


2-2013

Job Evaluation

Theodore J. Kowalski

University of Dayton, tkowalski1@udayton.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/eda_fac_pub

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Education Economics Commons](#), [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Other Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Special Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Urban Education Commons](#)

eCommons Citation

Kowalski, Theodore J., "Job Evaluation" (2013). *Educational Leadership Faculty Publications*. 32.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/eda_fac_pub/32

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Educational Leadership at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Leadership Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

STATE OF THE SUPERINTENDENCY

Evaluation Factors Identified by Superintendents

Evaluation Factor	Percentage
Job Description	73%
Employment Contract Provisions	45%
Guidelines from State School Boards Associations	30%
Other (Unspecified) Factors	26%
National Standards	15%
Guidelines from State Superintendent Associations	11%
Guidelines from Consultants	3%

JOB DESCRIPTION: 73%

EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT PROVISIONS: 45%

GUIDELINES FROM STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATIONS: 30%

OTHER (UNSPECIFIED) FACTORS: 26%

NATIONAL STANDARDS: 15%

GUIDELINES FROM STATE SUPERINTENDENT ASSOCIATIONS: 11%

GUIDELINES FROM CONSULTANTS: 3%

Job Evaluation

Knowing the factors used in the annual performance evaluation of superintendents is foundational to building a more effective process. The accompanying graph, based on AASA's decennial survey of the field, shows how superintendents rank seven response options about the conduct of their own assessments by school boards.

Critics claim current evaluation practices are plagued by ambiguous purposes, unrealistic expectations, uneven and subjective processes, and invalid outcomes. The overall quality of superintendent evaluations suffers from the variation in the bases of assessments and the number and competence of the evaluators.

The limited application of national standards (such as those published by AASA in 1993) and state superintendent association guidelines is especially disturbing because such documents should include essential and validated job requirements. Greater uniformity in evaluation criteria, within and across states, would be a step toward ensuring more purposeful and objective outcomes.

SOURCE OF DATA: "THE AMERICAN SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT: 2010 DECENNIAL STUDY" (2011) PUBLISHED BY ROWMAN & LITTLEFIELD EDUCATION AND CO-SPONSORED BY AASA AND PEARSON. ANALYSIS BY THEODORE J. KOWALSKI, STUDY LEAD-AUTHOR AND PROFESSOR OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON.