation, licensure, and preparation, as one of the goals of the superintendent evaluation policy. Moreover, none of the current legislative efforts across states speak to integration of district-level evaluation, licensure, and preparation (Scott, 2017).

State Coherence with the Joint Committee Standards

The findings related to the depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy identify whether states are taking active, intentional steps to ensure superintendent performance is fair and comprehensively measured in accordance with the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards. State scores on each of the four standards

demonstrate the level of coherence with the Joint Committee standards for quality performance evaluations. The highest scoring states indicate substantial coherence with the Joint Committee standards.

The highest scoring states, for this study, scored between 18.5 and 8.5, out of a possible 25 points. These states included Massachusetts, Michigan, Delaware, New Jersey, Kansas, West Virginia, Hawaii, North Carolina, Virginia, Iowa, Wyoming, Mississippi, Missouri, and Montana (See Table 5 and Table C1 of Appendix C). The fact that the highest scoring group of states still only met 34% to 74% of the total possible rubric score, means that many indicators have not yet been met and that superintendent evaluation policy is not receiving the level of state policy attention demanded of such an important process. States are missing the opportunity to inform superintendent performance, to strengthen the relationship between the superintendent and board, and, in turn, to positively impact school district performance.

Despite the fact that some of the highest scoring states still did not satisfy a substantial number of indicators, there were informative commonalities among these highest scoring states. These states included provisions that indicate that the states all value establishing goals and purposes for the evaluation process, developing performance criteria and measures, using the evaluation results for improvement, identifying and including multiple evaluator sources, specifically non-board member stakeholder participation. Thus, the highest scoring states set a vision for local school boards to follow about why a quality evaluation is important, identified the expected role and performance expectations for a superintendent in that state, and identified key data integrity measures.

The highest score does not suggest the policy approach adopted by these states leads to improved superintendent performance or school district outcomes, but it does indicate substantial coherence with the Joint Committee standards. If research correctly concludes that having a fair, equitable, high-quality superintendent evaluation system can positively impact the superintendent and board of education relationship, and in turn, the leadership provided by the superintendent and board of education, then higher scores should lead to improved superintendent performance and school district outcomes.

It is important to look to within the Joint Committee (1988, 2009) standards to understand the particular standards in which states with superintendent evaluation policies are exhibiting more significant policy development to understand where additional development and improvement can be made. More states scored higher on the utility and feasibility standards. This indicates that states have placed more emphasis on ensuring that superintendent evaluation results have utility, in that they are informative, influential, and produce useful, meaningful results. This also indicates that states have placed more emphasis on ensuring that the superintendent evaluation process is feasible to implement, meaning that it is efficient and politically viable, a very important consideration for a process that can be influenced by local-level politics.

By contrast to state scores on the utility and feasibility standards, states with policies have scored lower on the propriety and accuracy standards. This indicates that states have not placed as much emphasis on ensuring that superintendent evaluations have propriety, in that they are fair and consider the welfare of the superintendent. This also indicates that states have not placed as much emphasis on ensuring that

superintendent evaluations are accurate, in that the results are justified, well-documented, and logically linked to date sources.

These findings are consistent with superintendent perceptions and prior research and serve as evidence that states are not doing enough to ensure that the unique intricacies of the superintendent evaluation process are adequately recognized and addressed in the superintendent evaluation process. Superintendents reported that their evaluations do not recognize the full complexity of their role, perceived that they are not being evaluated accurately based on identified criteria (Kowalski et al., 2011; Mayo & McCartney, 2004), and were instead being evaluated by board member individual and subjective narratives (Costa, 2004; DiPaola, 2007). Unfortunately, these findings are also consistent with DiPaola and Stronge's (2001b) research as to the accuracy standard. Almost 20 years ago, DiPaola and Stronge found that the criteria most absent from superintendent evaluation policies were the accuracy standard and the findings of this study show that the accuracy standard continues to be neglected.

Within the accuracy standard, states are not taking adequate steps to ensure superintendent evaluation processes recognize role differences related to district-specific demographics. Only one state, Missouri, differentiated the superintendent evaluation process by type of district (e.g., rural, urban, suburban) and did so permissibly. Likewise, only two states, Massachusetts and North Carolina, differentiated by the district demographic of student enrollment, North Carolina mandatorily and Massachusetts permissibly. Research conducted by DiPaola (2010), DiPaola and Stronge (2001b), and Jones and Howley (2009), links differences in district type, student enrollment, and

district socioeconomic status to differences in the superintendent's role, responsibilities, and performance expectations.

The impact of a state's failure to differentiate by district-specific demographics cannot be understated. Not only is the accountability and reform movement changing the role and performance expectations for superintendents, such changes are not felt in the same way by every superintendent in every district. The context of a superintendent's role is relevant to performance expectations, the resulting impact of accountability and reform expectations, and even position longevity (The Broad Center, 2018). Examples can be found in any state but take Pennsylvania to illustrate. A superintendent in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, an urban school district educating almost 135,000 students with low socioeconomic status will have drastically different job duties and performance expectations than a superintendent in Thornburg, Pennsylvania, a suburban/rural school district educating less than 100 students with high socioeconomic status. The Philadelphia superintendent may focus more on managerial tasks and external relationships to secure funding. In contrast, the Thornburg superintendent may focus more on developing a culture of professional learning and instructional leadership. It is equally possible that expectations of the accountability and reform movement may force the Philadelphia superintendent to take a more active role in developing a culture of professional learning and instructional leadership. State-level superintendent evaluation policy, to be effective, must recognize district demographic differences and resulting superintendent role and provide a mechanism to shift with external demands. It is not evident that the states are making such policy distinctions.

Additionally, within the accuracy standard, findings show that states are not maintaining sufficient assessment or integrity assurance systems to ensure proper implementation of the state-level superintendent evaluation systems that do exist. Only five states had any type of tracking system (see feasibility standard Indicator B). The remaining 29 of 34 states with policies had no tracking benchmarks for their implementation efforts. All of the states that scored a three or below, either expressly or by implication, surrendered almost complete control to the local school district (see Appendix B). These states had a policy requirement for superintendent evaluation and, in doing so, identified the evaluators. However, all other evaluation-specific components and processes were left to the control of the local school districts, not only without any specific guidance or direction, but without a means to track or evaluate how superintendent performance evaluation systems are implemented. Of the states that did maintain some type of oversight, such as Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, and New York, they did so in the form of state approval of locally developed superintendent evaluation policies. This leaves the door open for, at best, implementation gaps and states conducting evaluations simply to satisfy a legal requirement, and, at worst, unfair or inaccurate evaluations that do not produce useful results and are used to make critical district leadership decisions.

At a minimum, states can pilot superintendent evaluation policy systems. Only three states piloted the superintendent evaluation policy process, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Missouri. If a state is hesitant to take on the responsibility and logistics of tracking the superintendent evaluation process, piloting the system would be a good alternative. It would allow the state to be able to identify implementation gaps and

concerns at the local district level. Currently, states are missing a critical opportunity to influence superintendent evaluation policy and establish quality evaluation mechanisms at the design stage (Toch, 2018).

Certain states take important steps towards implementation in their superintendent evaluation policy design. For example, Delaware and Michigan mandate almost every provision of their state-level superintendent evaluation policies. Other states follow close behind, mandating more provisions than they permit. This places them in an excellent position to guide implementation efforts. Yet some states do not maintain a tracking system. Virginia, for example, mandates nine indicators and permits five indicators but does not maintain a tracking system. This is not to suggest Virginia has any problem with superintendent evaluation system implementation. However, states may benefit from having both mandated provisions and systems that then monitor and track the effective implementation of the superintendent evaluation process to ensure the state-level superintendent evaluation process has substance to match its form.

In addition to facilitating implementation efforts, public tracking systems, like those in Michigan, acknowledge and speak to the board of education's role as representatives of the public. There must be a balance of transparency in the superintendent evaluation process while still protecting the fairness of the process and general welfare of the superintendent. Many states (14) acknowledged the importance of providing for the confidentiality or public disclosure of evaluation results. However, transparency of the policy through the policy approval process and/or making the policy publicly available balances the need for transparency in the process with the protection of the general welfare of the superintendent.

Study results further confirm that states are not taking adequate steps to ensure the propriety standard is met through exclusion of evaluators with conflicts of interest and who are untrained. Not a single state mandated the exclusion of evaluators with conflicts of interest and only 10 states required training for board member evaluators. In a performance evaluation process where the evaluators are a group of public representatives with no required education background or required background in employee performance evaluation, board members typically will not know to exclude themselves if they have a conflict of interest and will not know how to implement a fair, accurate evaluation process. In fact, some board members will run for office on platforms that specifically seek to remove the superintendent. When elected, those same board members seek to evaluate the superintendent without considering the lack of impartiality and the resulting conflict of interest. It is within this aspect of the propriety standard where there is most significant potential for political influence and the breakdown of the board member and superintendent relationship. Certainly, not all board members act with ill intention. With high board member turnover and state law that limit board member terms of office, many board members are simply too new and untrained to recognize the right path and process for superintendent evaluation. States would benefit from incorporating provisions similar to West Virginia's policy that provides for a balanced, jointly developed training by the state affiliates of both professional administrator and board member associations.

States need to increase focus towards policy development and revisions that incorporate mandatory propriety and accuracy standards but must do so without shifting focus away from utility and feasibility standards. States that did not score high on the

utility and feasibility standards should follow the higher scoring states to capitalize on areas of significant policy development. States that did score high on the utility and feasibility standards should continue to look for areas where additional policy development is possible to refine and maximize superintendent evaluation utility and feasibility.

One such area that has seen higher scores in the past 15-20 years but continues to need attention and focus is the inclusion of student performance measures. The findings of this study document a significant increase in the number of states that have included student performance in the superintendent evaluation criteria over DiPaola and Stronge's findings in 2001. It is likely that the inclusion of student outcome measures has been influenced by the accountability and reform movement's focus on student outcomes.

Given that the superintendent is ultimately responsible for all district outcomes, including student outcomes, it is not surprising that this performance measure is being incorporated into all educational leader evaluation systems. This finding reflects the accountability movement's influence on the superintendent role and performance expectations and other states should consider including similar policy revisions to update performance criteria and expectations. However, states must carefully select performance criteria in a process that involves superintendents, board members, and professional associations. This is particularly true with student performance measures, which have been found to impact a superintendent's tenure as superintendent in a state (Plotts & Gutmore, 2014) and in a district (Simpson, 2013). The superintendent's role in ensuring improved student outcomes may be more accurately described as an indirect focus on instruction via instructional resource management, instructional policy support,

and the balancing of internal and external political influences on instruction (Browne-Ferrigno & Glass, 2005; Hoyle et al., 2005; Waters & Marzano, 2006). Thus, some superintendents would argue against the inclusion of student performance measures or any evaluation measures over which the superintendent does not have direct control. While other superintendents would argue for inclusion of student performance measures but only inclusion of the proper performance measures that accurately reflect that for which the superintendent can be held responsible. Careful selection of performance criteria requires development of a collaborative process that includes superintendents, boards of education, and professional associations. Such a collaborative process will ensure superintendent performance criteria fairly and accurately reflects the superintendent's role and performance expectations.

Properly defining and understanding the superintendent's role in student performance and instructional leadership has significant implications not only when used as an evaluation criterion but also has significant implications for a state's use of multiple data sources and the frequency of evaluation. Any well-formed performance evaluation system will ensure the use of multiple data sources (DiPaola & Stronge, 2013). However, this is, perhaps, even more critical when considering the superintendent's indirect influence on student performance and the changing nature of state definitions of student performance and growth. Using multiple measures will more accurately define the superintendent's connection to and responsibility for student performance. This will maximize the accuracy and utility of the evaluation results while minimizing the potential harm to superintendents by seeking to hold them accountable for that which they do not directly control. Further, these multiple data sources related to student performance will

have the most impact when used in a formative evaluation process. Currently, states are requiring only an annual summative evaluation. Typical student performance outcomes are measured annually. It is difficult, if not impossible, to hold superintendents accountable, in an accurate and meaningful way for performance data that is only measured annually. Instead, multiple data sources should be reviewed at multiple points throughout the year in a formative way to underscore the fairness, accuracy, and utility of the superintendent evaluation process.

When these three indicators (use of student performance measures as an evaluation criterion, use of multiple data sources, and frequency of evaluation) are taken together, states have an opportunity to reinforce their philosophy of instructional leadership and the accountability of educational leaders (Maranto, Trivitt, Nichols, & Watson, 2017) through superintendent evaluation policy. If states do not consider these elements together and incorporate them into the superintendent evaluation policy process, local boards of education can misunderstand, or worse, misuse, student performance measures to unfairly target superintendents or engage in "political game playing" (Hoyle & Skrla, 1999, p. 405).

Another area of the utility and feasibility standards that demands continued focus is frequency of evaluation. Frequency of evaluation points to the importance placed on superintendent evaluation process and serves as evidence of whether boards of education are ensuring evaluations are using both mid-year formative in addition to summative components (Kowalski et al., 2011). Twenty-five of the 34 states with policies mandated the frequency of superintendent evaluations with another two states permissively identifying the frequency of evaluation. However, 24 of those 25 states mandated that

frequency as occurring annually. Only one state mandated evaluations twice per year. This suggests that superintendent evaluations, despite any stated purposes, are designed with a summative purpose rather than including a formative purpose. Efforts should be made to increase the frequency of superintendent evaluation to provide for the beneficial outcomes using both formative and summative components. As the findings suggest, 20 states indicate that superintendent evaluation results are used for professional growth. If that is truly the case, states should consider adopting a requirement for more frequent, formative evaluation processes.

Finally, even indicators within the utility standard that were frequently met by states, such as goal and purpose identification, need continued attention when viewed in conjunction with other indicators. Half of the states with policies, identified goals and purposes for the superintendent evaluation (Indicator A) but only six of those states mandate performance criteria that are tied to the goals and purpose (Indicator D). State policy makers should pay careful attention to the alignment of superintendent evaluation purpose with all aspects of the evaluation process, but in particular, selection of evaluation criteria. There is little value in identifying a goal and purpose of an evaluation system if the goals and purposes are not integrated throughout the rest of the process. The goal and purpose will be lost, and the entire process will lose focus and impact.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study's findings identified 17 states that do not provide school districts with a superintendent evaluation policy. However, there was no discernible relationship among these 17 states and student enrollment, the superintendent selection structure (e.g., elected or appointed), or a state's political culture and, therefore, geographic region.

Future research should be conducted to further investigate why these 17 states have not adopted a policy at either the legislative or administrative level that would provide school districts with the guarantee of a consistent, fair, equitable, high-quality evaluation process. Lack of policy adoption could be intentional, such as California, a state that makes a conscious effort to evaluate private school executive officers but not does maintain such a requirement for public school superintendents. In the alternative, a state's lack of policy could be an oversight given the need to focus on teacher and principal evaluation. Future research to understand the levers that would initiate policy development and/or the barriers preventing policy development would help inform the policy adoption process in that state. At a minimum, it would allow boards of education and superintendents to recognize that a state may be unwilling to act, and informed decisions must, instead, be made at the local level.

Potential connections not explored in this research include connections between policy development and specific state structures surrounding the superintendent position. States vary in the means through which superintendents are licensed and tenured. Each of these system structures should be explored in future research as potential explanations for a state's policy development or lack thereof.

A state's tenure system may account for the existence of superintendent evaluation policy or may explain changes in the development of state superintendent evaluation policy. For example, New Jersey is a state that historically provided tenure to superintendents. However, in the early 1990s New Jersey eliminated the superintendent statutory tenure system. Once a state no longer maintains tenure protections for a particular position, it is possible that evaluation policies are developed in greater detail as

there is a greater need for more routine evaluation to determine a superintendent's entitlement to the position. This may account for the development of superintendent evaluation policy provisions in New Jersey.

A state's superintendent licensure system may account for the existence of superintendent evaluation policy or the depth of superintendent evaluation policy. For example, Colorado and Utah do not require superintendents to hold a particular administrative license. Similarly, Florida does not maintain specific educational degree requirements for its superintendents, who can be elected or appointed. Colorado, Utah, and Florida were all states identified as not having state-level superintendent evaluation policies. With regard to depth of policy, Delaware, a high scoring state with depth of policy, had policy provisions that altered the superintendent evaluation process for superintendents with different levels (e.g., initial, continuing, or advanced) licensure.

The licensure connection is also important to understanding and minimizing the potential lag in superintendent evaluation policy development in the wake of the accountability movement. These findings present a presumption, given the close proximity of time between the passage of federal accountability reform and states adopting or revising policy language related to superintendent evaluation policy, more research is necessary to establish clear evidence of the connection between policy language adoption and federal accountability law adoption. As principal evaluation policy evidenced, legislative development specifically recognizing the superintendent's role in the accountability movement and aligning performance evaluation policy with licensure and preparation policy, is a signal that the lag time for linking accountability with performance may be coming to an end. Future research should extensively

investigate, through legislative committee hearing testimony and statements as well as administrative educational agency agendas and regulation adoption comments, which were outside the scope of this research, to determine the provisions in the accountability and reform legislation that triggered superintendent evaluation policy revision. Only then can states hope to avoid the lag faced by principal evaluation policy reform.

Another set of possible connections not explored in this research are the connection between state-level superintendent evaluation policy development and the state's educational governance structure. Specifically, this may include state board of education and the state superintendent governance structures. For example, all state legislatures have the authority to pass educational legislation, but all states do not have the same consistency in administrative educational agencies (Railey, 2017). Several states do not have a board of education and one state, New Mexico, has an advisory educational commission. To recall, New Mexico is one of the 17 states without a state-level superintendent evaluation policy. For states with state boards of education, there is variation in how the state selects board of education members. In fact, several models exist with different structures for state board of education member election, appointment, and level of authority. Thus, naturally, a state's educational governance structure is further influenced by the state's political climate and the political affiliations of those in charge of state government and state administrative educational agencies. In fact, chief state school officers, who are often responsible for making recommendations about education policy, including state-level superintendent evaluation policy, are appointed by the governor in 17 states and by the state board of education in 20 states. In the remaining states, the chief state school officer is elected (Railey, 2018).

A state's governance structure and political influence (i.e., political affiliation, whether Democratic or Republican, of the elected officials) within state educational agencies and legislative bodies may also account for some of the same factors that contribute to a state's political culture. For example, a state's governance structure may be welcoming to input from professional associations, as a moralistic state would be, or the state's governance structure may limit policy involvement to only those with power and influence, as a traditionalistic state would be. A state's governance structure and political influence would also impact a state's decision to minimize all policy and leave educational decisions to local control. Where this research did not find a significant relationship between political culture and the breadth and depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy, future research should be conducted to identify whether a relationship exists between a state's educational governance structure and the breadth and depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy.

The potential impact of a state's political influence on the existence of state-level superintendent evaluation policy, may not be a direct impact. For example, a state's political influence may dictate state law related to employee collective bargaining. States with employee collective bargaining laws may tend to see more political involvement of professional associations that represent groups of employees, including superintendents and school administrators. It is possible that these states would expect to see the existence of superintendent evaluation policies and depth of superintendent evaluation policy in the propriety standard. The propriety standard is the standard that ensures fairness and the welfare of the employee. Future research should explore the existence of

a correlation between states with employee collective bargaining laws and higher depth of policy coherence with the propriety standard.

The findings of this research ranked states based on the total score received on the rubric. As noted, the highest score does not suggest the policy approach adopted by these states leads to improved superintendent performance or school district outcomes, but it does indicate substantial coherence with the Joint Committee standards. The purpose of this study was to determine the current breadth and depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy. However, to further inform the possible connection between the depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy and superintendent performance or school district outcomes, future research needs to investigate these relationships using correlational data.

First, district outcome data along with state demographic characteristics should be identified. It has been suggested that a structured performance evaluation can potentially provide district-wide benefits of improved communication, budgeting, planning, accountability, and overall school improvement and reform (DiPaola & Stronge, 2001a, 2001b; Mayo & McCartney, 2004). Conversely, it has also been suggested that poorly formed superintendent evaluation policy can lead to superintendent turnover, the deterioration of goals and policies necessary for school reform (Alsbury, 2008; Grady & Bryant, 1989), negative superintendent and board member perceptions of the superintendent evaluation process, and even increased litigation between the superintendent and the board of education. In a 2018 study of superintendent longevity, The Broad Center recommended that superintendent candidates inquire about the performance review and evaluation process to determine if such review happens more

frequently than the sole annual evaluation (The Broad Center, 2018). While The Broad Center's research does not establish a directly link between the superintendent evaluation and longevity, certainly it is time that such issues be explored in further detail. Future research should make informed decisions to select the appropriate outcome measures and determine if there is any relationship between the depth of state-level superintendent evaluation policy and superintendent performance or district outcome measures.

The findings of this study indicate that the majority of states with superintendent evaluation policies provide either mandated or permissive performance criteria, most frequently identifying state-level performance standards for school and district leaders. This is partially consistent with the American Association of School Administrators' (AASA) survey results wherein a majority of superintendents indicated they were evaluated based on agreed upon criteria. However, AASA's findings indicated that only a minority of superintendents identified state or national performance standards as the selected criteria (Kowalski et al., 2011). Reconciling the findings between this study and the AASA study suggests there may be an implementation gap between state-level superintendent evaluation policy and actual district level superintendent performance evaluation. Despite state efforts, board members may be providing subjective narratives, unguided by a standardized set of criteria or criteria where superintendents may not be in a sufficient position of power to truly "agree" upon the criteria. Future research should investigate the potential existence of this implementation gap. Data should be collected at the district-level and compared to this study's findings at the state-level.

Perhaps compounding this implementation gap is the state's process for local superintendent selection (i.e., whether local superintendents are elected or appointed).

The local superintendent selection structure was explored as a possible reason why particular states do not have a superintendent evaluation policy. Although there was no discernible relationship between the existence of state-level superintendent evaluation policy and local superintendent selection structure, it is possible that superintendent election or appointment complicates the implementation of superintendent evaluation policy at the local level. For example, Mississippi, Georgia, and Tennessee have both elected and appointed superintendents and have state-level superintendent evaluation policy. Yet, a local school district with an elected superintendent and a local school district with an appointed superintendent in each of these states may implement the state-level superintendent evaluation policy in different ways. The local district with the appointed superintendent may strictly follow the state's mandatory requirements and permissive provisions but the local district with the elected superintendent may simply do what is necessary to meet only mandatory requirements. Future research should explore implementation of the state-level superintendent evaluation policy by comparing local-level school districts with differing superintendent selection structures within these states.

APPENDIX A

State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Content Analysis Rubric: STATE

Description of State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy

Policy Source	Does the Policy Source Exist for this State? (Y/N)	Location of Policy Source	Description of Policy Source	Last Updated
Statute				
Regulation				
Other Guidance				

Score for State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Propriety Standard	Data Collection Procedures: Evaluators	Does the state mandate exclusion of evaluators who may have a conflict of interest within the superintendent evaluation process?			
		Does the state mandate training for evaluators in conducting the superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state mandate any additional oversight to ensure evaluators implement the superintendent evaluation system with fidelity?			
	Data Collection Procedures: Stakeholder Involvement & Communication	Does the state require or permit involvement of professional educational associations in development of the superintendent evaluation policy?			
		If so, which professional educational associations are involved (e.g., national or administrator associations; national or state school boards associations)? *Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.*			
		If so, what roles do professional educational associations play, advisory or authoritative? *Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.*			
		Does the state require or permit non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation?			
	Methods for Using Results	Does the state mandate confidentiality of the superintendent evaluation?			

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Utility Standard	Evaluation Goals & Purposes	Does the state identify a goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation?			
		If so, what does the state identify as its goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation (e.g., accountability, Every Student Succeeds Act, coherence with preparation and licensure, coherence with locally developed goals and purposes)? *Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.*			
	Data Collection Procedures: Selected Performance Criteria and Measures	Does the state mandate particular superintendent evaluation criteria or components?			
		Do the mandated criteria or components directly name any existing professional educational standards or reflect at least 75% of any existing professional educational standards even if such standards are not directly named?			
		If so, which professional educational standards are specifically referenced (e.g., AASA, NSBA, PSEL, state-developed standards)? *Note: this question is not scored but is included for descriptive analysis purposes only.*			
		Does the state identify evaluation components that specifically reference the goals or purpose for superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state mandate inclusion of student performance measures in the superintendent evaluation?			
	Methods for Using Results	Does the state mandate or permit superintendent contractual provisions based upon evaluation results?			
		Does the state mandate or permit evaluation results to be used for development of a professional growth plan (or similar document) or other human resource decisions?			

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Feasibility Standard	Data Collection Procedures: Frequency of Evaluation	Does the state dictate frequency of superintendent evaluation?			
	Data Collection Procedures: Reporting	Does the state maintain a superintendent evaluation process data tracking system? (i.e., Does the state require districts to report superintendent evaluation results to the state?)			

CRITERIA STANDARD (Joint Committee, 1998, 2008)	CRITERIA CATEGORY (DiPaola, 2010; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	CRITERIA INDICATOR (American Institutes for Research, 2018; Jacques, Clifford, & Hornung, 2012)	SCORE		
			Fully Present (1 point)	Partially Present (.5 points)	Not Present (0 points)
Accuracy Standard	Data Collection Procedures: Data Integrity	Does the state mandate that multiple sources of data must be used in the superintendent evaluation process?			
		Does the state assign different weights to different sources of superintendent evaluation data?			
		Does the state mandate a particular form for the superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state identify evaluators for the superintendent evaluation?			
		Does the state mandate that multiple evaluator sources be used in the superintendent evaluation process?			
	Methods for Summarizing Results & System Evaluation	Does the state mandate a process to assess the state-level superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness?			
		Did the state pilot the superintendent evaluation system model process or form?			
		Does the state identify outcomes to determine overall effectiveness of state-level superintendent evaluation system?			
	System Structure: Recognition of District-Specific Demographics	Does the state differentiate between type of district (e.g., rural, urban, suburban) in the superintendent evaluation process?			
		Does the state differentiate between any district demographics in the superintendent evaluation process?			
		Total Score			

APPENDIX B

State	State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Source	Annotations
Alabama	No Policy Found*	State contacted – No response
Alaska	No Policy	A.S. §14.20.149 specifically excludes superintendents from the evaluation system
Arizona	A.R.S. §15-1325	Policy grants local control
Arkansas	No Policy	Ark. Admin. Code 005.16.21-7.0 specifically exempting the superintendent unless the local district elects to include
California	No Policy Found*	Stated contacted – Confirmed no superintendent evaluation policy and decisions left to local districts
Colorado	No Policy	C.S. §22:9-101 et seq. specifically excludes chief executive officers and grants local control
Connecticut	C.G.S. §10-157	Grants significant local control for evaluation components
Delaware	14 Del.C. §1270 14 Del. Admin. Code 108A https://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/377/DPAS%20II%20for%20Administrators%20Guide%20for%20District%20Administrators%20August%202017.pdf https://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib/DE01922744/Centricity/Domain/377/2015_DPAS_II_Guide_for_District_Administrators_Rubric.pdf	
Florida	No Policy Found	F.A.C. 6A-5.030 definition of school administrator does not include superintendent
Georgia	Ga. Code. Ann. §20-2-210 Ga. Comp. R. & Regs.160-5-1-.37	
Hawaii	HRS §302A-1004 http://boe.hawaii.gov/About/Pages/Superintendent-Evaluation-(2017-2018).aspx	Hawaii has one superintendent (statewide district)
Idaho	I.C. §33-320 & I.C. §33-513 IDAPA 08.02.02.121	Statute requires evaluation as part of continuous improvement plans. Specific components outlined in regulations are for administrators not superintendents
Illinois	105 I.L.C.S. 5/10-16.7 105 I.L.C.S. 5/24A-7.1 Historical Note P.A. 96-861 105 I.L.C.S. 5/2-3.53b	Policy is a collection of statutes referencing evaluation procedures
Indiana	No Policy Found*	State contacted – No response
Iowa	6 I.C.A. §284A.1 et seq. Iowa Admin. Code 281-83.8(284A) https://www.educateiowa.gov/pk-12/educator-quality/school-administrator-evaluation file:///C:/Users/tlsch/Desktop/Dissertation/State-Level%20Supt%20Eval%20Policies%20by%20State/Iowa/Superintendent%20Evaluation%20v3%20p48.pdf	

Note. Where no policy was found, the state department of education was contacted, and response indicated.

State	State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Source	Annotations
Kansas	K.S. §72-2407 https://www.ksde.org/Agency/Division-of-Learning-Services/Teacher-Licensure-and-Accreditation/Educator-Evaluations https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Educator%20Eval/Training%20Archives/ANN/KSEdEvalSysHdbk%20-%202016-2017.pdf https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Educator%20Eval/Training%20Archives/ANN/Evaluation%20Requirements.pdf https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Educator%20Eval/Training%20Archives/ANN/Evaluation%20Timeline.pdf https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Educator%20Eval/2016%20Educator%20Performance%20Rating%20Matrix%20.pdf https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/TLA/Educator%20Eval/Training%20Archives/ANN/KEEP%20District%20Leader%20Instructional%20Practice%20Protocol.pdf	
Kentucky	KRS §156.557 704 KAR 3:370	Policy specifics are subject to a locally developed plan, approved by the state
Louisiana	No Policy	Though generally statutes related to professional quality and development apply to all certified administrators and superintendents LSA-R.S. 17:3881 & 17:3901, the provisions of La. Admin Code tit. 28 Pt CXLVII §321 and §905 definitions do not include superintendents
Maine	No Policy Found*	State contacted – Confirmed no policy for superintendents and that educator effectiveness laws apply only to teachers and principals but that districts have the local control to go through regional administrator and school board associations
Maryland	No Policy	M.D. Educ. §2-205 does not include superintendents
Massachusetts	M.G.L.A. 71 §38 603 CMR 35.01 et seq. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/ http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartI.pdf http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/PartVI.pdf http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/faq.html?section=all	603 CMR 35.01 et seq. includes components but references additional standards established by the school committee

Note. Where no policy was found, the state department of education was contacted, and response indicated.

State	State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Source	Annotations
Michigan	M.C.L.A. 380.385 https://www.michigan.gov/mde /0,4615,7-140-5683_75438_78527---,00.html http://gomasa.org/PD/school-advance/	
Minnesota	No Policy Found*	State contacted – Indicated policy required evaluation but only specific competencies developed for principals; researcher could not confirm the existence of state policy evaluation requirement for superintendents
Mississippi	M.S. ST. §37-7-301 Miss. Admin. Code 7-3:14:19	
Missouri	V.A.M.S. 168.410 https://dese.mo.gov/educator-growth-toolbox /model-evaluation-system https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files /00-SuptEvaluation-CompleteDoc.pdf https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files /Guidance-Document-for-the-Implementation-Rubric.pdf https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files /Effective-Evaluation-Implementation-Rubric.pdf https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files /EssentialPrinciplesOverview-July2013.pdf https://dese.mo.gov/sites/default/files /GuidanceforPoliciesandImplementation-July2013.pdf	
Montana	Mont. Admin. R. 10.55.701 https://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files /Professional%20Learning/Docs/EPAS /ModelSuptEvalAlignment.pdf http://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files /Professional%20Learning/Docs/EPAS /SuptModelEvaluationGuide.pdf http://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files /Professional%20Learning/Docs/EPAS /ModelSuptEvaluation_4.pdf http://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files /Professional%20Learning/Docs/EPAS /ModelSuptEvaluation_3.pdf http://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files /Professional%20Learning/Docs/EPAS /ModelSuptEvaluation_2.pdf http://opi.mt.gov/Portals/182/Page%20Files /Professional%20Learning/Docs/EPAS /ModelSuptEvaluation_1.pdf	

Note. Where no policy was found, the state department of education was contacted, and response indicated.

State	State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Source	Annotations
Nebraska	Neb. Rev. St. §79-828 Neb. Admin. R. & Regs. Tit. 92, Ch. 10, § 007	
Nevada	No Policy	34 Nev. St. Chap. 391.465 exempts superintendents
New Hampshire	N.H. Code Admin R. Ed. 303.01	
New Jersey	N.J.S.A. 18A:17-20.3 N.J.A.C. 6A:10-8.1 https://www.njsba.org/services/field-services/onlhttps://www.njsba.org/services/field-services/online-evaluations/ https://www.njsba.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/CSA-Frequently-Asked-Questions-2018.pdf https://www.njsba.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/CSAEval-GuideBook2018.pdfine-evaluations/ https://www.njsba.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/CSA-Frequently-Asked-Questions-2018.pdf https://www.njsba.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/CSAEval-GuideBook2018.pdf	
New Mexico	No Policy Found*	State contacted – Confirmed focus has been on teacher and principal evaluation with superintendent evaluation reserved for future
New York	McKinney's Education Law §2590-e	
North Carolina	N.C.S.G.A. §115C-133 & §143B-146.8 http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/effectiveness-model/ncees/instruments/super-eval-process-sum.pdf http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/effectiveness-model/ncees/instruments/super-eval-manual.pdf https://stateboard.ncpublicschools.gov/policy-manual/evaluations-qualifications/evaluation-standards-and-criteria-superintendents-instructional-central-office-staff-members	Policy limits application of certain elements to superintendents in low performing schools only
North Dakota	N.D.C.C. §15.1-14-03	
Ohio	O.H. ST. R.C. §3319.01 http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Superintendent-Evaluation-System http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Superintendent-Evaluation-System/reducODE2009-SES-FULLv3.pdf.aspx	

Note. Where no policy was found, the state department of education was contacted, and response indicated.

State	State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Source	Annotations
Oklahoma	70 Okl.St. §6-101.10 Okla. Admin. Code 210:35-13-28 and 210:35-3-48 http://sde.ok.gov/sde/criteria-evaluation-effective-teaching-and-administrative-performance	
Oregon	No Policy	O.A.R. §581-027-2410 does not apply to superintendents; State contacted – Confirmed superintendent evaluation is within local control, unless position is a combined principal position with majority time spent as principal
Pennsylvania	24 P.S. §10-1073.1	Specific policy components in regulation do not apply to superintendents
Rhode Island	Gen.Laws 1956 §16-2-9 and 9.1 and 16-2-5.1 https://www.ri-asc.org/professional-development/	Policy requires the Rhode Island College and Rhode Island Association of School Committees to establish training but nothing more specific provided in the guidance documents
South Carolina	S.C. Code 1976 §59-28-160	
South Dakota	No Policy Found*	State contacted – No response
Oklahoma	70 Okl.St. §6-101.10 Okla. Admin. Code 210:35-13-28 and 210:35-3-48 http://sde.ok.gov/sde/criteria-evaluation-effective-teaching-and-administrative-performance	
Tennessee	T.N. St. §42-2-203	
Texas	V.T.C.A. Education Code §11.1513 & 11.1513 19 TAC §150.1031 https://tea.texas.gov/About_TEA/News_and_Multimedia/Correspondence/TAA_Letters/Commissioner_s_Recommended_Appraisal_Process_and_Criteria_For_Superintendents/	Policy exists and offers option but still provides for local control
Utah	No Policy	2012 Utah Laws Ch. 425 specifically excludes the superintendent
Vermont	No Policy	16 V.S.A. §241 does not reference superintendent evaluation; State contacted – Confirmed no policy for superintendent evaluation but that principal rubric may be used by districts within local control and discretion (http://education.vermont.gov/documents/educator-quality-leader-evaluation-review-rubric)

Note. Where no policy was found, the state department of education was contacted, and response indicated.

State	State-Level Superintendent Evaluation Policy Source	Annotations
Virginia	VA Code §22.1-60.1 and 253:13:5 http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/ performance_evaluation/superintendent/index.shtml http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/ performance_evaluation/guidelines_ups_eval_ criteria_superintendents.pdf http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/ performance_evaluation/superintendent/research_ synthesis_of_superintendent_eval.pdf http://www.doe.virginia.gov/administrators/ superintendents_memos/2012/272-12.shtml http://www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/ performance_evaluation/superintendent/ training/index.shtml	
Washington	R.C.W.A. §28.150.230 & §28A.405.100	Policy provides for local control over specific components
West Virginia	W. Va. Code §18-4-6 W. Va. Code St. R. §126-143-4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 https://wvde.state.wv.us/policies/p5309_ne.html http://wvde.state.wv.us/evalwv/summative-evaluation.html http://www.wvsba.org/resources/county-schools-superintendent-evaluation-process-and-procedures	
Wisconsin	Wis. Adm. Code §PI 8.01	Policy applies to all certified personnel
Wyoming	W.S.1977 §21-2-204, 304 2018 WY REG TEXT 497 WY ADC EDU Ch. 29 §1-9	Policy includes emergency regulations adopted June 29, 2018, effective for 120 days
Washington D.C.	D.C. ST. §38-102	

Note. Where no policy was found, the state department of education was contacted, and response indicated.

APPENDIX C

Table C1. *State Listing by Rank Order & Political Culture (States with Policies)*

State	Total Rubric Score	Political Culture
Massachusetts	18.50	Individualistic
Michigan	17.00	Moralistic
Delaware	16.00	Individualistic
New Jersey	14.50	Individualistic
Kansas	14.00	Moralistic
West Virginia	12.50	Traditionalistic
Hawaii	12.00	Individualistic
North Carolina	11.50	Traditionalistic
Virginia	11.50	Traditionalistic
Iowa	11.00	Moralistic
Wyoming	11.00	Individualistic
Mississippi	10.50	Traditionalistic
Missouri	8.50	Individualistic
Montana	8.50	Moralistic
Ohio	7.50	Individualistic
Washington	7.00	Moralistic
Texas	6.50	Traditionalistic
Georgia	6.50	Traditionalistic
Nebraska	5.50	Individualistic
Oklahoma	5.50	Traditionalistic
Idaho	5.00	Moralistic
New York	4.00	Individualistic
Pennsylvania	4.00	Individualistic
Tennessee	4.00	Traditionalistic
Connecticut	3.50	Individualistic
Illinois	3.50	Individualistic
North Dakota	3.00	Moralistic
Kentucky	2.50	Traditionalistic
New Hampshire	2.00	Moralistic
Rhode Island	2.00	Individualistic
South Carolina	2.00	Traditionalistic
Washington D.C.	2.00	Individualistic
Wisconsin	2.00	Moralistic
Arizona	1.50	Traditionalistic

Note. Political culture is defined by Elazar (1966, 1972) and Fowler (2013)

Table C2. *State Listing by Rank Order & Political Culture (States without Policies)*

State	Lack of Identified Policy	Political Culture
Alabama	--	Traditionalistic
Alaska	--	Individualistic
Arkansas	--	Traditionalistic
California	--	Moralistic
Colorado	--	Moralistic
Florida	--	Traditionalistic
Indiana	--	Individualistic
Louisiana	--	Traditionalistic
Maine	--	Moralistic
Maryland	--	Individualistic
Minnesota	--	Moralistic
Nevada	--	Individualistic
New Mexico	--	Traditionalistic
Oregon	--	Moralistic
South Dakota	--	Moralistic
Utah	--	Moralistic
Vermont	--	Moralistic

Note. Political culture is defined by Elazar (1966, 1972) and Fowler (2013)

APPENDIX D

Rubric Scores for the Propriety Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Evaluators)

Indicator A: Does the state mandate exclusion of evaluators who may have a conflict of interest within the superintendent process?
Indicator B: Does the state mandate training for evaluators in conducting a superintendent evaluation?
Indicator C: Does the state mandate any additional oversight to ensure evaluators implement the superintendent evaluation system with fidelity?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)		
State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Indicator C
Alabama	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	0
Arkansas	-	-	-
California	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	0	0
Delaware	0	1	1
Florida	-	-	-
Georgia	0	1	0
Hawaii	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0
Indiana	-	-	-
Iowa	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	1
Kentucky	0	0	0
Louisiana	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-
Massachusetts	0	1	1
Michigan	0	1	1
Minnesota	-	-	-
Mississippi	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	0

Rubric Scores for the Propriety Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Evaluators)

Indicator A: Does the state mandate exclusion of evaluators who may have a conflict of interest within the superintendent process?
Indicator B: Does the state mandate training for evaluators in conducting a superintendent evaluation?
Indicator C: Does the state mandate any additional oversight to ensure evaluators implement the superintendent evaluation system with fidelity?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)		
State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Indicator C
Nebraska	0	0	1
Nevada	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	1	.5
New Mexico	-	-	-
New York	0	0	1
North Carolina	0	1	0
North Dakota	0	0	0
Ohio	0	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0	0
Oregon	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	0	0
Rhode Island	0	1	0
South Carolina	0	0	0
South Dakota	-	-	-
Tennessee	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0
Utah	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-
Virginia	0	1	0
Washington	0	0	1
West Virginia	0	1	1
Wisconsin	0	0	0
Wyoming	0	.5	1
Washington D.C.	0	0	0

Rubric Scores for the Propriety Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Stakeholder Involvement & Communication)

Indicator D: Does the state require or permit involvement of professional educational associations in development of the superintendent evaluation policy?
Indicator D Follow-up 1: If so, which professional educational associations are involved (e.g. national or administrator associations: national or state school boards associations)?
Indicator D Follow-up 2: If so, what roles do professional educational associations play, advisory or authoritative?
Indicator E: Does the state require or permit non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation?

State	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)			
	Indicator D	Indicator D Follow-up 1	Indicator D Follow-up 2	Indicator E
Alabama	-	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0	-	-	.5
Arkansas	-	-	-	-
California	-	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	-	-	.5
Delaware	0	-	-	.5
Florida	-	-	-	-
Georgia	0	-	-	0
Hawaii	0	-	-	1
Idaho	0	-	-	0
Illinois	0	-	-	.5
Indiana	-	-	-	-
Iowa	.5	Iowa Association of School Boards; School Administrators of Iowa; The Wallace Foundation	Advisory	.5
Kansas	.5	Unions; College & University representatives	Advisory	.5
Kentucky	0	-	-	0
Louisiana	-	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	.5	Unions; Massachusetts Association of School Superintendents; Massachusetts Association of School Committees; Massachusetts Elementary Principals Association (comments); Massachusetts Secondary School Administrators Association (comments)	Advisory	1
Michigan	.5	ISLLC; National Association of Secondary School Principals; National Association of Elementary School Principals; Midcontinent Research for Education and Learning; Marzano Research Labs; Vanderbilt; Leadership Learning Center	Advisory	1
Minnesota	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	1	Mississippi School Boards Association	Authoritative	1
Missouri	.5	-	-	0
Montana	0	-	-	.5

Rubric Scores for the Propriety Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Stakeholder Involvement & Communication)

Indicator D: Does the state require or permit involvement of professional educational associations in development of the superintendent evaluation policy?
Indicator D Follow-up 1: If so, which professional educational associations are involved (e.g. national or administrator associations: national or state school boards associations)?
Indicator D Follow-up 2: If so, what roles do professional educational associations play, advisory or authoritative?
Indicator E: Does the state require or permit non-board member stakeholder participation in the superintendent evaluation?

State	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)			
	Indicator D	Indicator D Follow-up 1	Indicator D follow-up 2	Indicator E
Nebraska	0	-	-	0
Nevada	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	-	-	0
New Jersey	1	New Jersey School Boards Association; Consultant	Authoritative (NJSBA); Advisory (Consultant)	1
New Mexico	-	-	-	-
New York	0	-	-	0
North Carolina	0	-	-	1
North Dakota	0	-	-	0
Ohio	.5	Buckeye Association of School Administrators; Ohio School Boards Association	Authoritative	.5
Oklahoma	0	-	-	0
Oregon	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	-	-	0
Rhode Island	0	-	-	0
South Carolina	0	-	-	0
South Dakota	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	0	-	-	0
Texas	0	-	-	1
Utah	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-
Virginia	.5	American Association of School Administrators; National School Boards Association	Advisory	1
Washington	0	-	-	0
West Virginia	1	West Virginia School Boards Association; West Virginia Association of School Administrators	Authoritative (WVSBA) & Advisory (WVASA)	.5
Wisconsin	0	-	-	0
Wyoming	0	-	-	0
Washington D.C.	0	-	-	0

Rubric Scores for the Propriety Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Methods for Using Results)

Indicator F: Does the state mandate confidentiality or public disclosure of the superintendent evaluation?

State	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	State	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)
	Indicator F		Indicator F
Alabama	-	Nebraska	0
Alaska	-	Nevada	-
Arizona	0	New Hampshire	0
Arkansas	-	New Jersey	1
California	-	New Mexico	-
Colorado	-	New York	0
Connecticut	1	North Carolina	0
Delaware	0	North Dakota	0
Florida	-	Ohio	0
Georgia	1	Oklahoma	0
Hawaii	1	Oregon	-
Idaho	0	Pennsylvania	.5
Illinois	1	Rhode Island	0
Indiana	-	South Carolina	0
Iowa	0	South Dakota	-
Kansas	1	Tennessee	0
Kentucky	1	Texas	0
Louisiana	-	Utah	-
Maine	-	Vermont	-
Maryland	-	Virginia	0
Massachusetts	1	Washington	1
Michigan	1	West Virginia	1
Minnesota	-	Wisconsin	0
Mississippi	0	Wyoming	0
Missouri	1	Washington D.C.	0
Montana	1		

APPENDIX E

Rubric Scores for the Utility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Evaluation Goals & Purposes)

Indicator A: Does the state identify a goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation?
Indicator A Follow-up: If so, what does the state identify as its goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation (e.g. accountability, Every Student Succeeds Act, coherence with preparation and licensure, coherence with locally developed goals and purposes)?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	
State	Indicator A	Indicator A Follow-up
Alabama	-	-
Alaska	-	-
Arizona	0	-
Arkansas	-	-
California	-	-
Colorado	-	-
Connecticut	0	-
Delaware	1	Educators' professional growth; Continuous improvement of student outcomes; Effective educators in every school building and classroom
Florida	-	-
Georgia	0	-
Hawaii	1	Assess performance on five professional standards; Progress in meeting annual priorities; Feedback from internal and external stakeholders (not included in performance rating); Promote effectiveness and professional growth; Setting expectations
Idaho	.5	School improvement (implied because incorporate evaluation of performance into school improvement plans); Strengths and weaknesses of performance and areas of improvement
Illinois	0	-
Indiana	-	-
Iowa	1	Defines expectations; Enhances communication; Prioritizes district goals; Supports board of education in holding superintendents accountable for student achievement
Kansas	1	Rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluations
Kentucky	0	-
Louisiana	-	-
Maine	-	-
Maryland	-	-
Massachusetts	1	Promote student learning growth and achievement; Feedback for improvement; Opportunity for professional growth; Record of facts for personnel decisions; Clear structures for accountability
Michigan	1	Central role in high quality instruction; Enable and enhance professional learning communities; Manage resources and communicate; Provide guiding principles
Minnesota	-	-
Mississippi	1	Measure how well the district meets major goals; Ensure management systems are in place; Ensure smooth and effective operations
Missouri	.5	Develop good board and superintendent relations; Promotes professional growth; Provides clarity of roles; Creates common understanding of leadership; Promotes accountability; Student achievement (identified as benefits of evaluation not necessarily goals)
Montana	1	Professional growth; Continuous improvement; Quality assurance

Rubric Scores for the Utility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Evaluation Goals & Purposes)

Indicator A: Does the state identify a goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation?
Indicator A Follow-up: If so, what does the state identify as its goal or purpose for superintendent evaluation (e.g. accountability, Every Student Succeeds Act, coherence with preparation and licensure, coherence with locally developed goals and purposes)?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	
State	Indicator A	Indicator A Follow-up
Nebraska	1	Improve student learning; Provide clear, equitable, and systematic procedures
Nevada	-	-
New Hampshire	0	-
New Jersey	1	Promote professional excellence and improve the skills of the chief school administrator; Improve the quality of the education received by the students served by the public schools; Provide a basis for the review of the chief school administrator's performance
New Mexico	-	-
New York	0	-
North Carolina	1	Formative growth; Data-driven decision-making; Professional development; Alignment with licensure and preparation programs
North Dakota	0	-
Ohio	.5	Ongoing and comprehensive system of accountability and assessment; Customize learning and professional growth; Focus on most effective part of practice (identified as benefits of evaluation not necessarily goals)
Oklahoma	1	Reflection; Professional growth
Oregon	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	-
Rhode Island	0	-
South Carolina	0	-
South Dakota	-	-
Tennessee	0	-
Texas	0	-
Utah	-	-
Vermont	-	-
Virginia	1	Assessing and improving performance; Advancing effectiveness; Improving board and superintendent communications; Targeting tool for focus on student learning; Clarifying superintendents role; Continuous improvement; Improve planning; Collective accountability; Inform expectations; Personnel decisions; Aid in professional development; Fulfill legal obligations
Washington	0	-
West Virginia	0	-
Wisconsin	0	-
Wyoming	1	Improve district leader quality; Part of accountability and student achievement; Professional growth and capacity building
Washington D.C.	0	-

Rubric Scores for the Utility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Selected Performance Criteria and Measures)

Indicator B: Does the state mandate particular superintendent evaluation criteria or components?
Indicator C: Do the mandated criteria or components directly name any existing professional educational standards or reflect at least 75% of any existing professional educational standards even if such standards are not directly named?
Indicator C Follow-up: If so, which professional educational standards are specifically referenced (e.g. AASA, NSBA, PSEL, state-developed standards)?
Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluation components that specifically reference the goals or purpose for superintendent evaluation?
Indicator E: Does the state mandate inclusion of student performance measures in the superintendent evaluation?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)				
State	Indicator B	Indicator C	Indicator C Follow-up	Indicator D	Indicator E
Alabama	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	-	0	0
Arkansas	-	-	-	-	-
California	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	0	-	0	0
Delaware	1	1	Delaware Administrator Standards which are aligned to PSEL standards	1	1
Florida	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	0	0	-	0	0
Hawaii	1	1	AASA; New York State School Boards Association; Oregon School Boards Association	1	.5
Idaho	.5	0	-	0	.5
Illinois	1	0	-	0	0
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	1	1	Iowa Standards for School Leaders which substantially incorporates PSEL standards though not directly named	1	1
Kansas	1	1	Kansas Educator Evaluation Protocol criteria which substantially incorporates AASA standards though not directly named	1	.5
Kentucky	0	0	-	0	0
Louisiana	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	1	1	AASA (not directly named)	1	1
Michigan	0	0	-	0	1
Minnesota	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	1	1	NSBA (not directly named)	.5	.5
Missouri	.5	.5	Educational Leadership Constituent Council (PSEL)	.5	.5
Montana	.5	1	PSEL	.5	0

Rubric Scores for the Utility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Selected Performance Criteria and Measures)

Indicator B: Does the state mandate particular superintendent evaluation criteria or components?
Indicator C: Do the mandated criteria or components directly name any existing professional educational standards or reflect at least 75% of any existing professional educational standards even if such standards are not directly named?
Indicator C Follow-up: If so, which professional educational standards are specifically referenced (e.g. AASA, NSBA, PSEL, state-developed standards)?
Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluation components that specifically reference the goals or purpose for superintendent evaluation?
Indicator E: Does the state mandate inclusion of student performance measures in the superintendent evaluation?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)				
State	Indicator B	Indicator C	Indicator C Follow-up	Indicator D	Indicator E
Nebraska	1	0	-	0	0
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0	-	0	0
New Jersey	1	0	-	1	1
New Mexico	-	-	-	-	-
New York	0	0	-	0	0
North Carolina	.5	1	North Carolina Evaluation Standards and Criteria which is based on McREL	.5	.5
North Dakota	0	0	-	0	0
Ohio	.5	0	-	.5	.5
Oklahoma	1	0	-	0	0
Oregon	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	1	0	-	0	.5
Rhode Island	0	0	-	0	0
South Carolina	1	0	-	0	0
South Dakota	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	1	0	-	0	1
Texas	1	0	-	0	1
Utah	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	1	1	AASA	.5	1
Washington	1	0	-	0	0
West Virginia	1	0	-	0	1
Wisconsin	0	0	-	0	0
Wyoming	1	1	Wyoming Standards for District Leaders which substantially incorporates PSEL standards though not directly identified	0	1
Washington D.C.	0	0	-	0	0

Rubric Scores for the Utility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Methods for Using Results)

Indicator F: Does the state mandate or permit superintendent contractual provisions based upon evaluation results?
Indicator G: Does the state mandate or permit evaluation results to be used for development of a professional growth plan (or similar document) or other human resource decisions?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	
State	Indicator F	Indicator G
Alabama	-	-
Alaska	-	-
Arizona	0	0
Arkansas	-	-
California	-	-
Colorado	-	-
Connecticut	0	0
Delaware	0	1
Florida	-	-
Georgia	1	1
Hawaii	.5	1
Idaho	1	.5
Illinois	0	0
Indiana	-	-
Iowa	0	1
Kansas	1	.5
Kentucky	0	0
Louisiana	-	-
Maine	-	-
Maryland	-	-
Massachusetts	.5	.5
Michigan	1	1
Minnesota	-	-
Mississippi	0	.5
Missouri	0	.5
Montana	0	.5

Rubric Scores for the Utility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Methods for Using Results)

Indicator F: Does the state mandate or permit superintendent contractual provisions based upon evaluation results?
Indicator G: Does the state mandate or permit evaluation results to be used for development of a professional growth plan (or similar document) or other human resource decisions?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	
State	Indicator F	Indicator G
Nebraska	0	.5
Nevada	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0
New Jersey	1	1
New Mexico	-	-
New York	0	0
North Carolina	0	.5
North Dakota	0	1
Ohio	1	.5
Oklahoma	0	.5
Oregon	-	-
Pennsylvania	1	0
Rhode Island	0	0
South Carolina	0	0
South Dakota	-	-
Tennessee	0	0
Texas	0	0
Utah	-	-
Vermont	-	-
Virginia	0	.5
Washington	0	0
West Virginia	1	1
Wisconsin	0	0
Wyoming	0	1
Washington D.C.	0	0

APPENDIX F

Rubric Scores for the Feasibility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Frequency of Evaluation)

Indicator A: Does the state dictate frequency of superintendent evaluation?

State	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	State	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)
	Indicator A		Indicator A
Alabama	-	Nebraska	1
Alaska	-	Nevada	-
Arizona	0	New Hampshire	1
Arkansas	-	New Jersey	1
California	-	New Mexico	-
Colorado	-	New York	1
Connecticut	1	North Carolina	1
Delaware	1	North Dakota	1
Florida	-	Ohio	.5
Georgia	1	Oklahoma	1
Hawaii	1	Oregon	-
Idaho	1	Pennsylvania	0
Illinois	0	Rhode Island	0
Indiana	-	South Carolina	0
Iowa	1	South Dakota	-
Kansas	1	Tennessee	1
Kentucky	0	Texas	1
Louisiana	-	Utah	-
Maine	-	Vermont	-
Maryland	-	Virginia	1
Massachusetts	1	Washington	1
Michigan	1	West Virginia	1
Minnesota	-	Wisconsin	0
Mississippi	1	Wyoming	1
Missouri	.5	Washington D.C.	1
Montana	1		

Rubric Scores for the Feasibility Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Reporting)

Indicator B: Does the state maintain a superintendent process data tracking system? (i.e., Does the state require districts to report superintendent evaluation results to the state?)

State	**Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)**	**State**	**Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)**
	Indicator B		Indicator B
Alabama	-	Nebraska	0
Alaska	-	Nevada	-
Arizona	0	New Hampshire	0
Arkansas	-	New Jersey	0
California	-	New Mexico	-
Colorado	-	New York	1
Connecticut	0	North Carolina	0
Delaware	1	North Dakota	0
Florida	-	Ohio	0
Georgia	0	Oklahoma	0
Hawaii	0	Oregon	-
Idaho	0	Pennsylvania	0
Illinois	0	Rhode Island	0
Indiana	-	South Carolina	0
Iowa	0	South Dakota	-
Kansas	0	Tennessee	0
Kentucky	0	Texas	0
Louisiana	-	Utah	-
Maine	-	Vermont	-
Maryland	-	Virginia	0
Massachusetts	1	Washington	1
Michigan	1	West Virginia	0
Minnesota	-	Wisconsin	0
Mississippi	0	Wyoming	0
Missouri	0	Washington D.C.	0
Montana	0		

APPENDIX G

Rubric Scores for the Accuracy Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Data Integrity)

Indicator A: Does the state mandate that multiple sources of data must be used in the superintendent process?
Indicator B: Does the state assign different weights to different sources of superintendent evaluation data?
Indicator C: Does the state mandate a particular form for the superintendent evaluation?
Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluators for the superintendent evaluation?
Indicator E: Does the state mandate that multiple evaluator sources be used in the superintendent process?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)				
State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Indicator C	Indicator D	Indicator E
Alabama	-	-	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	0	1	0
Arkansas	-	-	-	-	-
California	-	-	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	0	0	1	0
Delaware	1	0	1	1	.5
Florida	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	0	0	.5	1	0
Hawaii	.5	0	.5	1	1
Idaho	0	0	0	1	0
Illinois	0	0	0	1	0
Indiana	-	-	-	-	-
Iowa	1	0	.5	1	.5
Kansas	1	0	0	1	1
Kentucky	0	0	0	1	0
Louisiana	-	-	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-
Massachusetts	1	0	.5	1	1
Michigan	1	0	1	1	1
Minnesota	-	-	-	-	-
Mississippi	.5	0	.5	1	1
Missouri	.5	0	.5	1	.5
Montana	0	0	.5	1	1

Rubric Scores for the Accuracy Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Data Collection Procedures: Data Integrity)

Indicator A: Does the state mandate that multiple sources of data must be used in the superintendent process?
Indicator B: Does the state assign different weights to different sources of superintendent evaluation data?
Indicator C: Does the state mandate a particular form for the superintendent evaluation?
Indicator D: Does the state identify evaluators for the superintendent evaluation?
Indicator E: Does the state mandate that multiple evaluator sources be used in the superintendent process?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)				
State	Indicator A	Indicator B	Indicator C	Indicator D	Indicator E
Nebraska	0	0	0	1	0
Nevada	-	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0	0	1	0
New Jersey	.5	0	.5	1	1
New Mexico	-	-	-	-	-
New York	0	0	0	1	0
North Carolina	.5	0	1	1	1
North Dakota	0	0	0	1	0
Ohio	.5	0	.5	1	.5
Oklahoma	0	0	0	1	0
Oregon	-	-	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	1	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0	1	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	1	0
South Dakota	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	0	0	0	1	0
Texas	0	0	.5	1	1
Utah	-	-	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	1	0	.5	1	.5
Washington	0	0	0	1	0
West Virginia	0	0	.5	1	.5
Wisconsin	1	0	0	1	0
Wyoming	1	0	.5	1	0
Washington D.C.	0	0	0	1	0

Rubric Scores for the Accuracy Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Methods for Summarizing Results & System Evaluations)

Indicator F: Does the state mandate a process to assess the state-level superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness?
Indicator G: Did the state pilot the superintendent evaluation system model process or form?
Indicator H: Does the state identify outcomes to determine overall effectiveness of state-level superintendent evaluation system?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)		
State	Indicator F	Indicator G	Indicator H
Alabama	-	-	-
Alaska	-	-	-
Arizona	0	0	0
Arkansas	-	-	-
California	-	-	-
Colorado	-	-	-
Connecticut	0	0	0
Delaware	1	0	1
Florida	-	-	-
Georgia	0	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0
Indiana	-	-	-
Iowa	0	0	0
Kansas	1	0	0
Kentucky	.5	0	0
Louisiana	-	-	-
Maine	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-
Massachusetts	1	1	0
Michigan	1	1	.5
Minnesota	-	-	-
Mississippi	0	0	0
Missouri	0	.5	0
Montana	0	0	0

Rubric Scores for the Accuracy Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(Methods for Summarizing Results & System Evaluations)

Indicator F: Does the state mandate a process to assess the state-level superintendent evaluation system's effectiveness?
Indicator G: Did the state pilot the superintendent evaluation system model process or form?
Indicator H: Does the state identify outcomes to determine overall effectiveness of state-level superintendent evaluation system?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)		
State	Indicator F	Indicator G	Indicator H
Nebraska	0	0	0
Nevada	-	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0	0
New Jersey	0	0	0
New Mexico	-	-	-
New York	0	0	0
North Carolina	0	0	0
North Dakota	0	0	0
Ohio	0	0	0
Oklahoma	1	0	0
Oregon	-	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0
South Dakota	-	-	-
Tennessee	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0
Utah	-	-	-
Vermont	-	-	-
Virginia	0	0	0
Washington	1	0	0
West Virginia	1	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0	0
Wyoming	1	0	0
Washington D.C.	0	0	0

Rubric Scores for the Accuracy Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(System Structure: Recognition of District-Specific Demographics)

Indicator I: Does the state differentiate between type of district (e.g. rural, urban, suburban) in the superintendent evaluation process?
Indicator J: Does the state differentiate between any district demographics in the superintendent evaluation process?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	
State	Indicator I	Indicator J
Alabama	-	-
Alaska	-	-
Arizona	0	0
Arkansas	-	-
California	-	-
Colorado	-	-
Connecticut	0	0
Delaware	0	0
Florida	-	-
Georgia	0	0
Hawaii	0	0
Idaho	0	0
Illinois	0	0
Indiana	-	-
Iowa	0	0
Kansas	0	0
Kentucky	0	0
Louisiana	-	-
Maine	-	-
Maryland	-	-
Massachusetts	0	.5
Michigan	0	0
Minnesota	-	-
Mississippi	0	0
Missouri	.5	0
Montana	0	0

Rubric Scores for the Accuracy Standard: State-Level Superintendent Evaluation
(System Structure: Recognition of District-Specific Demographics)

Indicator I: Does the state differentiate between type of district (e.g. rural, urban, suburban) in the superintendent evaluation process?
Indicator J: Does the state differentiate between any district demographics in the superintendent evaluation process?

	Rubric Scores (1=Fully Present .5=Partially Present 0=Not Present)	
State	Indicator I	Indicator J
Nebraska	0	0
Nevada	-	-
New Hampshire	0	0
New Jersey	0	0
New Mexico	-	-
New York	0	0
North Carolina	0	1
North Dakota	0	0
Ohio	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0
Oregon	-	-
Pennsylvania	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0
South Carolina	0	0
South Dakota	-	-
Tennessee	0	0
Texas	0	0
Utah	-	-
Vermont	-	-
Virginia	0	0
Washington	0	0
West Virginia	0	0
Wisconsin	0	0
Wyoming	0	0
Washington D.C.	0	0

APPENDIX H

Crosstabs

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
State Category * Political Culture	51	100.0%	0	0.0%	51	100.0%

State Category * Political Culture Crosstabulation

			Political Culture			
			Traditionalistic	Moralistic	Individualistic	Total
State Category	Top 25%	Count	4	4	6	14
		Expected Count	4.4	4.7	4.9	14.0
	Top 50%	Count	4	2	6	12
		Expected Count	3.8	4.0	4.2	12.0
	Below 50% with Policy	Count	3	3	2	8
		Expected Count	2.5	2.7	2.8	8.0
	No Policy	Count	5	8	4	17
		Expected Count	5.3	5.7	6.0	17.0
Total		Count	16	17	18	51
		Expected Count	16.0	17.0	18.0	51.0

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.133[a]	6	.659
Likelihood Ratio	4.267	6	.641
Linear-by-Linear Association	.734	1	.391
N of Valid Cases	51		

a. 9 cells (75.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.51.

Symmetric Measures

		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Contingency Coefficient	.274	.659
N of Valid Cases		51	

FOOTNOTES

[1] Although AASA conducted a 2015 mid-decade update, the 2015 survey focused on the role of the superintendent and superintendent perceptions compared by gender and school enrollment (Finnan et al., 2015). The 2015 update did not report survey results regarding the superintendent evaluation process.

[2] While DiPaola and Stronge identified less than 17 states without policies or guidance, this does not indicate that states have repealed their policies. DiPaola and Stronge defined policy more broadly than this research study to include AASA and NSBA guidance regardless of whether such guidance was explicitly adopted by the state administrative education agency. Whereas this study limited the definition of policy to only include guidance explicitly adopted by the state administrative agency, thus, perhaps, broadening the number of states that did not meet this research study's policy definition.

REFERENCES

Alsbury, T. L. (2008). School board member and superintendent turnover and the influence on student achievement: An application of dissatisfaction theory. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 7,* 202-229. doi:10.1080/15700760701748428

American Association of School Administrators. (1980). *Evaluating the superintendent*. Arlington, VA: Author.

American Association of School Administrators. (1993). *Professional standards for superintendents*. Arlington, VA: Author.

American Association of School Administrators. (2007). Study of the American superintendency: 2006 mid-decade update. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/content.aspx?id=8392

American Association of School Administrators. (2018). *About AASA* [webpage]. Retrieved from http://aasa.org/About-AASA/

American Institutes for Research. (2018). *Databases on state teacher and principal evaluation policies* [webpage]. Retrieved from http://resource.tqsource.org /stateevaldb/

Aragon, S., Griffith, M., Wixom, M. A., Woods, J., & Workman, E. (2016). *ESSA: Quick guides on top issues*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from https://www.ecs.org/essa-quick-guides-on-top-issues/

Basic Health and Human Services Policy for Protection of Human Research Subjects, 45 C.F.R. 46 (2018).

Baumgartner, F. R., & Leech, B. L. (1998). *Basic interest: The importance of groups in politics and in political science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Björk, L. G., Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Kowalski, T. J. (2014). The superintendent and educational reform in the United States of America. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 13*, 444-465. doi:10.1080/15700763.2014.945656

Björk, L. G., & Gurley, D. K. (2005). Superintendent as educational statements and political strategist. In L. G. Björk & T. J. Kowalski, T. J. (Eds.), *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice, and development* (pp. 45-69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Björk, L. G., Kowalski, T. J., & Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2005). Learning theory and research. In L. G. Björk & T. J. Kowalski, T. J. (Eds.), *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice, and development* (pp. 71-106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Björk, L. G., Kowalski, T. J., & Young, M. D. (2005). National education reform reports. In L. G. Björk & T. J. Kowalski, T. J. (Eds.), *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice, and development* (pp. 45-69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Borba, A. L. (2010). *The superintendent's evaluation: Bridging the gap from theory to practice*. Retrieved from http://aasa.org/content.aspx?id=12766

Boyd, W. L. (1976). The public, the professionals, and educational policy making: Who governs? *Teachers College Record, 77*, 539-577.

Bredeson, P. V., & Kose, B. W. (2007). Responding to the education reform agenda: A study of school superintendents' instructional leadership. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 15*(5), 2-23.

Brown, T., Swenson, S., & Hertz, K. (2007*).* Identifying the relative strength in Glasser's 5 basic needs in school superintendents. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, *3*(4), 5-11.

Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Glass, T. E. (2005). Superintendent as organizational manager. In L. G. Björk & T. J. Kowalski, T. J. (Eds.), *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice, and development* (pp. 137-161). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Callahan, R. E. (1966). *The superintendent of schools: A historical analysis.* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED0104410)

Callan, M. F., & Levinson, W. (2011). *Achieving success for new and aspiring superintendents: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Canole, M., & Young, M. (2013). *Standards for educational leaders: An analysis*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Cohen, D. K., Spillane, J. P., & Peurach, D. J. (2018). The dilemmas of educational reform. *Educational Researcher*, *47*, p. 204-212. doi:10.3102/0013189X17743488

Costa, E. W., II. (2004). Performance-based evaluations for superintendents: Combining formative and summative approaches to address procedures, policies, and products. *School Administrator*, *61*(9). Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=10250

Davis, S., Erickson, D. E., Kinsey, G. W., Moore-Steward, T., Padover, W., …, & Wise, D. (2010). Reforming the California public school licensure system through the alignment of research, policy, and practice: Policy perspectives and

recommendations from the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA). *CAPEA Education Leadership and Administration, 22,* 66-82.

Dillon, R. R., & Halliwell, J. W. (1991). Superintendents' and school board presidents' perceptions of the purposes, strengths and weaknesses of formal superintendent evaluations. *Journal of School Leadership, 1,* 328-337.

DiPaola, M. F. (2007). Revisiting superintendent evaluation. *School Administrator, 64*(6).

DiPaola, M. F. (2010). *Evaluating the superintendent* [White paper]. Retrieved from American Association of School Administrators website: http://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Resources/AASA_White_Paper_on_Superintendent_Evaluation.pdf

DiPaola, M. F., & Stronge, J. H. (2001a). Credible evaluation: Not yet state-of-the-art. *School Administrator, 58*(2), 18-21.

DiPaola, M. F., & Stronge, J. H. (2001b). Superintendent evaluation in a standards-based environment: A status report from the states. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 15,* 97-110.

DiPaola, M. F., & Stronge, J. H. (2003). *Superintendent evaluation handbook*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Drisko, J., & Maschi, T. (2015). *Content analysis*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Eadie, D. (2004). CEO-centric evaluation: Turning superintendent assessment into a more powerful tool of partnership with the board. *School Administrator, 61*(9), 10-13.

Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Elazar, D. J. (1966). *American federalism: A view from the states*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Elazar, D. J. (1972). *American federalism: A view from the states* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Elazar, D. J. (1984). *American federalism: A view from the states* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, 20 U.S.C. §6301 et seq. (2015).

Finnan, L. A., McCord, R. S., Stream, C. C., Mattocks, T. C., Peterson, G. J., & Ellerson, N. M. (2015). *Study of the American superintendent: 2015 mid-decade update*. Alexandria, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Fowler, F. C. (2013). *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Fullan, M. M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fusarelli, L. D., Cooper, B. S., & Carella, V. A. (2002). Dilemmas of the modern superintendency. In B. S. Cooper & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *The promises and perils facing today's school superintendent* (pp. 5-20). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Glasman, N. S., & Fuller, J. (2002). Superintendent evaluation: Concepts, practices, and an outcome-related case. In B. S. Cooper & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *The promises*

and perils facing today's school superintendent (pp. 133-152). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Glass, J. (2014). 7 design principles for superintendent evaluations: A framework for constructing fair, high standards for accountability. *District Administration.* Retrieved from https://www.districtadministration.com/article/7-design-principles-superintendent-evaluations

Glass, T. (2007). Superintendent evaluation: What AASA's study discovered. *School Administrator*, *64*(6). Retrieved from http://aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorIssue.aspx?id=3840

Glass, T. E., Björk, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). *The superintendency 2000: America's education leaders in the new millennium*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Goens, G. A. (2009). Evaluating the superintendent. *The American School Board Journal*, *9*(196), 24-26.

Goldring, E., Porter, A. C., Murphy, J., & Elliott, S. (2009). Assessing learning-centered leadership: connections to research, professional standards, and current practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*(1), 1–36.

Gore, P. (2013). Washington standards-based superintendent evaluation. Retrieved from Washington State School Directors' Association website: http://www.wssda.org/Portals/0/Sup%20Eval%20Initiative/Superintendent%20Evaluation%20Framework%20(V9%205%2013).pdf

Grady, M. L., & Bryant, M. T. (1989). Critical incidents between superintendents and school boards: Implications for practice. *Planning and Changing*, *20*, 206–214.

Griffiths, D. E. (1966). *The school superintendent*. New York, NY: Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement.

Grissom, J. A., Blissett, R. S. L., & Mitani, H. (2018). Evaluating school principals: Supervisor ratings of principal practice and principal job performance. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *40*, 446-472. doi:10.3102/0162373718783883

Hall, D., & McHenry-Sorber, E. (2017). Politics first: Examining the practices of the multi-district superintendent. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 25*(82), 1-25. doi:10.14507/epaa.25.2934

Harris, P., & Smith, B. M. (2011). *The myths of standardized tests: Why they don't tell you what you think they do*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hendricks, S. (2013). Evaluating the superintendent: The role of the school board. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review*, *14*(3), 62-72.

Henrikson, R. (2018). Superintendent evaluation frameworks for continuous school improvement: Using evidence-based practices to promote the stance of improvement. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, *15*(1), 22-29.

Herman, R., Gates, S. M., Chavez-Herrerias, E. R., & Harris, M. (2016). *School leadership interventions under the Every Student Succeeds Act* [Research report]. Retrieved from RAND Corporation website: https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1500/RR1550/RAND_RR1550.pdf

Holliday, T. K. (2013). Tying superintendent performance to teachers, principals. *School Administrator*, *70*(7), 12-13.

Hoyle, J. R., Bjork, L. G., Collier, V., & Glass, T. (2005). *The superintendent as CEO: Standards-based performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoyle, J., English, F., & Steffy, B. (1990). *Skills for successful school leaders: Why are some administrators more successful than others?* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Hoyle, J., & Skrla, L. (1999). The politics of superintendent evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13*(4), 405-419.

IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 24.0, Released 2016) [Computer software]. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

Jacques, C., Clifford, M., & Hornung, K. (2012). *Principal evaluation policy landscape: A survey of state policies*. Washington, DC: Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.

Jimenez, L., & Sargrad, S. (2017). *A new vision for school accountability* [Report]. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Johnstone, C., Dikkers, A. G., & Luedeke, A. (2009). Educational leadership in the era of accountability. *Educational Considerations, 36*(2), 14-18.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1988). *The personnel evaluation standards*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (2009). *The personnel evaluation standards* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jones, K., & Howley, A. (2009). Contextual influences on superintendents' time usage. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 17*(23), 1-24.

Keedy, J. L., & Björk, L. G. (2002). Superintendents and local boards and the potential for community polarization: The call for use of political strategist skills. In B. S. Cooper & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *The promises and perils facing today's school superintendent* (pp. 103-127). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Kowalski, T. J. (2005). Evolution of the school district superintendent position. In L. G. Björk & T. J. Kowalski (Eds.), *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice, and development* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kowalski, T. J., & Glass, T. E. (2002). Preparing superintendents in the 21st century. In B. S. Cooper & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *The promises and perils facing today's school superintendent* (pp. 41-59). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Kowalski, T. J., McCord, R. S., Peterson, G. J., Young, I. P., & Ellerson, N. M. (2011). *The American school superintendent 2010 decennial study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Kraft, M. E., & Furlong, S. R. (2018). *Public policy: Politics, analysis, and alternatives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press.

Krippendorff, K. (2013). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Learning Forward. (2017). *A new vision for professional learning: A toolkit to help states advance learning and improvement systems*. Retrieved from https://learningforward.org/docs/default-source/getinvolved/essa/essanewvisiontoolkit

Louis, K. S., Thomas, E., Gordon, M. F., & Febey, K. S. (2008). State leadership for school improvement: An analysis of three states. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*, 562-591. doi:10.1177/0013161X08323858

Maranto, R., Trivitt, J., Nichols, M., & Watson, A. (2017). No contractual obligation to improve education: School boards and their superintendents. *Politics & Policy, 45*, 1003-1023.

Marshall, C., Mitchell, D., & Wirt, F. (1986). The context of state-level policy formation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *8*, 347-378.

Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Mayo, C. R., & McCartney, G. P. (2004). School superintendents' evaluations: Effective and results-based? *ERS Spectrum*, *22*(1), 19-33.

McDonnell, L . M., & Elmore, R . F. (1987). Getting the job done: Alternative policy instruments. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *9*(2), 133-152.

McGuinn, P. (2012). Stimulating reform: Race to the Top, competitive grants and the Obama education agenda. *Educational Policy*, *26*, 136-159. doi:10.1177/0895904811425911

McMahon, M., Peters, M. L., & Schumacher, G. (2014). The principal evaluation process and its relationship to student achievement. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, *11*(3), 34-48.

Moody, M. (2011). Superintendent-board relations: Understanding the past to promote the future.

Morgan, C. L., & Peterson, G. J. (2002). The role of the district superintendent in leading academically successful school districts. In B. S. Cooper & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *The promises and perils facing today's school superintendent* (pp. 175-196). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Murphy, J., Louis, K. S., & Smylie, M. (2017). Positive school leadership: How the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders can be brought to life. *Kappan, 91*(1), 21-24.

Namit, C. (2008, December). Sharpening a district's leadership model. *District Administration, 44*(13), 54-59.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *Enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools by region, state and jurisdiction: Selected years, fall 1990 through fall 2023*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_203.20.asp

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders 2015*. Reston, VA: Author.

National School Boards Association (2000). *The key work of school boards.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

National School Boards Association. (2018). *Homepage* [webpage]. Retrieved from https://www.nsba.org/

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C.A. § 6301 et seq.

Owen, J. C., & Ovando, M. N. (2000). *Superintendent's guide to creating community*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Parker, J. (1995, August-September). *Politics, culture, and education Goals 2000: The politics of systemic education reform in the American states*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED392688)

Patton, C., Sawicki, D., & Clark, J. (2016). *Basic methods of policy analysis and planning* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Peterson, K. D. (1995). *Teacher evaluations: a comprehensive guide to new directions and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Peterson, G. J., & Barnett, B. G. (2005). The superintendent as instructional leader. In L. G. Björk & T. J. Kowalski, T. J. (Eds.), *The contemporary superintendent: Preparation, practice, and development* (pp. 107-136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Peterson, G. J., Fusarelli, L. D., & Kowalski, T. J. (2008). Novice superintendent perceptions of adequacy and problems of practice. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 3*(2), 2-22.

Plotts, T., & Gutmore, D. (2014). The superintendent's influence on student achievement. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice, 11*(1), 26-34.

Railey, H. (2017). *State education governance structures: 2017 update*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Reeves, D. B. (2008). *Assessing educational leaders: Evaluating performance for improved individual and organizational results*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Roach, V., Smith, L. W., & Boutin, J. (2011). School leadership policy trends: Policy expediency or policy excellence? *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*, 71-113. doi:10.1177/0011000010378611

Robinson, G. E., & Bickers, P. M. (1990). *Evaluation of Superintendents and School Boards* [ERS report]. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Saltzman, A. (2017). Training the trainers: Learning to be a principal supervisor. *The Learning Professional*, *38*(1), 54-56. Retrieved from www.learningforward.org

Scott, D. (2017). *2017 state policy review: School and district leadership. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States*. Retrieved from https://www.ecs.org/wp-content/uploads/2017-State-Policy-Review-School-and-district-leadership.pdf

Shaked, H., & Schechter, C. (2017). School principals as mediating agents in education reforms. *School Leadership and Management*, *37*(1-2), 19-37. doi:10.1080/13632434.2016.1209182

Simpson, J. (2013). Superintendent tenure and student achievement. *Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, *9*(4), 10-23.

Texas Association of School Boards. (2007). *About the Texas Association of School Boards new sample superintendent evaluation instrument.* Retrieved from http://www.tasb.org/ services/lts/resources/documents/2006_supt_ eval_instrument_w-instructions_rvoct07.pdf

The Broad Center. (2018). *Hire expectations: Big-district superintendents stay in their jobs longer than we think*. Retrieved from https://www.broadcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/TheBroadCenter_HireExpectations_May2018.pdf

Thompson Reuters. (2018). *Discover Thompson Reuters Westlaw* [webpage]. Retrieved from https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/products/westlaw

Toch, T. (2018). Why reforming teacher evaluation has—and hasn't—succeeded. *EducationNext*. Retrieved from http://educationnext.org/reforming-teacher-evaluation-hasnt-succeeded/

United States Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of State Support. (2015). *Fundamental Change: Innovation in America's schools under Race to the Top*. Washington, DC: Author.

Warner, R. E. (2013). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques*. Washington DC: Sage.

Waters, T., & Marzano, R. J. (2006). *School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement.* Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning Laboratory.

Weber, L. E. (2007). Evaluate me on measures, not tales. *School Administrator*, *64*(6), 16.

Whitehouse, E. (2017, July/August). What the Every Student Succeeds Act means for state education leaders. *The Current State* [e-newsletter of The Council of State Governments]. Retrieved from http://www.csg.org/pubs/capitolideas/enews/cs46_1.aspx

Young, M. D., Winn, K. M., & Reedy, M. A. (2017). The Every Student Succeeds Act: Strengthening the focus on educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*, 705-726. doi:10.1177/0013161X17735871

VITA

Tracey L. Schneider
New Jersey, USA

Education & Degrees

B.S./Business Administration - 2000
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA

J.D. - 2004
University of Richmond School of Law
Richmond, VA

Ph.D. - 2019
The College of William & Mary
Williamsburg, VA

Relevant Experience

Practice of education law for 13 years