

# Evaluating Leaders in Ministry Performance Evaluation Form Frequently Asked Questions

*Evaluating leaders in ministry is crucial to creating a mindset of ministerial growth and development in the school and early childhood ministry settings of the WELS. This is a time-consuming process because it requires the collection of evidence over time that honestly represents the habits of the called worker. And yet it must be accomplished in order to grow the worker in their professional practice and to provide our church body with the accurate information it needs for call lists. Dedicating time and organizing the procedures necessary benefit all involved. Thank you for your dedication and commitment to this task.*

**Q: Are leaders who also teach encouraged to have a leader evaluation and a teacher evaluation for themselves? When should the evaluation take place in conjunction with the MDP?**

*A: Consider the individual's primary role. Reference the leader's job description with the evaluator to determine the most applicable form. Should both be conducted, consider rotating the forms when completing the MDP. Leader evaluations, like teacher evaluations, occur in conjunction with the MDP and evidence gathering every three years.*

**Q: What do I do if I am a leader who does not teach? Should I still complete the entire evaluation?**

*A: The summative evaluation has been designed to consider a variety of leadership roles. It is recommended that the leader complete only those sections that apply to their roles and responsibilities.*

**Q: How much should the leader's MDP play in the evaluation process?**

*A: The MDP serves as one of many pieces of evidence that can be used in the evaluation. The MDP is unique in its ability to demonstrate the commitment to and ability to carry out a long-term, detailed professional development activity.*

**Q: Who conducts the leader's evaluation?**

*A: The board chair, an executive ministry team, or a selected governance team may conduct an evaluation. When necessary, the evaluator/team may enlist the support of trained educators and administrators to provide specific feedback in support of the evaluation.*

**Q: What if an identified congregational leader does not feel adequately prepared to complete a portion of the evaluation?**

*A: District Schools Coordinator or Early Childhood District Coordinator. Break the evaluation into portions and assign the portions to individuals who feel comfortable in those portions.*

**Q: How will leader evaluation information be shared with calling bodies?**

*A: Calling bodies will see the description paragraph and not the rating label. They will also see a customized example or any others provided that apply.*

**Q: What evidence should be collected for the leader's evaluation? How many artifacts of practice are suggested?**

*A: Artifacts of practice that inform the evaluation may include - but are not limited to - things like ministry development plans, focused surveys to selected groups, qualitative feedback, and/or data connections to school/ECM mission and vision and annual ministry goals or objectives. Evidence gathered around WELS standards for school/ECM leaders would also serve as an excellent resource. It will be important for the school leader to work with the person(s) responsible for conducting the evaluation to identify what evidence will need to be collected to support the findings. Evidence should generally be gathered into a shared electronic folder providing honest and open transparency for both the leader and evaluator(s). Since the evaluator may serve in a volunteer capacity, it will likely be necessary to enlist others to assist with gathering evidence from those that interact with the leader on a regular basis. Refer to the Performance Evaluation Evidence Guide for examples (working on this one!)*

**Q: If there is a disagreement between the leader and evaluator, what process is followed for resolution?**

*A:*

- 1. The atmosphere of the conference should be collegial and ministry focused (gospel-minded). Disagreements can and will occur in ministry.*
- 2. Remember, perceptions of the data collected can be biased or misinterpreted when viewed out of context. Perceptions can be biased or misinterpreted depending on each person's perspective and the context in which the data is collected.*
- 3. A successful conference relies on evidence collected. The evidence (data) must remain the focal point of the conversation during the conference.*
- 4. If an agreement on ratings cannot be reached or a communication impasse occurs, utilize resources available to you. Schedule a meeting with a trusted, unbiased third party or parties (a peer, a pastor, a board member, or the CLS District Coordinator). Designate such a person who might help resolve differences of opinion in a God-pleasing and collegial manner. If differences cannot be resolved, contact a district or synodical CLS administrator, and note disagreement on the evaluation rubric for any ratings that remain in question. Remind the leader that the CLS office will use the evaluator's ratings for their records unless a change is communicated after completion of the process described above.*
- 5. If there is a question about the amount or type of data, plan together how additional data and evidence could be collected.*
- 6. Conduct a new meeting.*

**Q: How will the school leader be evaluated for those responsibilities unique to a particular role (Assistant Principal, Guidance, Academics, Athletics, etc)?**

*A: It is certainly appropriate that the evaluation narrative reflects language specific to the unique roles a school leader plays. Evaluators are encouraged to take the leader's job description into consideration when gathering evidence, preparing for, and conducting the evaluation.*

**Q: Which school leaders should be evaluated using this tool?**

*A: The evaluation tool is recommended for school leaders who carry out administrative tasks as a substantial portion of their duties but can be utilized by anyone carrying out educational administration duties in a school/ECM setting. As noted above, you can use only the pieces of the summative evaluation that apply to a leader's roles and responsibilities.*

**Q: For the sake of synodical call information, is there a way to more clearly specify the current workload of a school leader? For instance, an administrator teaches 1-2 periods/hours/etc and has release time for the rest?**

*A: Each year the school submits a school information form. That form lists all the teachers in the school and their responsibilities. The number of administrative hours is listed for each school leader. That type of information could be shared more regularly in the additional notes from the district president during call meetings. Be sure to record the amount of time allotted in the leader's divine call for teaching vs. leadership duties and responsibilities on the evaluation form.*

**Q: How much narrative (commenting) is required for each of the evaluation areas?**

*A: While there is no specific requirement for the narrative piece of each evaluation area, having an accurate reflection of each leader's area of ability is important to the individual's ministry development and to the calling process. What narrative is provided should be as accurate and evidence-based of an account as possible.*

**Q: How do I use the performance key?**

*A: Each performance category is written based on the standards of evaluation for WELS school/ECM leaders. Seek to discover with collected evidence which category best describes your leader's performance at this point in time of their ministry. Examples are provided as to what each performance category MIGHT look like, but please remember they are not a checklist of "to-do" items for a leader to achieve such a rating.*

**Q: Why do the standards categorize with unaware, conscious, developing, refinement and the evaluation categorizes with minimal, basic, proficient, distinguished?**

*A: Creators of the summative performance evaluation for leaders sought to maintain uniformity between the domains used in the summative teacher evaluation form. As the standards will be used for more formative growth efforts by individuals and faculties, it seemed fitting that a different language would be acceptable for this different purpose.*