



ECRA LITERATURE REVIEW

District Leadership

- Roles
- Responsibilities
- The 360° Assessment

CONTENTS

- 03 About the Lead Author
- 04 Introduction: District Leadership and the 360° Appraisal
- 06 360° Assessment
- 07 How the District Leadership 360° Appraisal was Constructed
- 09 Vision and Values
- 10 Knowledge Competencies
- 11 Instructional Leadership
- 12 Management
- 13 Community and Culture
- 14 Communication
- 15 References

About the Lead Author

John Gatta, Ph.D., is Executive Vice President of ECRA Group, a national educational research and analytical services consulting firm. In addition to his responsibilities at ECRA, Dr. John Gatta is an Assistant Professor and Director of Research for Northwestern University. His unique blend of academic, technical and management experience gives him keen insights into the research process. Dr. John Gatta has publications in both the education and healthcare sectors, and has taught graduate educational and bio-statistical methods coursework at Loyola and Northwestern universities. Dr. John Gatta's educational research has focused on analytical models related to student performance, program evaluation and accountability. He designs and oversees ECRA Group research projects, and is the chief architect of ECRA Group's analytical systems related to data structures, statistical algorithms and reporting. He also designs and oversees healthcare-related research projects conducted by Northwestern University Medical School's Department of Family and Community Medicine.

Introduction: District Leadership and the 360° Appraisal

The role of the modern superintendent is often analogized with that of an orchestra conductor (see: American Association of School Administrators, 2006; Domenech, 2009), and for good reason: a district leader “conducts” all aspects of the district’s educational, financial, and administrative performance; facilitates the performance of all personnel; and responds to and persuades an audience with varying ideas about the performance and leadership of the district. Like a conductor, he/she guides a shared *vision* of exemplary performance, manages disparate components and constituents to ensure progress toward that goal, and serves as a model for inspired leadership. The superintendent, in short, personifies the aspirations and responsibilities of the entire organization (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003). It is no wonder that research literature on educational leadership shows a strong correlation between the quality of district leadership and the achievement of said school district (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2006).

The role of the superintendent, however, is in constant flux. For many years school boards and the school community had defined the superintendency almost exclusively by the leader’s ability to manage fiscal, physical, and personnel resources; recently, though, the emphasis has shifted to *vision*, and the ideal of the current model superintendent is one who communicate strongly, build relationships, and demonstrate political acumen (Glass, 2005). Goens (2009) argues this dichotomous classification—leader or manager—is overly simplistic, failing to account for the “network of relationships, interactions, and protocols” that, while intangible, are critical to the success of the district leader. Indeed, Phillips & Phillips (2007) believe any conception of the superintendency must be relationship-centered, focusing on how leaders demonstrate vision and initiative through the involvement of stakeholders, the fostering of teamwork, and the building of strong relationships. The American Association of School Administrators (2007) agrees and adds that the superintendent, like principals, must also demonstrate a keen understanding of teaching, learning and what works for students. Portis & Garcia, (2007) emphasize the efficient use of resources, personnel, and data to break down resistance and drive systemic change; empower board and personnel to set goals, measure results, develop accountability, and support planning, evaluation, and resource allocation.

In light of these shifting definitions of district leadership, a true definition of the superintendency must reflect a comprehensive and challenging vision of district leadership, a synthesis of managerial and leadership components, interpersonal skills, and strategic action assessment. Perhaps it is not surprising, then, that a consensus is coalescing around the five core responsibilities proposed by Marzano et al. (2006), who hold the district leader responsible not only for managing organizational and environmental capacity and providing results-driven leadership but also for creating a values-driven culture, defining clear instructional focus, and ensuring accountability for results.

Though more reflective of the actual responsibilities and performance of the district leader, these increasingly varied and complex definitions of district-level leadership present a significant challenge to the process of superintendent evaluation. Historically, the evaluation process has been largely unsatisfactory to board members and superintendents alike, defined by overly subjective and vague judgments, little feedback or guidance on performance, and few analytics or relevant metrics to define strengths and weaknesses (DiPaola, 2007). Mandates in the No Child Left Behind and other state-level standards-based reforms have required local education agencies to explicitly define the expectations for the district leader and how they will be evaluated, leading to greater availability of common superintendent performance standards and performance-based assessments; however, the results are far too often the sort of generic “checklist” that assess the superintendent for completion of a task rather than evaluation of performance or growth over the course of a school year. To DiPaola (2007), effective superintendent evaluation must be *formative* in nature—it must guide the superintendent’s professional growth, enhance communications among the superintendent and stakeholders, and contribute to improving the educational performance or overall effectiveness of the district.

A true definition of the superintendency must reflect:

- A comprehensive and challenging vision of district leadership
- A synthesis of managerial and leadership components
- Interpersonal skills
- Strategic action assessment

360° Assessment

One possible tool to assess the growth and leadership of the district leader, as well as his/her achievement of strategic goals, is a 360° assessment, a multi-source feedback system that collects feedback from multiple viewpoints to provide a detailed and accurate picture of individual performance. When 360° assessment is applied to school leaders, *teams* of evaluators are utilized to gain the input of all members of the school's professional community, offering an overall assessment of the individual that addresses both results-focused and interpersonal-centered leadership skills (Fletcher & Baldry, 2000; Phillips & Phillips, 2007). Evaluators may include supervisors (school board members, etc.), colleagues (assistant superintendents, curriculum directors, etc.), school personnel (educators, office staff), and community members (parents, students, etc.). All participants respond to the same survey items, thereby providing many perspectives and viewpoints on the actions and impact of the district leader being evaluated.

Because 360° assessment focuses on feedback and subsequent action to strengthen school leadership, the method reflects the research literature's support of the mechanism as a formative evaluation tool to help school leaders focus on personal and leadership development and target particular areas for professional improvement (Moore, 2009). Furthermore, by comparing a leader's perceptions with the evaluation of stakeholders, schools encourage enhanced self-awareness and performance improvement from all participants (Carlson, 1998). Anonymous 360° feedback ensures leaders get honest feedback. In turn, it can create a culture where individuals become more ready to commit themselves to seeking and accepting feedback (Moore, 2009; Fletcher & Baldry, 2000; Santeusano, 1998).

- The 360 assessment is a system that collects feedback from multiple viewpoints to provide a detailed and accurate picture of individual performance.

How the District Leadership 360° Appraisal was Constructed

The District Leadership 360° Appraisal is a comprehensive evaluation program that utilizes a multi-rater, evidence-based approach to measure the effectiveness of district leadership behaviors known to positively influence student achievement and district culture. The instrument consists of 40 items that comprise six core domains, as well as an open-ended response item; each respondent rates the district leader's effectiveness on a six-point scale. The reference period is the current school year.

ECRA initiated a multi-step development process to construct its 360° survey. The initial step of any 360° assessment is to define the competencies of the position and to identify the learning outcomes that are the target of the evaluation (Cottrell, Crow, & Shumway, 2007; Santeusano, 1998). Building upon its experience constructing program and talent evaluations, ECRA first reviewed superintendent evaluation standards from key voices and institutions in the field of education leadership, including standards developed by the American Association of School Administrators (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003) and the principles defined by Marzano et al. (1996) in *Leadership that Works*. An analysis of these standards and instruments led ECRA to incorporate and intersperse the six performance domains of the AASA guidance—policy and government, planning and assessment, instructional leadership, organizational management, communications and community, and professionalism—and the five core components of Marzano et al. throughout the survey instrument. By adopting these standards and performance indicators, ECRA has constructed an evaluation instrument that codifies and clarifies leadership behaviors representative of *effective* superintendents.

This focus on best practices acknowledges the multifaceted role of the superintendent while prioritizing the instructional focus and school guidance responsibilities that commonly define the 21st century district leader.

360° Appraisal Construction

Vision and Values—Items in this category measure the district leader’s vision and commitment to excellence; the alignment of district programs to the broader mission, vision, and philosophy of the district; and the promotion and upholding high expectations for all stakeholders, including his/her own professional behavior.

Knowledge Competencies—Items in this category measure the district leader’s subject matter expertise in the various instructional, managerial, legal, financial, and personnel issues superintendents must face and respond to every day.

Instructional Leadership—Items in this category measure the district leader’s ability to plan, implement, and evaluate the efficacy of the school or district’s instructional and assessment programming, as well as to use that data and other sources of external research to inform district improvement practices.

Management – Items in this category measure the district leader’s effectiveness in aligning district systems and operations (e.g., budgeting, compliance) and organizational performance to the goals and values of the district.

Communication—Items in this category measure the district leader’s performance as the voice of the district, both in the way district performance is communicated to the school and external community and how superintendent provides feedback to whom he/she collaborates.

Community and Culture—Items in this category measure the district leader’s ability to involve stakeholders, particularly school personnel and the school board, in realizing the district’s vision and improve student achievement.

Vision and Values

Goal setting, initiative, drive, high expectations, and accountability are defining qualities of district leaders and their leadership teams—they lead, as Phillips & Phillips (2007) suggest, *for results*. The successful superintendent value change and guide change efforts by developing and articulating a vision and a clear direction for the district, ensuring that the mission of each school within his/her district aligns to this vision (American Association of School Administrators, 2009; Portis & Garcia, 2007; Waters & Marzano, 2007). To enable and implement positive change, the district leader implements and oversees effective strategic planning processes to ensure a continual focus on what matters most to all stakeholders served by the district (AASA, 2006; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2006). The superintendent sets goals that are rigorous yet attainable, aligns these goals with the district’s existing plans and initiatives (e.g., special education, professional development), and includes meaningful success/progress indicators and annual performance targets to review and revise goals as reform is implemented (Bennett, 2009; Waters & Marzano, 2007). As a result, the district leader commits the district to continuous improvement: he/she stipulates clear and non-negotiable priorities; builds progress monitoring tools into the routine process of each school in the district to determine the effects of district decision making on teaching, student learning, and the personnel implementing them; and establishes a district culture in which personnel are invested in the process and outcomes of change (Domenech, 2009; DuFour, 2007; Waters & Marzano, 2007). Not surprisingly, the effective district leader maintains high expectations for school performance and for all participants involved in this achievement—students, personnel, and the community—and maintains a relentlessly positive approach to helping others realize their potential (Lukaszewski, 2008; Waters & Marzano, 2007).

Knowledge Competencies

Because the superintendent is accountable for overall district performance educationally, financially, and administratively, he/she must be a subject matter expert on many areas of educational leadership—and continually update this knowledge as trends and mandates change (Eadie, 2003; Phillips & Phillips, 2007). The district leader must pay close attention to what data and research say about learning and achievement, and apply new leadership frameworks and practices to ensure improved student achievement (American Association of School Administrators, 2007). It is also critical that the superintendent have significant knowledge of legal issues affecting education; they must also keep abreast of changes to mandates, legal requirements, and compensation/retirement systems at the state level (Glass, 2005).

The superintendent must:

- Have significant knowledge of legal issues affecting education
- Keep abreast of changes to mandates, legal requirements and compensation/retirement systems at the state level.

Instructional Leadership

The effective superintendent embraces his/her function as the primary instructional leader for the district, prioritizing student achievement and effective instructional practices as the foremost goals of the district (DiPaola & Stronge, 2003; Waters & Marzano, 2007). More than simply a cheerleader of good pedagogy, the superintendent hones a clear and collaborative vision of teaching and learning, one whose goals for student achievement and the instructional program represent a synthesis of relevant research and the specific needs of the district (Portis & Garcia, 2007; Waters & Marzano, 2007). Moreover, the superintendent plays an active role in evaluating the implementation of district instructional programming: he/she clearly and regularly communicate expectations for learning to faculty, monitors district progress toward student achievement goals, and embeds professional development and coaching into the school day (AASA, 2007). As instructional leader, the superintendent also must be a leader of data-driven practice: he/she uses student achievement data to identify gaps in learning, examine instructional practice, and inform future curricular and instructional decision making (AASA, 2006; Waters & Marzano, 2007).

Management

Though the focus of superintendent evaluation has in recent years shifted from management to leadership, Glass (2005) argues that managerial imperatives and leadership imperatives cannot be separated from one another. That is, a superintendent is a strong leader only when they effectively allocate time, money, personnel, and resources in ways that align with the goal of achievement for all students (Portis & Garcia, 2007; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2006). To do so, the superintendent must employ a system-wide, district-centered approach to manage both the millions of taxpayer dollars invested annually in the district and the ever-increasing array of demands resulting from federal- and state-level centralization of education policy (e.g., NCLB). Essential managerial duties of the role therefore include *fiscal responsibilities*, such as setting spending priorities, distributing funds, and forecasting projected revenues; *regulatory responsibilities*, such as ensuring compliance to accounting and auditing systems; *operational responsibilities*, such as facilities management, purchasing and contracting, property and supply management; and *personnel responsibilities*, such as labor relations, salary and wage management, and hiring policies—all of these resources and services must be effectively planned and coordinated to support short-term and long-term district needs (Glass, 2005; Waters & Marzano, 2007). To ensure efficient usage of tax dollars and a smoothly functioning management base, the district leader must also balance setting clear, non-negotiable goals about how the district is to be operated while providing school leadership teams with the responsibility and authority for determining how to meet those goals (AASA, 2007).

Communication

The successful superintendent communicates timely and relevant information—particularly student achievement data—to all stakeholders (parents, community, media, et al.) with great clarity and great frequency so that the mission of the district is understood and supported (AASA, 2006; AASA, 2007; Waters & Marzano, 2007). By being a proactive communicator, the superintendent builds trust, provides actionable guidance on personnel and programs he/she supervises, and demonstrates responsiveness to situations that arise (McCullough, 2009).

Community and Culture

Recent research literature on the superintendency shares a conception of significant and effective leadership that is, at its core, about and defined by *relationships* (see: Goens, 2009; Phillips & Phillips, 2007; Portis & Garcia, 2007). Coalitions, collaborations, and motivation determine the efficacy of outcomes and initiatives—so the district leader must build trust, focus attention to process, and employ political savvy to ensure buy-in (Goens, 2009; Phillips & Phillips, 2007). The superintendent also needs to discern community values and expectations; they must establish early-on and consistently nurture relationships with key stakeholders (AASA, 2009; Banks et al, 2007). To do so, the effective district leader involves key constituents in the goal setting process, shares and publicizes relevant school data, mobilizes parents and community members, builds local- or state-level coalitions, and communicates timely and relevant information to personnel (AASA, 2006; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2006).

The model superintendent recognizes that effective leadership is shared leadership, one in which teams and ongoing collaborations help define and commit to a common vision, to a culture of respect and openness, and to methods for decision making that ensure every child gets the best possible education (Blankstein, 2004; Weast, 2008). The district leader can promote this transformation by ensuring principals have the resources and opportunities to function as true instructional leaders, rather than merely as site managers (AASA, 2009). Quality school board-superintendent partnerships are also essential to effective governance in a school district: the results-driven superintendent works side-by-side with board members during the goal-setting process to determine performance targets and monitor progress (Banks et al, 2007; Eadie, 2003; Waters & Marzano, 2007). Finally, the good superintendent will develop their own constituency among business and civic groups, thereby enlisting the support of the wider community (Portis & Garcia, 2007).

References

- American Association of School Administrators. (2006). Leadership for change: National superintendent of the year forum. Arlington, VA.
- American Association of School Administrators. (2007). *Leadership for change: National superintendent of the year forum*. Arlington, VA.
- American Association of School Administrators. (2009). *Transforming our schools: National superintendent of the year forum*. Arlington, VA.
- Banks, P.A., Maloney, R.J., Stewart, D.F., Weber, L.E. (2007, June). Changing the subject of your education. *School Administrator*, 64(6) p.10-16.
- Bennett, T. (2009, April). A five-year push for district change. *School Administrator*, 66(4), 42.
- Blankstein, A. (2004) *Failure is not an option: six principles that guide student achievement in highperforming schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Carlson, M.S. (1998). 360-Degree feedback: The power of multiple perspectives. *Popular Government*, 63 (2), p. 38-51.
- Cottrell, S., Crow, S., Cottrell, L., & Shumway, J. (2007). Applying 360-degree evaluations to focus student learning and its improvement. In *Educational Psychology Research Focus*, Ed. E.M. Vargios. Nova Publishers.
- DiPaola, M.F. (2007, June). Revisiting superintendent evaluation. *School Administrator*. 64(6), p.
- Dipaola, M.F., & Stronge, J. (2003). *Superintendent Evaluation Handbook*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- Domenech, D. (2009, April). A foundation for leadership support. *School Administrator*, 66(4), p.41.
- Dufour, R. (2007, November). In praise of top-down leadership. *School Administrator*, 65(10), p.38-42.
- Eadie, D. (2003, July). High-impact governing. *American School Board Journal*, 190(7), p26-29.
- Fletcher, C., & Baldry, C. (2000). A study of individual differences and self-awareness in the context of multi-source feedback . *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 73 (3).
- Glass, T. (2005, October). Management Matters. *American School Board Journal*. 192(10), p. 34-39.
- Goens, G. A. (2009, March). Evaluating the superintendent. *American School Board Journal*. 196(3),
- Knauss, D. (2007, March). Values-based leadership. *School Administrator*, 64 (3), p. 50-51.
- Lukaszewski, J.. (2008, August). The ingredients for good leadership. *School Administrator*, 65(7), 16-19.
- Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., McNulty, B.A. (2005). *School leadership that works: from research to results*. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McCullough, B. (2009, May). Do unto others: A roadmap for communicating well. *School Administrator*, 66(5), 37-38.
- Moore, B. (2009). Improving the evaluation and feedback process for principals. *Principal*. 38-41.
- Phillips, D.A., & Phillips, R.S. (2007, March). The four-quadrant leadership team. *School Administrator*. 64(3), p. 42-47.
- Portis, C., & Garcia, M.W. (2007, March). The superintendent as change leader. *School Administrator*. 64(3), p.18-25.
- Santeusanio, R. (1998). Improving performance with 360-degree feedback. *Educational Leadership*.
- Sternberg, R. (2009, February). Wisdom, intelligence & creativity synthesized. *School Administrator*, 66(2), 10-14.
- Waters, J.T., & Marzano, R.J. (2007, March). The primacy of superintendent leadership. *School Administrator*, 64(3), p.10-16.
- Weast, J. (2008, August). Creating shared leadership that works. *School Administrator*, 65(7), p.38.