

May 2, 2019

To: School Committee
Rebecca McFall, Superintendent

From: Tara Mitchell, School Committee Chairperson

Re: Superintendent Summative Evaluation Procedure

Background:

It is the responsibility of the Lincoln School Committee to evaluate the performance of the superintendent. As of September 2012, the Committee is using the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluations for the purposes of evaluation.

The evaluation system uses a five-step cycle: self-assessment; goal-setting and plan development; implementation; formative assessment; summative evaluation. We are now at step 5 in the cycle, the summative evaluation. The summative evaluation will be used to provide feedback to Dr. McFall, to assign an overall performance rating, to discuss further supports that the School Committee can provide to the superintendent, and to provide a framework for beginning next year's evaluation cycle.

Process for Evaluation:

May 9th School Committee Meeting: In preparation for the meeting, please review the information from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and the summative evaluation form that are enclosed.

May 23rd School Committee Meeting: Dr. McFall will provide the Committee with the following:

- Progress towards Annual Goals: End-of Year Self-Assessment
- Evidence related to Performance Indicators
- District Strategic Plan: End-of Year Report
- Summary of Administrative Team Survey Results

In addition, all materials, such as your individual observations, reports to the School Committee, and Administrative Team meeting agendas, are considered evidence. Dr. McFall will also provide materials such as redacted feedback to administrators, invitations to present to her colleagues, and relevant redacted exchanges with parents.

May 23rd – June 2nd: Using all the evidence mentioned above and the Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership Superintendent Rubric created by DESE, each member of the School Committee will fill out the Summative Evaluation Form. These forms will be submitted to the Chairperson by the end of the day on June 2nd and are part of the public record.

June 6th: The Chairperson will compile the individual evaluations and create a draft composite Summative Evaluation for discussion during the regular June 6th Committee meeting. The meeting is intended to be a conversation among Committee members and with the Superintendent. Individual members will be asked to highlight areas of strength and areas for growth based on specific examples of the Superintendent's work and/or direct observation.

As stated above, the summative evaluation is part of the state-wide evaluation system for superintendents (and all educators in the district) and is intended to be part of the open communication that is necessary for a positive relationship between a superintendent and a

School Committee. It is the expectation that all feedback be related to performance, and not personal or derogatory in nature. Members are encouraged to raise serious concerns with the superintendent before the open discussion in order to give her an opportunity to address questions and/or provide further evidence.

Rating System:

The summative evaluation comprises ratings on four standards (Instructional Leadership, Management and Operations, Family and Community Engagement, and Professional Culture), a rating on the superintendent's goals, and an overall rating based on the prior two ratings. The possible ratings are:

- *Unsatisfactory:* Performance is consistently below the requirements of a standard or overall, and is considered inadequate.
- *Needs Improvement:* Performance is below the requirements of a standard or overall but is not considered to be Unsatisfactory at the time. Improvement is necessary and expected.
- *Proficient:* Proficient practice is understood to be fully satisfactory. This is the rigorous, expected level of performance.
- *Exemplary:* This rating indicates that practice significantly exceeds "Proficient" and could serve as a model of practice regionally or statewide.

If School Committee members give a rating other than "proficient" to any element or indicator, they must supply specific evidence to support the rating.

An overall summative rating, which is reported to the state, will be assigned as part of the summary evaluation.



LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Annual Superintendent Evaluation Timeline

Month	Action	Tasks and Responsibilities
Early June	Establish District goals	The Administrative Council and School Committee collaborate to establish the District Goals.
Late June	Superintendent presents outline of Annual Plan for School Committee approval	Superintendent develops goals for the upcoming school year based on end of cycle evaluation and established District Goals.
September	Superintendent presents Annual Plan for School Committee final approval	The superintendent works in collaboration with the School Committee to develop the superintendent's Annual Plan.
Early January	Mid-cycle progress report on District Goals and the superintendent's goals presented to the School Committee*	Superintendent prepares a mid-cycle report on progress toward attaining goals set forth in the Annual Plan.
Mid-January	Mid-cycle review**	School Committee Chair leads the mid-cycle goals review meeting.
February / March	Contract negotiation	Superintendent and School Committee collaboratively develop the Superintendent's contract.
Mid - May	End-cycle progress report on District Goals and performance on the Standards presented to the School Committee	Superintendent prepares an end of cycle report on progress toward attaining goals and performance on the Standards.
End of May	End of cycle review	Superintendent actively participates in the end of cycle evaluation meeting. School Committee develops a Summative Evaluation Report and ensures that it contains accurate information and appropriately reflects the individual performance of the superintendent.

*In 2012 – 2013 mid-year goal reports will take place in February as indicated on the SC long-term agenda. Work plan timelines have been developed with this in mind.

**2012 – 2013 Mid-Cycle Review will focus on the Superintendent's entry plan



Lincoln Public Schools

Ballfield Road
Lincoln, MA 01773
781-259-9409 • FAX: 781-259-9246
bmcfall@lincnet.org

Rebecca E. McFall, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

Superintendent's Annual Plan for Evaluation

The goals identified for the Superintendent's Annual Plan 2018 - 2019 for evaluation are aligned with the recommendations set forth in the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation, Part VI: Implementation Guide for Superintendent Evaluation. The identified goals are also aligned with the District Strategic Plan.

Student Learning Goal 1:

Support the development of administrator and faculty use of Collaborative Practices that focus on student learning.

Superintendent Evaluation Rubric: Indicators I-A-1, I-A-2, I-C-1, IV-A-1, IV-A-2, IV-A-3, IV-D-1, IV-E-1

Strategic Priority: A1 – Continue to develop, demonstrate and expand team-based collaborative practices, Facilitative Leadership, and coaching capacity.

Key Actions:

Guide and coach the principals and other administrators as they work with their faculty to develop collaborative teams. Collaborative teams focus on student learning by examining their professional practice and the work of their students using a Teaching to Learn cycle that includes a) setting clear learning targets and success criteria b) planning engaging instruction c) assessing learning, and d) responding to the needs of individual students. (See Strategic Priority Map A1 for action steps.)

In addition to the action steps outlined in Strategic Priority Map A1, the Principal's Meeting group will have a text-based focus using Leaders of Their Own Learning, by Ron Berger of Expeditionary Learning. And, the Administrative Council will participate in a series of Learning Walks together to continue our development of a shared understanding of what constitutes high quality instruction. A clear understanding of high quality, effective, engaging instruction is the foundation required to appropriately guide and support collaborative teams.

Outcome: Administrative Council develops an approach that ensures all collaborative practice teams are effective through more consistent support and accountability, and identifies ways for teams to incorporate FAR and FIRME, as well as document and share their learning more broadly.

Measures:

- Evidence provided by faculty demonstrating the work of their team including student results.

Evidence may include: curriculum units, common assessments, student data, student work samples.

Professional Practice Goal 1:

Provide support and guidance to the Assistant Superintendent and Director of Technology as they carry out an assessment review process (Assessment Committees, Side Letter with LTA)

Superintendent Evaluation Rubric: Indicators I-C-1, I-C-2, I-E

Strategic Objective: Assessment and Data

Key Actions:

Support and coach the Assistant Superintendent and Director of Technology as they lead the Assessment Steering Committee and begin to carry out a review of our district assessments in order to make progress toward the goals outlined in the Assessment Committees side letter with the LTA.

Measures:

Progress towards meeting the goals set forth in the *Assessment Committees* side letter.

The Committee will study the assessments currently used in the Lincoln Public Schools to achieve the following goals:

- *Minimize time spent on testing while ensuring that high quality data is available to teachers and the district.*
- *Recommend a set of assessments that should be mandatory across the district and for which data will be collected at a district level.*
- *Create a framework for collecting, analyzing and using student data to inform instruction.*

Professional Practice Goal 2:

Work with the Administrative Team and key faculty to review our course offerings, staffing, and scheduling across the district. (Specialist Scheduling, Side Letter with LTA)

Superintendent Evaluation Rubric: Standard II

Key Actions:

Work with administrators and faculty to carry out a needs assessment and begin to develop clear guidelines for specialist course offerings across the district.

Develop clear guidelines for FTE loads by specialist discipline in order to determine FTE needs by school and provide effective scheduling. And, use the guidelines to ensure that each specialist teacher is appropriately scheduled based upon their FTE.

Measures:

Progress towards carrying out the goals set forth in the *Specialist Scheduling* side letter.

Collection of data about specialist schedules and instructional needs in order to consider:

- *ensuring that the learning expectations for the students in specialist programs are being well-met,*
- *setting clear expectations for equitable programming and effective scheduling, and*
- *ensuring that no faculty with a specialist role are scheduled for more instructional time than their FTE assignment.*

District Improvement Goal 1:

Appropriately fulfill the necessary leadership role of the superintendent in order to successfully complete the 20% schematic design phase and initiate the design development phase of the Lincoln School building project.

Superintendent Evaluation Rubric: Standard I - Instructional Leadership Standard II -Management and Operations

Key Actions:

Carry out responsibilities of the superintendent as a member of the School Building Committee. Co-chair the Campus Coordinating Group with Town Administrator, Tim Higgins to ensure collaboration with the Community Center Planning and Preliminary Design Committee (PPDC).

Work with the Owner's Project Manager and Design Team to carry out educational vision and programmatic design requirements development.

Provide leadership and focus to the development of the educational vision and connection to the facility design.

Facilitate and coordinate the processes required to provide information from the schools to the Design Team and community.

Participate in the planning and presentation of community outreach events.

Measures:

The successful bonding of a recommended school design by the Town of Lincoln at a Special Town Meeting on December 1, 2018.

District Improvement Goal 2:

Begin to explore the possibility of developing a Vision/Profile of an LPS graduate and/or a vision for our Hanscom students who are with us for shorter time periods.

Superintendent Evaluation Rubric: Standard I - Instructional Leadership

Key Actions:

Gather documents from other districts to inform our thinking.

Visit the Farmington, CT Public Schools and collaborate with the administrators who have carried out this work in their district and schools.

Begin to explore the utility of developing a student Vision/Profile and draft a process for stakeholder input.

Measures:

Presentation of the information gathered, our evolution of thinking regarding whether or not to develop a Vision/Profile of an LPS graduate, and possible draft plans for engaging stakeholders and next steps.

**EVALUATING THE SUPERINTENDENT
UNDER THE NEW
MASSACHUSETTS EDUCATOR EVALUATION
SYSTEM**

**A Guide for the School Committee, School
Councils, and Parents**

**Prepared by the Massachusetts Association of School Committees
Revised, November 2012**

In the interest of providing clarity to our members and our colleagues in education as well as to parents, students and interested members of the community, MASC has prepared this document as a guide to understanding the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation System as it relates to superintendents of schools.

More than 375 pages of additional information, including copies of relevant state law, regulations, guidelines, instructions and matrices that highlight individual evaluation standards may be downloaded from the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's web site at:

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/>

There you will find highly detailed explanations of the educator evaluation system for faculty, including teachers and administrators, as well as superintendents of schools.

MASC was closely involved in helping to develop the general outline of the model system and has recommended adoption of most of the state's model system as a way to begin the process. We have also included a model evaluation tool for evaluating, rating, and scoring the performance of the superintendent that is based predominantly on the example produced by the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The MASC model calls special attention to the importance of the School Improvement Plans and to the ability of the school committee to adapt the evaluation to local standards and goals.

MASSACHUSETTS EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM

What is this all about?

Starting in 2012 Massachusetts public school systems will be introducing a new educator evaluation system for teachers, other full time professional educators, principals and administrators, including school superintendents. The system will be the most comprehensive and ambitious to date. It will be built around several important principles:

1. Educators around the state should be evaluated regularly using common standards that will be relevant to the work they do. These standards have been set by the state, subject to regular revision.
2. District administrators will be responsible for evaluating all professional educators. School principals will oversee the evaluations of teachers, counselors, and therapists in their buildings as well as school based administrators. The superintendents will oversee the evaluations of district based administrators and school principals. The school committees will evaluate the superintendents.
3. The purpose of the evaluation process will be multifold including:
 - a. Guiding the professional development and performance improvement of every educator.
 - b. Maintaining a consistent set of standards to measure educator performance.
 - c. Helping to measure the effectiveness of each educator in terms of their impact on student achievement and on the development of their own professional skills.
 - d. By mutually agreement, the school committee and superintendent or through negotiations with the employees and their unions, apply the evaluation data to other work-based conditions, including economic or professional conditions.
4. Each educator will be evaluated on individual standards which are also divided into additional "indicators," and even further divided into "elements." *The school committee has the flexibility to determine just how many of the four standards, forty one elements and twenty indicators may be used for the superintendent and for the personal, professional goals.*
5. The evaluation system will result in a four tier ranking system (unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and exemplary) for all those evaluated.
6. Measures of student achievement on standardized tests will be used in several ways to determine how well students learn their subject matter in the evaluation of all educators.

7. While the state has set the general standards, many facets of the evaluation process will be subject to the collective bargaining process. This is a process whereby school committees, guided by their advisors including superintendents, administrators and legal counsel will negotiate with teachers unions over important parts of the evaluation process. Among the items subject to collective bargaining for unionized employees will be:
- The standards of performance and specific language used to define the various rankings within each standard, subject to certain requirements that the state sets.
 - Identification of those "artifacts of student performance" that may be among those used to measure student achievement.
 - Determining how much each component of the evaluation will be weighed in a final evaluation.
 - Determining how the evaluation data may be used for the purposes of assigning educators, transferring personnel, promotions, or other job related matters.
 - What economic incentives might be linked to the evaluation process, such as performance-based bonuses, salary increases, opportunities to perform additional work for additional pay, or other terms that might be negotiated.
 - How the evaluation process will be administered, subject to the general guidelines approved by BESE. There are several steps in the process that are subject to clarification or more detailed definition through collective bargaining.

Why is this happening?

The new system is based on requirements set by state regulation and provisions of the federal "Race to the Top" program.

Because a strong evaluation system is important to helping teachers and administrators become effective educators, state law authorizes the MA Board Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) to establish an educator evaluation process, set standards of performance to use in assessing personnel performance and to authorize the means of measuring student performance in several areas. Student performance is measured in many ways, but among the best known are standardized tests that assess how well pupils have mastered the state's Curriculum Frameworks.

The Frameworks are organized grade by grade curricula that determine what skills are to be mastered by particular milestones or grades. The standardized tests measure learning of the curricula by grade. The entire process of Frameworks and testing is called the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). Many people believe that MCAS refers only to the tests, but, in fact, it refers to the entire system of standards and measurements.

In 2011, 75% of the state's school districts, including school committees, superintendents, and local teachers unions joined with DESE to seek what became a \$250 million grant from the US Department of

Education under the Race to the Top Program. Part of the grant application required the creation of this new evaluation system and the eventual implementation statewide.

Almost immediately after the awarding of the grant, a 40-person task force representing many public, quasi-public, and private business groups proposed to BESE the general guidelines of what became the new evaluation system. The "grand bargain" that set forth the master plan was an agreement by at least one of the state's major unions (MA Teachers Association), the school committees and school superintendents to adopt groundbreaking and precedent-setting provisions such as using student tests and measurements as part of the evaluating process in exchange for using the collective bargaining process to negotiate some of the most sensitive parts at the local level. Ultimately, BESE adopted the current plan.

Not all parties to the negotiations were satisfied. Voices within the business community sought a fixed, high percentage of student achievement data as a mandated component of teacher assessment. Others wanted a more limited role for the collective bargaining process. One group managed to secure enough signatures to place an initiative petition before voters to overturn much of the more collaborative parts of the system. Before the petition could be finalized, further negotiations secured one additional provision to the master plan. It dealt with the implications of teacher transfers and the controversial process of "bumping," where a teacher being transferred involuntarily is allowed to take the position of another teacher for one of several reasons, including "seniority." To head off the ballot question, state legislators approved and the governor signed a bill preventing a teacher from being involuntarily removed from one's position unless the teacher doing the "bumping" was certified in the subject matter and "highly qualified." The term "highly qualified" would also be subject to collective bargaining and the new provision would be held off until 2016 to allow time to prepare districts and complete local negotiations on this matter.

HOW DOES THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE BEGIN THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR THE SUPERINTENDENT?

The educator evaluation systems are built around a five step process.

Before You Start:

1. Review Your Contract of Employment with Your Superintendent

School committees are required to evaluate their superintendents, but many of the terms, timelines, and protocols for the valuation may have been negotiated into your chief executive's contract of employment. The contract may specify:

- The annual timetable for the evaluation.
- Clarification of how the evaluation will take place and who will serve as the school committee point person for gathering and aggregating feedback from members before completing a composite review.

- Specification of which members may participate in the evaluation. Some school committees require members to have served for a minimum period of time before participating. Others may or may not allow former members who served during the prior year to participate.
- Determining whether the school committee must confer with the superintendent prior to establishing the evaluation criteria or whether the development of the tool, timetable and process must be mutually agreeable.

✱ This last provision can be controversial. If a school committee agrees in its contract of employment with the superintendent to establish a "mutually agreeable" evaluation tool, it must be acceptable to both parties before it can be used. If the school committee agrees only to confer or consult with the superintendent prior to establishing a tool, it does not need the approval of the chief executive before deploying the evaluation document. MASC recommends to its members that they use the "confer or consult" model language in order to avoid a potential stalemate over the evaluation content.

2. Setting District Goals

Evaluation systems are based on both standards and goals. District goals, set by the school committee in collaboration with the superintendent, and they must be the basis for all evaluations in that everyone must work towards the same objectives.

The school committee has the authority to set goals and establish the strategic plan based on criteria the board sets for itself. However, district goals are most often set following a collaborative discussion with the superintendent that may include such additional input as:

- A review of a district strategic plan or set of strategic directions already in place.
- Recommendations of the superintendent based on the chief executive's professional judgment about district needs and priorities.
- A new superintendent entry plan that is the result of a broad outreach by the chief executive to learn the strengths, areas for improvement, emerging trends, political developments, economic conditions, and long term needs for the district and member communities.
- Input from current teachers, administrators, support staff, school councils, and parents.
- Guidance from other appropriate sources, including stakeholder groups, economic research, and other experts.

The superintendent, in consultation with the school committee and subject to its approval will establish a personal practice and student achievement goal for themselves. In addition, the school committee and superintendent would agree to between two and four district improvement goals to complement the standards upon which the evaluations will be based. These are also subject to the approval of the school committee. These goals will be important as will be explained shortly.

CREATING THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT AND FULFILLING THE PROCESS

STEP 1: Understanding the Evaluation System and Related Criteria¹

The first step of the five step cycle is to review the entire system and begin a self-assessment process for the superintendent. This includes having the school committee and superintendent come to agreement around the standards, rubrics, evidence of performance, and goals built around the state standards as well as personal, professional goals.

The superintendent's evaluation will be based on four major standards (See Attachment A, The Evaluation Matrix for Superintendents). Each of these standards is subdivided into several "Indicators" that define further how a skill set can be considered. These "Indicators" are subdivided even further into "Elements." These allow the school committee to define more precisely how detailed the evaluation might become. All in all, there are more than 65 separate Standards, Indicators and Elements. They are outlined on the Evaluation Matrix for Superintendents.

To help make the process understandable, DESE produced lengthy guides to this process and created sample "descriptors" for every one of the four Standards, 41 Indicators and 21 Elements. Each descriptor is highlighted on the complete matrix compilation that can be downloaded from the DESE web site. These descriptors explain how each of the 65 categories would appear if they were performed in each of the four grading categories (underperforming, needs improvement, proficient, and exemplary).

In addition to evaluating the superintendent on the basis of the standards selected from the Evaluation Matrix for Superintendents, each superintendent must have at least two additional goals: a professional practice goal, a student achievement goal, and two to four district improvement goals. The professional practice goal focused on one's growth and development as an educational leader and might include pursuit of a doctorate or specialized advanced study, participation at professional conferences, mastery of new theories and practices, extensive integration into the fabric community, or some other personal objective. The district improvement goal would relate to overall growth and development of the district in terms of teaching and learning.

Moreover, these goals must be "S M A R T" Goals meaning that they are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely. This concept leaves little room for ambiguity and requires the actual achievement of clearly defined measures of achievement. (For example, one either completes defined course work or one does not; student achievement overall either increases by the stated goal, or it does not.)

¹ Resources for steps one through five can be found in the "Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation, Part VI" accessible from the MA DESE web site.

Step Two: Meeting to Formalize the Goals and Superintendent Development Plan

Assuming district goals have been established, it is a good idea to have an initial discussion with the superintendent about any special considerations that will go into the evaluation process. This might include recognizing special circumstances or challenges (i.e., a new superintendency; a pending retirement; high numbers of high risk students; an economic catastrophe like the closing of a military base or employment site that will affect morale, census, or family life), unique developments that might arise during the year (recovery from last year's flood damage; construction sites contiguous to busy school buildings; political strife with the municipality; new curricula being introduced), or other facts that will merit special consideration.

At this time, you can also reach an agreement about the criteria and information you will use to base your own evaluations of the superintendent. These include important questions like:

- What is the best evaluation cycle to use? (Some districts will want to begin the cycle in September at the start of the school year while others may wish to begin after town elections in the Spring or on the anniversary date of the superintendent's contract.)
- What are reasonable expectations for the superintendent at this point in time?
- What evaluation standards will you use, including those required by the state, the further refinements that you elect, and those in the professional practice goals of the superintendent?
- What are the most effective ways to assess the superintendent's performance?
- How should we tie student achievement to the work of the superintendent?
- How will we measure the superintendent's ability to lead the district?
- What will effective leadership look like? This will be an important consideration when you select items from the model rubric as a guide.
- How can we deal with our concerns about the district through the superintendent's evaluation?
- From whom should we seek appropriately any additional input into the evaluation (i.e., municipal officials, parents, faculty and administrators, local leaders and business representatives, or others)?

Once these ground rules have been established, it is appropriate to begin the drafting process for an evaluation document.

Selecting the appropriate criteria to use in a superintendent evaluation and reviewing the personal goals can be an extraordinarily complex process and one that does not easily surrender itself to a group editing process. It does not have to be unnecessarily complicated.

MASC strongly recommends that school committees adopt one of these initial steps:

1. Designate a small subcommittee of the school committee, or authorize the chair and/or vice chair, or a special ad-hoc subcommittee, to meet with the superintendent to draft a model

- evaluation document for review by the full school committee. In this way, you will take the initiative to prepare a document that is already well thought-out before it goes to the board.
2. In some circumstances, a school committee may be well served by asking the superintendent to draft the full evaluation tool for their consideration. As a variation, the superintendent may develop a draft of a full evaluation tool for review by the chair and/or vice chair or subcommittee.

The proposed tool can be presented to the school committee for approval.

Step 3: Implementing the Evaluation and Collect the Evidence Upon Which to Base the Evaluation

During the year, the superintendent will gather evidence of performance based on the agreement at the start of the process. In addition, school committee members will gather information based on their observations, feedback, and other sources that are appropriate. For example, school committee members will gather their own evidence and provide feedback to the superintendent based upon various items, including, but not limited to:

- Evidence of instructional leadership and the links to student achievement.
- Reports and research prepared by the superintendent for their review.
- Recommendations from the superintendent on any range of subjects.
- Personnel recommendations.
- Involvement in the collective bargaining negotiations.
- Personal advice and counsel to individual members who seek assistance.
- The quality of the budget proposed by the superintendent and the appropriate linkages to district goals and needs.
- Fulfillment of professional duties (Presenting the budget on time; ensuring that all educators have been evaluated as the law requires; filled all necessary positions; etc.).
- Performance at school committee meetings at which the superintendent will propose recommendations, address questions, speak to the board or to the public, and reflect the values of the district.
- Relationship with municipal officials as ascertained by conversations or observations of the school committee.
- Comments from the public at large. Citizens will frequently comment to the school committee about the performance of the superintendent.
- District morale that can be linked appropriately to the superintendent's leadership.

MASC also strongly urges school committee members to use the School Improvement Plan (SIP) for each district school as evidence of performance. By reviewing the SIPs closely, members can determine a school's success, improvement, consistency with district goals, and contributions toward overall district success. The school committee is authorized under the law to review these plans. The superintendent may approve them. However, school committees should ensure that the

superintendent's approval of these plans reflects overall district goals and that the superintendent is using the SIP process to promote teaching, learning, and student success.

Gathering evidence can be a special challenge to school committee members because much of what a superintendent does is performed in an administrative and often confidential setting to which you do not generally have open access.

Unlike the superintendent or principal who may make an unannounced observation of a teacher or administrator, school committee members may not intrude into confidential staff, administrative or private meetings where much of the difficult work of the superintendent takes place. For that reason, it is important to have a good set of "evidence" agreed upon in advance and to give the superintendent plenty of opportunity to demonstrate proficiency.

Step 4: A Mid-Cycle Goals Review Meeting

As is done with teachers and other professional personnel, the superintendent should prepare a progress report at the mid-year point. This is an important strategy for giving a "heads-up" to potential weaknesses or to commend successful performance and offer encouragement. Where professional competence is at issue, the session must be held in public.

Step 5: The End-of-Cycle, or Summative Evaluation and Report.

At the end of the evaluation cycle, the superintendent prepares and submits a report to the school committee giving evidence of performance as agreed earlier in the process. The school committee members then prepare their own individual observations and assessments on a form agreed to in advance. The school committee chair or member designated to aggregate the information and summarize the results then prepares a final end-of-year summative evaluation report.

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE EVALUATION

The evaluation process for the superintendent is generally a public one. Only the superintendent is subject to a public process. In all other cases, the educator evaluation is a confidential personnel document.

The Massachusetts Open Meeting Law permits executive sessions only for the discussion of character, reputation, physical or mental health, or to discuss pending charges or allegations against municipal officials, of which the superintendent is one. Use of the executive session process for the superintendent is at the discretion of the school committee, although the superintendent may demand that it take place in public. Review of performance, including effectiveness of district administration, management of other professional staff, oversight of the budget, relationships with the community, or other matters related to professional competence must be done in public.

In addition, when individual school committee members complete their own evaluations of the superintendent, those individual rating forms also become public documents. When the aggregated evaluation data are reviewed at the end of the process, that document and discussion related to it are also public.

WHAT TO EXPECT

At this early stage of implementation, school committees, superintendents, and other employees will need to identify areas for further clarification, change, or even expansion. Several important questions remain to be resolved and areas of ongoing disagreement need to be worked out.

Will the Evaluation Process Work? School leaders are preparing to implement an evaluation process that will take considerable time, skill, and professional judgment. It is estimated that as much as an additional 10-hours per week of administrator time may be required to fulfill the responsibilities of the new process. Similarly, school committees may find the process more complex than their current one.

Exemplary vs. Proficient Performance. One important matter for superintendents stems from the public nature of the evaluation and their exposure as "public figures" subject to media coverage and vulnerable to harsh criticism from the public and the press. For example, every student strives for the "A" grade, and, while "Bs" are admirable grades, they may be perceived by many as insufficient. Similarly, the evaluation matrix definitions of "exemplary" performance reflect rigorous holding to very high standards set for the highest performing administrators and teachers. Fewer than 20% of our students perform in the top quadrant of test rating or receive the "A" grade in a given subject.

It is expected that most of the state's educators will be ranked as "proficient" at first as they build up the credentials and performance achievements to reach "exemplary" status. However, this is a confidential rating for everyone except the superintendent. A highly able superintendent who provides good leadership to a district may, in the first years of the superintendency, reach proficiency quickly, but not reach an exemplary rating for a while. This exposes the superintendent to the appearance of failing to fulfill the highest expectations, when, in fact, it is simply a reflection of continuing professional growth. Moreover, different school committees will apply their evaluation scores differently. There is a concern that grading the superintendent will take on an unprofessional level of inappropriate competitiveness in the public eye.

Making it Easier vs. Making it Harder

You should develop the evaluation process, including the timetable and specific content in a way that the school committee believes will be most effective and democratic. However, MASC recommends that school committees delegate some of the early stages of the process to the chair or a small working group of members who, in collaboration with the superintendent, can draft a model timetable and initial version of the evaluation tool and content. In this way, the school committee can avoid the unpopular and often challenging exercise of group writing and editing of complex documents.

Following the initial drafts, the full board could then review the drafts and make changes. In some cases, the superintendent might even take the initiative to prepare the document as an initial step. Ultimately, however, the school committee as a body should finalize the evaluation tool and content and feel confident that this document is appropriate, practical, fair, and a powerful tool for focusing on district leadership and student achievement.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A:** The Sample Evaluation Matrix for the Superintendent Including: The 4 Standards, 20 Indicators and 41 Elements in the Model Rubric and The Complete Model Superintendent Matrix with Standards, Indicators and Elements Listed with Descriptions of "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Proficient," and "Exemplary" Ratings
- Attachment B:** MASC's recommended model evaluation tool, adapted from the sample produced by the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- Attachment C:** Guidance from the Attorney General on the Open Meeting Law and Public Records Law as They Relate to Superintendent Evaluation. ("Appendix J" from the Attorney General's Web Frequently Asked Question Guide from the web site.)

How Do the Open Meeting and Public Records Laws Affect the Superintendent Evaluation Process?

The Attorney General has issued guidance in the form of responses to frequently asked questions concerning superintendent evaluations pursuant to the revised Open Meeting Law (c. 28, s. 18 2009).

1. May a public body perform an evaluation of an employee in executive session?

No. Deliberations conducted for the explicit purpose of evaluating the professional competency of an individual may not occur during an executive session. See G.L. c.30A, s.21(a)(1). While conclusions drawn from deliberations about professional competency may be part of a deliberation for another executive session purpose, the evaluation of professional competency, itself, must occur during open session. For example, as part of the discussion in preparation for renegotiating a superintendent's contract, a school committee may wish to consider the results of an annual professional competency evaluation. The evaluation results may be considered as part of deliberations about strategy held in executive session, however, only after deliberations about professional competency were held during a previously convened open session.

2. Are individual evaluations completed by members of public bodies public records?

Yes. The Open Meeting Law carves out an exception from the Public Records Law for "materials used in a performance evaluation of an individual bearing on his professional competence," that were created by members of a public body and used during a meeting. See G.L. c. 30A, s.22(e). Individual evaluations created and used by members of a public body for the purpose of evaluating an employee are public records. Comprehensive evaluations that aggregate the individual public body members' evaluations are also public records if they are used during the course of a meeting. However, evaluations conducted by individuals who are not members of public bodies are not public records. For example, the individual evaluations created by municipal employees in response to a request for feedback on the town administrator are not public records, provided the employees completed the evaluations are not also members of the public body tasked with evaluating the town administrator's professional competency.

3. May the individual evaluations of an employee be aggregated into a comprehensive evaluation?

Yes. Members of a public body may individually create evaluations, and then submit them to an individual to aggregate into a master evaluation document to be discussed at an open meeting. Ideally, members of the public body should submit their evaluations for compilation to someone who is not a member of the public body, for example, an administrative assistant. If this is not a practical option, then the chair or other designated public body member may compile the evaluation. However, once the individual evaluations are submitted for aggregation there should be no deliberation among members of the public body regarding the content of the evaluations outside of an open meeting, whether in person or over email.

4. May a public body discuss issues relative to the salary of a public employee in executive session?

It depends. Discussions of salary issues may only occur in executive session as part of a contract negotiation. See G.L. c.30A, s.21(a)(2), (3). Other discussions related to salary, such as a discussion about whether an employee's job performance merits a bonus or salary increase, must be conducted in open session.

**Superintendent Performance Indicators:
Priorities Agreed Upon by Superintendent McFall and the School Committee
Lincoln Public Schools, 2012-13**

Standard I: Instructional Leadership

I-B-I: Instructional Practices

While observing principal practice and artifacts, ensures that principals identify a variety of effective teaching strategies and practices when they observe practice and review unit plans.

I-C-I: Variety of Assessments

Supports administrator teams to use a variety of formal and informal methods and assessments, including common interim assessments that are aligned across grade levels and subject areas.

I-D-1: Educator Goals

Supports administrators and administrator teams to develop and attain meaningful, actionable, and measurable professional practice, student learning, and where appropriate, district/school improvement goals.

I-D-3: Ratings

Exercises sound and reliable judgment in assigning ratings for performance, goal attainment, and impact on student learning and ensures that administrators understand why they received their ratings.

I-E-2: School and District Goals

Uses data to accurately assess school and district strengths and areas for improvement to inform the creation of focused, measurable district goals. Provides support to principals in their efforts to create focused, measurable school goals.

Standard II: Management and Operations

II-E-1: Fiscal Systems

Develops a budget that aligns with the district's vision, mission, and goals. Allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district/school-level goals and available resources.

Standard III: Family and Community Engagement

III-B-2: Family Collaboration

Sets clear expectations for and supports administrators to regularly engage families in supporting learning at school and home, including appropriate adaptation for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency.

**EVALUATING THE SUPERINTENDENT
UNDER THE NEW
MASSACHUSETTS EDUCATOR EVALUATION
SYSTEM**

**A Guide for the School Committee, School
Councils, and Parents**

**Prepared by the Massachusetts Association of School Committees
Revised, November 2012**

In the interest of providing clarity to our members and our colleagues in education as well as to parents, students and interested members of the community, MASC has prepared this document as a guide to understanding the Massachusetts Educator Evaluation System as it relates to superintendents of schools.

More than 375 pages of additional information, including copies of relevant state law, regulations, guidelines, instructions and matrices that highlight individual evaluation standards may be downloaded from the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's web site at:

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/eval/model/>

There you will find highly detailed explanations of the educator evaluation system for faculty, including teachers and administrators, as well as superintendents of schools.

MASC was closely involved in helping to develop the general outline of the model system and has recommended adoption of most of the state's model system as a way to begin the process. We have also included a model evaluation tool for evaluating, rating, and scoring the performance of the superintendent that is based predominantly on the example produced by the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The MASC model calls special attention to the importance of the School Improvement Plans and to the ability of the school committee to adapt the evaluation to local standards and goals.

MASSACHUSETTS EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM

What is this all about?

Starting in 2012 Massachusetts public school systems will be introducing a new educator evaluation system for teachers, other full time professional educators, principals and administrators, including school superintendents. The system will be the most comprehensive and ambitious to date. It will be built around several important principles:

1. Educators around the state should be evaluated regularly using common standards that will be relevant to the work they do. These standards have been set by the state, subject to regular revision.
2. District administrators will be responsible for evaluating all professional educators. School principals will oversee the evaluations of teachers, counselors, and therapists in their buildings as well as school based administrators. The superintendents will oversee the evaluations of district based administrators and school principals. The school committees will evaluate the superintendents.
3. The purpose of the evaluation process will be multifold including:
 - a. Guiding the professional development and performance improvement of every educator.
 - b. Maintaining a consistent set of standards to measure educator performance.
 - c. Helping to measure the effectiveness of each educator in terms of their impact on student achievement and on the development of their own professional skills.
 - d. By mutually agreement, the school committee and superintendent or through negotiations with the employees and their unions, apply the evaluation data to other work-based conditions, including economic or professional conditions.
4. Each educator will be evaluated on individual standards which are also divided into additional "indicators," and even further divided into "elements." ***The school committee has the flexibility to determine just how many of the four standards, forty one elements and twenty indicators may be used for the superintendent and for the personal, professional goals.***
5. The evaluation system will result in a four tier ranking system (unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and exemplary) for all those evaluated.
6. Measures of student achievement on standardized tests will be used in several ways to determine how well students learn their subject matter in the evaluation of all educators.

7. While the state has set the general standards, many facets of the evaluation process will be subject to the collective bargaining process. This is a process whereby school committees, guided by their advisors including superintendents, administrators and legal counsel will negotiate with teachers unions over important parts of the evaluation process. Among the items subject to collective bargaining for unionized employees will be:
- The standards of performance and specific language used to define the various rankings within each standard, subject to certain requirements that the state sets.
 - Identification of those "artifacts of student performance" that may be among those used to measure student achievement.
 - Determining how much each component of the evaluation will be weighed in a final evaluation.
 - Determining how the evaluation data may be used for the purposes of assigning educators, transferring personnel, promotions, or other job related matters.
 - What economic incentives might be linked to the evaluation process, such as performance-based bonuses, salary increases, opportunities to perform additional work for additional pay, or other terms that might be negotiated.
 - How the evaluation process will be administered, subject to the general guidelines approved by BESE. There are several steps in the process that are subject to clarification or more detailed definition through collective bargaining.

Why is this happening?

The new system is based on requirements set by state regulation and provisions of the federal "Race to the Top" program.

Because a strong evaluation system is important to helping teachers and administrators become effective educators, state law authorizes the MA Board Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) to establish an educator evaluation process, set standards of performance to use in assessing personnel performance and to authorize the means of measuring student performance in several areas. Student performance is measured in many ways, but among the best known are standardized tests that assess how well pupils have mastered the state's Curriculum Frameworks.

The Frameworks are organized grade by grade curricula that determine what skills are to be mastered by particular milestones or grades. The standardized tests measure learning of the curricula by grade. The entire process of Frameworks and testing is called the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS). Many people believe that MCAS refers only to the tests, but, in fact, it refers to the entire system of standards and measurements.

In 2011, 75% of the state's school districts, including school committees, superintendents, and local teachers unions joined with DESE to seek what became a \$250 million grant from the US Department of

Education under the Race to the Top Program. Part of the grant application required the creation of this new evaluation system and the eventual implementation statewide.

Almost immediately after the awarding of the grant, a 40-person task force representing many public, quasi-public, and private business groups proposed to BESE the general guidelines of what became the new evaluation system. The "grand bargain" that set forth the master plan was an agreement by at least one of the state's major unions (MA Teachers Association), the school committees and school superintendents to adopt groundbreaking and precedent-setting provisions such as using student tests and measurements as part of the evaluating process in exchange for using the collective bargaining process to negotiate some of the most sensitive parts at the local level. Ultimately, BESE adopted the current plan.

Not all parties to the negotiations were satisfied. Voices within the business community sought a fixed, high percentage of student achievement data as a mandated component of teacher assessment. Others wanted a more limited role for the collective bargaining process. One group managed to secure enough signatures to place an initiative petition before voters to overturn much of the more collaborative parts of the system. Before the petition could be finalized, further negotiations secured one additional provision to the master plan. It dealt with the implications of teacher transfers and the controversial process of "bumping," where a teacher being transferred involuntarily is allowed to take the position of another teacher for one of several reasons, including "seniority." To head off the ballot question, state legislators approved and the governor signed a bill preventing a teacher from being involuntarily removed from one's position unless the teacher doing the "bumping" was certified in the subject matter and "highly qualified." The term "highly qualified" would also be subject to collective bargaining and the new provision would be held off until 2016 to allow time to prepare districts and complete local negotiations on this matter.

HOW DOES THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE BEGIN THE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR THE SUPERINTENDENT?

The educator evaluation systems are built around a five step process.

Before You Start:

1. Review Your Contract of Employment with Your Superintendent

School committees are required to evaluate their superintendents, but many of the terms, timelines, and protocols for the valuation may have been negotiated into your chief executive's contract of employment. The contract may specify:

- The annual timetable for the evaluation.
- Clarification of how the evaluation will take place and who will serve as the school committee point person for gathering and aggregating feedback from members before completing a composite review.

- Specification of which members may participate in the evaluation. Some school committees require members to have served for a minimum period of time before participating. Others may or may not allow former members who served during the prior year to participate.
- Determining whether the school committee must confer with the superintendent prior to establishing the evaluation criteria or whether the development of the tool, timetable and process must be mutually agreeable.

✱ This last provision can be controversial. If a school committee agrees in its contract of employment with the superintendent to establish a "mutually agreeable" evaluation tool, it must be acceptable to both parties before it can be used. If the school committee agrees only to confer or consult with the superintendent prior to establishing a tool, it does not need the approval of the chief executive before deploying the evaluation document. MASC recommends to its members that they use the "confer or consult" model language in order to avoid a potential stalemate over the evaluation content.

2. Setting District Goals

Evaluation systems are based on both standards and goals. District goals, set by the school committee in collaboration with the superintendent, and they must be the basis for all evaluations in that everyone must work towards the same objectives.

The school committee has the authority to set goals and establish the strategic plan based on criteria the board sets for itself. However, district goals are most often set following a collaborative discussion with the superintendent that may include such additional input as:

- A review of a district strategic plan or set of strategic directions already in place.
- Recommendations of the superintendent based on the chief executive's professional judgment about district needs and priorities.
- A new superintendent entry plan that is the result of a broad outreach by the chief executive to learn the strengths, areas for improvement, emerging trends, political developments, economic conditions, and long term needs for the district and member communities.
- Input from current teachers, administrators, support staff, school councils, and parents.
- Guidance from other appropriate sources, including stakeholder groups, economic research, and other experts.

The superintendent, in consultation with the school committee and subject to its approval will establish a personal practice and student achievement goal for themselves. In addition, the school committee and superintendent would agree to between two and four district improvement goals to complement the standards upon which the evaluations will be based. These are also subject to the approval of the school committee. These goals will be important as will be explained shortly.

CREATING THE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT AND FULFILING THE PROCESS

STEP 1: Understanding the Evaluation System and Related Criteria¹

The first step of the five step cycle is to review the entire system and begin a self-assessment process for the superintendent. This includes having the school committee and superintendent come to agreement around the standards, rubrics, evidence of performance, and goals built around the state standards as well as personal, professional goals.

The superintendent's evaluation will be based on four major standards (See Attachment A, The Evaluation Matrix for Superintendents). Each of these standards is subdivided into several "Indicators" that define further how a skill set can be considered. These "Indicators" are subdivided even further into "Elements." These allow the school committee to define more precisely how detailed the evaluation might become. All in all, there are more than 65 separate Standards, Indicators and Elements. They are outlined on the Evaluation Matrix for Superintendents.

To help make the process understandable, DESE produced lengthy guides to this process and created sample "descriptors" for every one of the four Standards, 41 Indicators and 21 Elements. Each descriptor is highlighted on the complete matrix compilation that can be downloaded from the DESE web site. These descriptors explain how each of the 65 categories would appear if they were performed in each of the four grading categories (underperforming, needs improvement, proficient, and exemplary).

In addition to evaluating the superintendent on the basis of the standards selected from the Evaluation Matrix for Superintendents, each superintendent must have at least two additional goals: a professional practice goal, a student achievement goal, and two to four district improvement goals. The professional practice goal focused on one's growth and development as an educational leader and might include pursuit of a doctorate or specialized advanced study, participation at professional conferences, mastery of new theories and practices, extensive integration into the fabric community, or some other personal objective. The district improvement goal would relate to overall growth and development of the district in terms of teaching and learning.

Moreover, these goals must be "S M A R T" Goals meaning that they are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely. This concept leaves little room for ambiguity and requires the actual achievement of clearly defined measures of achievement. (For example, one either completes defined course work or one does not; student achievement overall either increases by the stated goal, or it does not.)

¹ Resources for steps one through five can be found in the "Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation, Part VI" accessible from the MA DESE web site.

Step Two: Meeting to Formalize the Goals and Superintendent Development Plan

Assuming district goals have been established, it is a good idea to have an initial discussion with the superintendent about any special considerations that will go into the evaluation process. This might include recognizing special circumstances or challenges (i.e., a new superintendency; a pending retirement; high numbers of high risk students; an economic catastrophe like the closing of a military base or employment site that will affect morale, census, or family life), unique developments that might arise during the year (recovery from last year's flood damage; construction sites contiguous to busy school buildings; political strife with the municipality; new curricula being introduced), or other facts that will merit special consideration.

At this time, you can also reach an agreement about the criteria and information you will use to base your own evaluations of the superintendent. These include important questions like:

- What is the best evaluation cycle to use? (Some districts will want to begin the cycle in September at the start of the school year while others may wish to begin after town elections in the Spring or on the anniversary date of the superintendent's contract.)
- What are reasonable expectations for the superintendent at this point in time?
- What evaluation standards will you use, including those required by the state, the further refinements that you elect, and those in the professional practice goals of the superintendent?
- What are the most effective ways to assess the superintendent's performance?
- How should we tie student achievement to the work of the superintendent?
- How will we measure the superintendent's ability to lead the district?
- What will effective leadership look like? This will be an important consideration when you select items from the model rubric as a guide.
- How can we deal with our concerns about the district through the superintendent's evaluation?
- From whom should we seek appropriately any additional input into the evaluation (i.e., municipal officials, parents, faculty and administrators, local leaders and business representatives, or others)?

Once these ground rules have been established, it is appropriate to begin the drafting process for an evaluation document.

Selecting the appropriate criteria to use in a superintendent evaluation and reviewing the personal goals can be an extraordinarily complex process and one that does not easily surrender itself to a group editing process. It does not have to be unnecessarily complicated.

MASC strongly recommends that school committees adopt one of these initial steps:

1. Designate a small subcommittee of the school committee, or authorize the chair and/or vice chair, or a special ad-hoc subcommittee, to meet with the superintendent to draft a model

- evaluation document for review by the full school committee. In this way, you will take the initiative to prepare a document that is already well thought-out before it goes to the board.
2. In some circumstances, a school committee may be well served by asking the superintendent to draft the full evaluation tool for their consideration. As a variation, the superintendent may develop a draft of a full evaluation tool for review by the chair and/or vice chair or subcommittee.

The proposed tool can be presented to the school committee for approval.

Step 3: Implementing the Evaluation and Collect the Evidence Upon Which to Base the Evaluation

During the year, the superintendent will gather evidence of performance based on the agreement at the start of the process. In addition, school committee members will gather information based on their observations, feedback, and other sources that are appropriate. For example, school committee members will gather their own evidence and provide feedback to the superintendent based upon various items, including, but not limited to:

- Evidence of instructional leadership and the links to student achievement.
- Reports and research prepared by the superintendent for their review.
- Recommendations from the superintendent on any range of subjects.
- Personnel recommendations.
- Involvement in the collective bargaining negotiations.
- Personal advice and counsel to individual members who seek assistance.
- The quality of the budget proposed by the superintendent and the appropriate linkages to district goals and needs.
- Fulfillment of professional duties (Presenting the budget on time; ensuring that all educators have been evaluated as the law requires; filled all necessary positions; etc.).
- Performance at school committee meetings at which the superintendent will propose recommendations, address questions, speak to the board or to the public, and reflect the values of the district.
- Relationship with municipal officials as ascertained by conversations or observations of the school committee.
- Comments from the public at large. Citizens will frequently comment to the school committee about the performance of the superintendent.
- District morale that can be linked appropriately to the superintendent's leadership.

MASC also strongly urges school committee members to use the School Improvement Plan (SIP) for each district school as evidence of performance. By reviewing the SIPs closely, members can determine a school's success, improvement, consistency with district goals, and contributions toward overall district success. The school committee is authorized under the law to review these plans. The superintendent may approve them. However, school committees should ensure that the

superintendent's approval of these plans reflects overall district goals and that the superintendent is using the SIP process to promote teaching, learning, and student success.

Gathering evidence can be a special challenge to school committee members because much of what a superintendent does is performed in an administrative and often confidential setting to which you do not generally have open access.

Unlike the superintendent or principal who may make an unannounced observation of a teacher or administrator, school committee members may not intrude into confidential staff, administrative or private meetings where much of the difficult work of the superintendent takes place. For that reason, it is important to have a good set of "evidence" agreed upon in advance and to give the superintendent plenty of opportunity to demonstrate proficiency.

Step 4: A Mid-Cycle Goals Review Meeting

As is done with teachers and other professional personnel, the superintendent should prepare a progress report at the mid-year point. This is an important strategy for giving a "heads-up" to potential weaknesses or to commend successful performance and offer encouragement. Where professional competence is at issue, the session must be held in public.

Step 5: The End-of-Cycle, or Summative Evaluation and Report.

At the end of the evaluation cycle, the superintendent prepares and submits a report to the school committee giving evidence of performance as agreed earlier in the process. The school committee members then prepare their own individual observations and assessments on a form agreed to in advance. The school committee chair or member designated to aggregate the information and summarize the results then prepares a final end-of-year summative evaluation report.

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE EVALUATION

The evaluation process for the superintendent is generally a public one. Only the superintendent is subject to a public process. In all other cases, the educator evaluation is a confidential personnel document.

The Massachusetts Open Meeting Law permits executive sessions only for the discussion of character, reputation, physical or mental health, or to discuss pending charges or allegations against municipal officials, of which the superintendent is one. Use of the executive session process for the superintendent is at the discretion of the school committee, although the superintendent may demand that it take place in public. Review of performance, including effectiveness of district administration, management of other professional staff, oversight of the budget, relationships with the community, or other matters related to professional competence must be done in public.

In addition, when individual school committee members complete their own evaluations of the superintendent, those individual rating forms also become public documents. When the aggregated evaluation data are reviewed at the end of the process, that document and discussion related to it are also public.

WHAT TO EXPECT

At this early stage of implementation, school committees, superintendents, and other employees will need to identify areas for further clarification, change, or even expansion. Several important questions remain to be resolved and areas of ongoing disagreement need to be worked out.

Will the Evaluation Process Work? School leaders are preparing to implement an evaluation process that will take considerable time, skill, and professional judgment. It is estimated that as much as an additional 10-hours per week of administrator time may be required to fulfill the responsibilities of the new process. Similarly, school committees may find the process more complex than their current one.

Exemplary vs. Proficient Performance. One important matter for superintendents stems from the public nature of the evaluation and their exposure as "public figures" subject to media coverage and vulnerable to harsh criticism from the public and the press. For example, every student strives for the "A" grade, and, while "Bs" are admirable grades, they may be perceived by many as insufficient. Similarly, the evaluation matrix definitions of "exemplary" performance reflect rigorous holding to very high standards set for the highest performing administrators and teachers. Fewer than 20% of our students perform in the top quadrant of test rating or receive the "A" grade in a given subject.

It is expected that most of the state's educators will be ranked as "proficient" at first as they build up the credentials and performance achievements to reach "exemplary" status. However, this is a confidential rating for everyone except the superintendent. A highly able superintendent who provides good leadership to a district may, in the first years of the superintendency, reach proficiency quickly, but not reach an exemplary rating for a while. This exposes the superintendent to the appearance of failing to fulfill the highest expectations, when, in fact, it is simply a reflection of continuing professional growth. Moreover, different school committees will apply their evaluation scores differently. There is a concern that grading the superintendent will take on an unprofessional level of inappropriate competitiveness in the public eye.

Making it Easier vs. Making it Harder

You should develop the evaluation process, including the timetable and specific content in a way that the school committee believes will be most effective and democratic. However, MASC recommends that school committees delegate some of the early stages of the process to the chair or a small working group of members who, in collaboration with the superintendent, can draft a model timetable and initial version of the evaluation tool and content. In this way, the school committee can avoid the unpopular and often challenging exercise of group writing and editing of complex documents.

Following the initial drafts, the full board could then review the drafts and make changes. In some cases, the superintendent might even take the initiative to prepare the document as an initial step. Ultimately, however, the school committee as a body should finalize the evaluation tool and content and feel confident that this document is appropriate, practical, fair, and a powerful tool for focusing on district leadership and student achievement.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A:** The Sample Evaluation Matrix for the Superintendent Including: The 4 Standards, 20 Indicators and 41 Elements in the Model Rubric and The Complete Model Superintendent Matrix with Standards, Indicators and Elements Listed with Descriptions of "Unsatisfactory," "Needs Improvement," "Proficient," and "Exemplary" Ratings
- Attachment B:** MASC's recommended model evaluation tool, adapted from the sample produced by the MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- Attachment C:** Guidance from the Attorney General on the Open Meeting Law and Public Records Law as They Relate to Superintendent Evaluation. ("Appendix J" from the Attorney General's Web Frequently Asked Question Guide from the web site.)

How Do the Open Meeting and Public Records Laws Affect the Superintendent Evaluation Process?

The Attorney General has issued guidance in the form of responses to frequently asked questions concerning superintendent evaluations pursuant to the revised Open Meeting Law (c. 28, s. 18 2009).

1. May a public body perform an evaluation of an employee in executive session?

No. Deliberations conducted for the explicit purpose of evaluating the professional competency of an individual may not occur during an executive session. See G.L. c.30A, s.21(a)(1). While conclusions drawn from deliberations about professional competency may be part of a deliberation for another executive session purpose, the evaluation of professional competency, itself, must occur during open session. For example, as part of the discussion in preparation for renegotiating a superintendent's contract, a school committee may wish to consider the results of an annual professional competency evaluation. The evaluation results may be considered as part of deliberations about strategy held in executive session, however, only after deliberations about professional competency were held during a previously convened open session.

2. Are individual evaluations completed by members of public bodies public records?

Yes. The Open Meeting Law carves out an exception from the Public Records Law for "materials used in a performance evaluation of an individual bearing on his professional competence," that were created by members of a public body and used during a meeting. See G.L. c. 30A, s.22(e). Individual evaluations created and used by members of a public body for the purpose of evaluating an employee are public records. Comprehensive evaluations that aggregate the individual public body members' evaluations are also public records if they are used during the course of a meeting. However, evaluations conducted by individuals who are not members of public bodies are not public records. For example, the individual evaluations created by municipal employees in response to a request for feedback on the town administrator are not public records, provided the employees completed the evaluations are not also members of the public body tasked with evaluating the town administrator's professional competency.

3. May the individual evaluations of an employee be aggregated into a comprehensive evaluation?

Yes. Members of a public body may individually create evaluations, and then submit them to an individual to aggregate into a master evaluation document to be discussed at an open meeting. Ideally, members of the public body should submit their evaluations for compilation to someone who is not a member of the public body, for example, an administrative assistant. If this is not a practical option, then the chair or other designated public body member may compile the evaluation. However, once the individual evaluations are submitted for aggregation there should be no deliberation among members of the public body regarding the content of the evaluations outside of an open meeting, whether in person or over email.

4. May a public body discuss issues relative to the salary of a public employee in executive session?

It depends. Discussions of salary issues may only occur in executive session as part of a contract negotiation. See G.L. c.30A, s.21(a)(2), (3). Other discussions related to salary, such as a discussion about whether an employee's job performance merits a bonus or salary increase, must be conducted in open session.

**Superintendent Performance Indicators:
Priorities Agreed Upon by Superintendent McFall and the School Committee
Lincoln Public Schools, 2012-13**

Standard I: Instructional Leadership

I-B-I: Instructional Practices

While observing principal practice and artifacts, ensures that principals identify a variety of effective teaching strategies and practices when they observe practice and review unit plans.

I-C-I: Variety of Assessments

Supports administrator teams to use a variety of formal and informal methods and assessments, including common interim assessments that are aligned across grade levels and subject areas.

I-D-1: Educator Goals

Supports administrators and administrator teams to develop and attain meaningful, actionable, and measurable professional practice, student learning, and where appropriate, district/school improvement goals.

I-D-3: Ratings

Exercises sound and reliable judgment in assigning ratings for performance, goal attainment, and impact on student learning and ensures that administrators understand why they received their ratings.

I-E-2: School and District Goals

Uses data to accurately assess school and district strengths and areas for improvement to inform the creation of focused, measurable district goals. Provides support to principals in their efforts to create focused, measurable school goals.

Standard II: Management and Operations

II-E-1: Fiscal Systems

Develops a budget that aligns with the district's vision, mission, and goals. Allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district/school-level goals and available resources.

Standard III: Family and Community Engagement

III-B-2: Family Collaboration

Sets clear expectations for and supports administrators to regularly engage families in supporting learning at school and home, including appropriate adaptation for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency.



Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluation

Part III: Guide to Rubrics and Model Rubrics for Superintendent, Administrator, and Teacher

Appendix A. Superintendent Rubric

January 2012

Guide to Superintendent Rubric

Rubrics – defined in the regulations as “scoring tool[s] that describe characteristics of practice or artifacts at different levels of performance” ([603 CMR 35.02](#)) – are a critical component of the Massachusetts educator evaluation framework and are required for every educator. Rubrics are designed to help educators and evaluators (1) develop a consistent, shared understanding of what proficient performance looks like in practice, (2) develop a common terminology and structure to organize evidence, and (3) make informed professional judgments about formative and summative performance ratings on each Standard and overall. This appendix contains the ESE Model Superintendent Rubric.

Structure of the Superintendent Rubric

- **Standards:** Standards are the broad categories of knowledge, skills, and performance of effective practice detailed in the regulations. There are four Standards for all administrators: *Instructional Leadership*; *Management and Operations*; *Family and Community Engagement*; and *Professional Culture*.
- **Indicators:** Indicators, also detailed in the regulations, describe specific knowledge, skills, and performance for each Standard. For example, there are five Indicators in Standard I of the Superintendent rubric including *Curriculum*, *Instruction*, and *Evaluation*.
- **Elements:** The elements are more specific descriptions of actions and behaviors related to each Indicator. The elements further break down the Indicators into more specific aspects of educator practice and provide an opportunity for evaluators to offer detailed feedback that serves as a roadmap for improvement.
- **Descriptors:** Performance descriptors are observable and measurable statements of educator actions and behaviors aligned to each element and serve as the basis for identifying the level of teaching or administrative performance in one of four categories: *Unsatisfactory*, *Needs Improvement*, *Proficient*, or *Exemplary*.

Use of the Superintendent Rubric

This rubric describes administrative leadership practice at the district level. It is intended to be used throughout the 5 step evaluation cycle for the evaluation of the superintendent by the school committee. This rubric can also be used by the superintendent for the evaluation of other district level administrators, such as assistant superintendents, directors of curriculum and instruction, school business administrators, and directors of special education.

The responsibilities of administrators to whom this rubric will be applied may vary. ESE encourages administrators and evaluators to use the rubric strategically by discussing and agreeing upon certain Indicators and elements that should be high priorities according to that administrator's role and responsibilities as well as his/her professional practice, student learning, and district and/or school improvement goals. There are a variety of ways to emphasize these components throughout the evaluation cycle. For example, high priority Indicators and/or elements can be analyzed in greater depth during self-assessment, targeted during goal setting, a focus for more comprehensive evidence collection, or all of the above. However, the expectation is that by the end of the evaluation cycle, administrators and evaluators have gathered and shared a reasonable amount of evidence on every Indicator to support a rating for each Standard.

Superintendent Rubric At-A-Glance

Standard I: Instructional Leadership	Standard II: Management & Operations	Standard III: Family and Community Engagement	Standard IV: Professional Culture
A. Curriculum Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Standards-Based Unit Design Lesson Development Support B. Instruction Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Instructional Practices Quality of Effort & Work Diverse Learners' Needs C. Assessment Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Variety of Assessments Adjustment to Practice D. Evaluation Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Educator Goals Observations & Feedback Ratings Alignment Review E. Data-Informed Decision Making Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge & Use of Data School and District Goals Improvement of Performance, Effectiveness, and Learning 	A. Environment Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Plans, Procedures, and Routines Operational Systems Student Safety, Health, and Social and Emotional Needs B. Human Resources Management & Development Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment & Hiring Strategies Induction, Professional Development, and Career Growth Strategies C. Scheduling & Management Information Systems Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Time for Teaching and Learning Time for Collaboration D. Law, Ethics & Policies Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Laws and Policies Ethical Behavior E. Fiscal Systems Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Fiscal Systems 	A. Engagement Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Family Engagement Community and Business Engagement B. Sharing Responsibility Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Student Support Family Collaboration C. Communication Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Two-Way Communication Culturally Proficient Communication D. Family Concerns Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Family Concerns 	A. Commitment to High Standards Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Commitment to High Standards Mission and Core Values Meetings B. Cultural Proficiency Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Policies and Practices C. Communications Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Communication Skills D. Continuous Learning Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous Learning of Staff Continuous Learning of Administrator E. Shared Vision Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Shared Vision Development F. Managing Conflict Indicator <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Response to Disagreement Conflict Resolution Consensus Building

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Standard I: Instructional Leadership. The education leader promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff by cultivating a shared vision that makes powerful teaching and learning the central focus of schooling.

Indicator I-A. Curriculum: Ensures that all instructional staff design effective and rigorous standards-based units of instruction consisting of well-structured lessons with measurable outcomes.				
I-A. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-A-1. Standards-Based Unit Design	Does not set the expectation that administrators use effective strategies for ensuring development of well-designed standards-based units, provide adequate resources or support for this activity, and/or monitor or assess progress.	Provides limited training and/or support to administrators to employ effective strategies for ensuring well-designed standards-based units. May sometimes monitor and assess progress and provide feedback.	Provides support and assistance for administrators to learn and employ effective strategies for ensuring that educators and educator teams design standards-based units with measurable outcomes and challenging tasks requiring higher-order thinking. Frequently monitors and assesses progress, providing feedback as necessary.	Empowers administrators to employ strategies that empower staff to create rigorous standards-based units of instruction that are aligned across grade levels and content areas. Continually monitors and assesses progress, provides feedback, and connects administrators to additional supports as needed. Is able to model this element.
I-A-2. Lesson Development Support	Does not state expectations for administrators that they establish effective strategies to ensure development of well-structured lessons, does not provide training or support, and/or does not discriminate between strong and weak strategies for ensuring effective lesson-planning practices.	Provides limited training to administrators on how to establish effective strategies for ensuring that educators develop well-structured lessons and/or does not consistently identify and/or address patterns when there is evidence of a weak strategy being employed.	Supports administrators to learn and establish effective strategies for ensuring that educators develop well-structured lessons with challenging, measurable objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, activities, materials, technologies, and grouping.	Supports administrators to collaborate on developing strategies that enable educators to consistently develop series of interconnected, well-structured lessons with challenging objectives and appropriate student engagement strategies, pacing, sequence, materials, and grouping and identifies specific exemplars and resources in each area. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator I-B. Instruction: Ensures that practices in all settings reflect high expectations regarding content and quality of effort and work, engage all students, and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness.

I-B. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-B-1. Instructional Practices	Does not look for evidence of and/or cannot accurately identify ways that principals identify effective teaching strategies when the principals observe practice and review unit plans..	While the superintendent may observe principal practice and artifacts, s/he only occasionally looks for evidence that principals are identifying effective teaching strategies and practices when they observe practice and review unit plans.	While observing principal practice and artifacts, ensures that principals identify a variety of effective teaching strategies and practices when they observe practice and review unit plans.	While observing principal practice and artifacts, ensures that principals know and employ effective strategies and practices for helping educators improve instructional practice. Is able to model this element.
I-B-2. Quality of Effort and Work	Does not set high expectations for the quality of content, student effort, and/or student work district-wide, or expectations are inappropriate.	May set high expectations for the quality of content, student effort, and student work district-wide, but allows expectations to be inconsistently applied across the district.	Sets and models high expectations for the quality of content, student effort, and student work district-wide and supports administrators to uphold these expectations consistently.	Sets and models high expectations for the quality of content, student effort, and student work district-wide and empowers administrators, educators and students to uphold these expectations consistently. Is able to model this element.
I-B-3. Diverse Learners' Needs	Does not look for evidence of and/or cannot accurately identify ways that principals identify effective teaching strategies and practices that are appropriate for diverse learners.	While the superintendent may observe principal practice, s/he only occasionally looks for evidence that principals are identifying effective teaching strategies and practices that are appropriate for diverse learners when they observe practices and review unit plans.	While observing principal practice, ensures that principals look for and identify a variety of teaching strategies and practices that are effective with diverse learners when they observe practices and review unit plans.	Employs strategies that ensure that principals know and consistently identify teaching strategies and practices that are meeting the needs of diverse learners while teaching their content. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator I-C. Assessment: Ensures that all principals and administrators facilitate practices that propel personnel to use a variety of formal and informal methods and assessments to measure student learning, growth, and understanding and make necessary adjustments to their practice when students are not learning.

I-C. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-C-1. Variety of Assessments	Does not communicate or monitor a strategy for assessments, leaving it up to administrators to design and implement their own strategies.	Provides administrators with some formal assessment options and suggests that they coordinate their assessment practices within their teams and include a variety of assessments but does not monitor this practice.	Supports administrator teams to use a variety of formal and informal methods and assessments, including common interim assessments that are aligned across grade levels and subject areas.	Leads administrator teams to develop and implement a comprehensive assessment strategy that includes ongoing informal assessment and common interim assessments that are aligned across grade levels and subject areas. Is able to model this element.
I-C-2. Adjustment to Practice	Does not encourage or facilitate administrator teams to review assessment data.	Suggests that administrator teams meet to review data and plan for adjustments and interventions but inconsistently monitors this practice.	Provides the resources for planning time and effective support for administrator teams to review assessment data and identify appropriate interventions and adjustments to practice. Monitors administrators' efforts and successes in this area.	Leads, plans, facilitates, and supports administrator team review meetings after each round of assessments. Monitors teams' plans, adjustments to instruction, and outcomes and shares lessons learned with others. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator I-D. Evaluation: Provides effective and timely supervision and evaluation of all staff in alignment with state regulations and contract provisions.

I-D. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-D-1. Educator Goals	Does not support administrators to develop professional practice, student learning and/or district/school improvement goals, review the goals for quality, and/or support administrators in attaining goals.	Supports administrators and administrator teams to develop professional practice, student learning and, where appropriate, district/school improvement goals but does not consistently review them for quality and/or monitor progress.	Supports administrators and administrator teams to develop and attain meaningful, actionable, and measurable professional practice, student learning, and where appropriate, district/school improvement goals.	Supports administrators and administrator teams to develop and attain meaningful, actionable, and measurable professional practice, student learning and district/school improvement goals and models this process through the superintendent's own evaluation process and goals. Is able to model this element.
I-D-2. Observations and Feedback	Rarely conducts visits to observe principal practice and/or does not provide honest feedback to administrators who are not performing proficiently.	Makes infrequent unannounced visits to schools to observe principal practice, rarely provides feedback that is specific and constructive for administrators, and/or critiques struggling administrators without providing support to improve their performance.	Typically makes at least three unannounced visits to each school to observe principal practice every year and provides targeted constructive feedback to all administrators. Acknowledges effective practice and provides redirection and support for those whose practice is less than <i>Proficient</i>.	Makes unannounced visits to schools throughout the year to observe administrator practice and provides targeted constructive feedback to all administrators. Engages with all in conversations with all administrators about improvement, celebrates effective practice, and provides targeted support to administrators whose practice is less than <i>Proficient</i> . Is able to model this element.
I-D-3. Ratings	Assigns ratings for performance, goal attainment, and impact on student learning without collecting and analyzing sufficient and/or appropriate data or does not assign ratings for some administrators.	Assigns ratings for performance, goal attainment, and impact on student learning in a way that is not consistently transparent to administrators.	Exercises sound and reliable judgment in assigning ratings for performance, goal attainment, and impact on student learning and ensures that administrators understand why they received their ratings.	Exercises sound and reliable judgment in assigning ratings for performance, goal attainment, and impact on student learning. Ensures that administrators understand in detail why they received their ratings and provides effective support around this practice. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

I-D. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-D-4. Alignment Review	Does not review alignment between judgment about practice and data about student learning when evaluating and rating administrators.	Occasionally reviews alignment between judgment about practice and student learning data.	Consistently reviews alignment between judgment about practice and student learning data and provides guidance to administrators to make informed decisions about educator support and evaluation based upon this review.	Studies alignment between judgment about practice and data about student learning when evaluating and rating administrators and provides effective support around this practice. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator I-E. Data-Informed Decision Making: Uses multiple sources of evidence related to student learning, including state, district, and school assessment results and growth data, to inform school and district goals and improve organizational performance, educator effectiveness, and student learning.

I-E. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-E-1. Knowledge and Use of Data	Relies on too few data sources to represent the full picture of school or district performance, and/or does not analyze the data accurately.	May work with administrators to identify multiple sources of student learning data, but these data do not provide multiple perspectives on performance, and/or analysis of the data is sometimes inaccurate.	Guides administrators and supports them in identifying a range of appropriate data sources and effectively analyze the data for decision-making purposes.	Leads administrator teams to identify a range of appropriate data sources, including non-traditional information that offers a unique perspective on school and district performance, and models effective data analysis for staff. Is able to model this element.
I-E-2. School and District Goals	Gathers limited information on school and district strengths and weaknesses and/or does not use these data to inform district plans or actions.	Assesses school and district strengths and weaknesses using data that are not carefully analyzed and/or writes an unfocused strategic plan.	Uses data to accurately assess school and district strengths and areas for improvement to inform the creation of focused, measurable district goals. Provides support to principals in their efforts to create focused, measurable school goals.	Involves stakeholders in a comprehensive diagnosis of school and district strengths and weaknesses using appropriate data, and leads a collaborative process to develop a focused, results-oriented strategic plan with annual goals. Is able to model this element.
I-E-3. Improvement of Performance, Effectiveness, and Learning	Does not share assessment data with administrators or provide them with resources and support to use data to make adjustments to school or district plans, and/or model appropriate data analysis strategies.	Shares limited data with administrators to identify student and/or educator subgroups that need support; provides limited assistance to administrator teams in using data to improve performance.	Uses multiple data sources to evaluate administrator and district performance. Provides administrators and administrator teams with the resources and support to disaggregate assessment data and assists them in identifying students who need additional support.	Uses multiple data sources to evaluate administrator and district performance. Provides administrators and administrator teams with the resources and support to disaggregate assessment data and assists them in identifying students who need additional support. Empowers educators to use a range of data sources to pinpoint areas for their own and schoolwide improvement. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Standard II: Management and Operations. *Promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff by ensuring a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, using resources to implement appropriate curriculum, staffing, and scheduling*

Indicator II-A. Environment: Develops and executes effective plans, procedures, routines, and operational systems to address a full range of safety, health, and emotional and social needs.

II-A. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-A-1. Plans, Procedures, and Routines	Does not organize the district effectively for orderly and efficient movement of students.	May establish plans, procedures, and routines to guide administrators, but student entry, dismissal, meals, class transitions, assemblies, and recess are not consistently orderly and/or efficient.	Develops systems, plans, procedures, and routines for administrators to implement that generally ensure orderly and efficient student entry, dismissal, meals, class transitions, assemblies, and recess.	Establishes systems, plans, procedures, and routines that empower administrators, students and staff to implement orderly and efficient student entry, dismissal, meals, class transitions, assemblies, and recess. Is able to model this element.
II-A-2. Operational Systems	Fails to establish systems and procedures to support custodial and/or other staff, so that the campus is not generally clean, attractive, welcoming, and/or safe.	Develops systems and procedures that result in inconsistent supervision and/or support of custodial and other staff, resulting in a campus that is not consistently clean, attractive, welcoming, or safe.	Develops systems and procedures for the effective supervision and support of custodial, clerical, food services, and other staff effectively so that the campus is clean, attractive, welcoming, and safe.	Creates and maintains a district environment in which custodial and other staff take personal responsibility for keeping the campus clean, attractive, welcoming, and safe. Is able to model this element.
II-A-3. Student Safety, Health, and Social and Emotional Needs	Does not develop consistent procedures for student discipline; district disciplinary practice varies from school to school; often tolerates discipline violations and/or enforces district policies or procedures inconsistently.	May urge administrators to demand good student behavior but allows varying standards to exist in different schools. Supervises and supports administrators in addressing student discipline and bullying matters on a case-by-case basis in the absence of a system of procedures and consequences.	Supports administrator teams in developing systems and procedures for positive student behavior; models high expectations for student behavior and provides appropriate training for administrators to uphold these expectations. Establishes district-wide routines and consequences, including policies and systems to prevent and address bullying and other behaviors that threaten students' social and emotional well-being.	Guides administrators and teams to develop practices that consistently showcase high expectations for student behavior and invest staff and students in upholding these expectations. Successfully implements district-wide routines and consequences such that students take ownership over addressing bullying and other behaviors that threaten students' social and emotional well-being. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator II-B. Human Resources Management and Development: Implements a cohesive approach to recruitment, hiring, induction, development, and career growth that promotes high-quality and effective practice.

II-B. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-B-1. Recruitment and Hiring Strategies	Does not successfully lead the recruitment and hiring process.	Leads the recruitment and hiring process but does not consistently identify effective administrators and educators.	Leads the district's recruitment and hiring process and, through it, consistently identifies effective administrators and educators who share the district's mission.	Consistently identifies effective administrators and educators who share the district's mission. Empowers administrators and faculty members to share in a structured, consistent interview process. Is able to model this element.
II-B-2. Induction, Professional Development, and Career Growth Strategies	Does not support new administrators, provide guidance to them to support educators, organize high-quality job-embedded professional development, and/or support the career growth of effective educators.	Develops only a limited district-wide induction program for new administrators and teachers and/or inconsistently implements the district's induction strategy; organizes job-embedded professional development that is not consistently high quality or aligned with goals; and/or does not consistently support effective administrators' and educators' career growth. Does not establish criteria for the awarding of professional status.	Develops district-wide induction support for new administrators and teachers and/or faithfully implements the district's induction strategy; organizes high-quality job-embedded professional development aligned with district goals; and supports the career growth of effective professional personnel by distributing leadership tasks, developing criteria for the awarding of professional status, and monitoring progress and development.	Facilitates the administrator-led design and implementation of induction support, job-embedded professional development, and career growth support all of which are aligned with district goals; are consistently viewed by professional personnel as effective and helpful, and provide multiple opportunities for administrator and educator growth and learning. Leads the administrator team in developing district criteria for the awarding of professional status. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator II-C. Scheduling and Management Information Systems: Uses systems to ensure optimal use of data and time for teaching, learning, and collaboration, minimizing disruptions and distractions for school-level staff.

II-C. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-C-1. Time for Teaching and Learning	Does little to minimize disruptions to instructional time and minimize disruptions and distractions for school-level staff, including principals.	Generally acts to minimize disruptions to instructional time and minimize disruptions and distractions for school-level staff, including principals.	Creates schedules, procedures and related systems that maximize instructional time and minimize school day disruptions and distractions for school-level staff, including principals; and consistently monitors the extent to which these systems are effective	Empowers administrators and teams to contribute to the design and monitoring of district systems that maximize instructional time and minimize disruptions and distractions for all school-level staff. Is able to model this element.
II-C-2. Time for Collaboration	Sets unrealistic expectations for administrator team meetings if at all and/or does not create a schedule that provides adequate meeting time for teams. Does not work to prevent or deflect time-wasting activities. Does not establish norms for the administrator team meetings.	Sets inconsistent expectations for administrator team meetings and/or creates a schedule that only provides adequate meeting time for some team meetings. Works to prevent or deflect activities with limited success. Norms for team behavior are unclear and/or not consistently practiced.	Sets expectations for administrator team meetings and creates a schedule that provides sufficient meeting time for all team meetings. Prevents or deflects activities that interfere with administrators' ability to focus on the agenda during team time. Establishes norms for effective team behavior.	Is transparent and forthcoming about expectations for all administrator team meetings; creates and implements a schedule that maximizes meeting time for all team members. Collaborates with team members to develop team norms. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator II-D. Laws, Ethics, and Policies: Understands and complies with state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, collective bargaining agreements, and ethical guidelines.

II-D. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-D-1. Laws and Policies	Demonstrates lack of awareness or consistent non-compliance with some or all state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, or collective bargaining agreements.	May know state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, and collective bargaining agreements, but inconsistently complies with some laws or policies.	Understands and complies with state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, and collective bargaining agreements. Provides the resources and support to ensure district-wide compliance.	Provides the resources and support for all school personnel to understand and comply with state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, and collective bargaining agreements. Is able to model this element.
II-D-2. Ethical Behavior	Demonstrates lack of sound judgment reflecting integrity and fairness and/or does not adequately protect administrator, student, family, and/or staff confidentiality.	Generally demonstrates sound judgment reflecting integrity and fairness with occasional lapses in judgment and/or does not always protect administrator, student, family, and staff confidentiality appropriately.	Reliably demonstrates sound judgment reflecting integrity and fairness; protects administrator, student, family, and staff confidentiality appropriately; and expects all district personnel to reflect this practice.	Reliably demonstrates sound judgment reflecting integrity and fairness; protects administrator, student, family, and staff confidentiality appropriately. Effectively supports all staff to do both as well. Is able to model this element.

Indicator II-E. Fiscal Systems: Develops a budget that supports the district's vision, mission, and goals; allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district- and school-level goals and available resources.

II-E. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-E-1. Fiscal Systems	Builds a budget that does not align with the district's goals or mismanages available resources.	Develops a budget that loosely aligns with the district's vision, mission, and goals or inconsistently manages expenditures and available resources.	Develops a budget that aligns with the district's vision, mission, and goals. Allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district/school-level goals and available resources.	Leads the administrator team to develop a district budget that aligns with the district's vision, mission, and goals with supporting rationale; uses budget limitations to create new opportunities for improvement, when possible; allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district/school-level goals; and seeks alternate funding sources as needed. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Standard III: Family and Community Engagement. *Promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff through effective partnerships with families, community organizations, and other stakeholders that support the mission of the school and district.*

Indicator III-A. Engagement: Actively ensures that all families are welcome members of the classroom and school community and can contribute to the effectiveness of the classroom, school, district and community.

III-A. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-A-1. Family Engagement	Does little to welcome families as members of the district, classroom or school community or tolerates an environment that is unwelcoming to some families.	May provide some resources and support and make some attempts to welcome families as members of the district, classroom and school community but does not consistently use culturally sensitive practices and/or work to identify and remove barriers to family involvement.	Provides resources and support for all personnel to use culturally sensitive practices to ensure that all families are welcome and can contribute to the district, classroom, school and community's effectiveness. Works with administrators to identify and remove barriers to families' involvement, including families whose home language is not English.	Provides resources and support for all personnel to use culturally sensitive practices and successfully engages most families, ensuring that all families are welcome and can contribute to district, classroom, school, and community effectiveness. Works with administrators, families, and organizations to identify and remove barriers to family involvement, including families whose home language is not English. Is able to model this element.
III-A-2. Community and Business Engagement	Limits work to the immediate context of the schools. Does not make efforts to reach out to community organizations, community members, or businesses that could otherwise contribute to district effectiveness.	Engages some community organizations, community members, and/or businesses in annual district events but does not make efforts to increase their involvement to maximize community contributions for district effectiveness.	Establishes ongoing relationships with community organizations, community members, and businesses. Engages them to increase their involvement to maximize community contributions for district effectiveness.	Establishes strategic partnerships with community organizations, community members, and businesses that improve district effectiveness. Works to increase the types and number of organizations with whom the district partners in order to deepen relationships and increase partner contribution. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator III-B. Sharing Responsibility: Continuously collaborates with families and community stakeholders to support student learning and development at home, school, and in the community.

III-B. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-B-1. Student Support	Does not work with administrators to support educators to identify student needs, does not work with administrators to support families to address student needs, and/or does not draw upon internal or external resources.	Asks administrators to identify students struggling academically or behaviorally and/or work with a limited number of families to address student needs, utilizing a limited set of resources.	Provides resources and support to enable administrators and educators to identify each student's academic, social, emotional, and behavioral needs, including students with disabilities and English learners. Collaborates with administrators to support families to address student needs, utilizing resources within and outside of the district.	Provides resources and support to enable administrators and educators to identify each student's academic, social, emotional, and behavioral needs, including students with disabilities and English learners. Collaborates with administrators to support families to effectively address student needs and prevent further challenges, connecting students with a network of resources within and outside the district. Is able to model this element.
III-B-2. Family Collaboration	Does not set clear expectations or provide support for administrators to regularly communicate with families on ways to support their children's learning at home and at school.	Sets general expectations and provides occasional support for administrators to engage families in supporting their children's learning at school and at home and/or supporting their children with disabilities or limited English proficiency.	Sets clear expectations for and supports administrators to regularly engage families in supporting learning at school and home, including appropriate adaptation for students with disabilities or limited English proficiency.	Sets clear expectations and provides differentiated resources to support administrators to consistently and regularly engage all families in supporting their children's learning at school and home, including families and children with limited English proficiency and/or children with disabilities. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator III-C. Communication: Engages in regular, two-way, culturally proficient communication with families and community stakeholders about student learning and performance.

III-C. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-C-1. Two-Way Communication	Does not set clear expectations for or provide support to administrators to communicate with families. District communication regarding student learning and performance primarily occurs through school report cards.	May set expectations for and provide limited support to administrators to communicate with families but does not stress the importance of two-way communication channels. District communication regarding student learning and performance primarily occurs through school newsletters and other one-way media.	Sets clear expectations for and provides support to administrators to communicate regularly with families using two-way communication channels, including careful and prompt response to communications from families. Supports administrators to maximize the number of face-to-face family/teacher interactions.	Sets clear expectations for and provides differentiated support to ensure that all administrators design and implement frequent personalized communications, respond carefully and promptly to communications from families, and solicit feedback from families that informs improvement to communication plans. Is able to model this element.
III-C-2. Culturally Proficient Communication	Does not set clear expectations for or provide support to administrators regarding culturally sensitive communication and/or allows inappropriate disrespectful communication with families that ignores different family cultural norms.	May set expectations for administrators regarding culturally sensitive communication but does not provide support to them; and/or occasionally communicates in ways that are culturally insensitive to some families' home language, culture, and values.	Sets clear expectations for and provides support to administrators regarding culturally sensitive communication. Ensures that district-wide communication with families is always respectful and demonstrates understanding of and sensitivity to different families' home language, culture, and values.	Sets clear expectations for, models, and provides differentiated support regarding culturally sensitive communication. Ensures that district-wide communication with families is always respectful and demonstrates understanding and appreciation of different families' home language, culture, and values. Is able to model this element.

Indicator III-D. Family Concerns: Addresses family and community concerns in an equitable, effective, and efficient manner.

III-D. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-D-1. Family Concerns	Fails to provide systems and support for personnel to consistently reach out to families in response to concerns, and agreed-upon solutions are often not in the best interest of students.	May systems and support to address concerns with families as they arise, but agreed-upon solutions are not always in the best interest of students.	Provides systems, and support for administrators to reach out to families as concerns arise and works to reach equitable solutions in the best interest of students.	Provides system and support for all school personnel to reach out to families proactively, as soon as concerns arise. Effectively reaches equitable solutions that satisfy families, faculty, and staff and are in the best interest of students. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Standard IV: Professional Culture. *Promotes success for all students by nurturing and sustaining a school culture of reflective practice, high expectations, and continuous learning for staff.*

Indicator IV-A. Commitment to High Standards: Fosters a shared commitment to high standards of service, teaching and learning with high expectations for achievement for all.

IV-A. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-A-1. Commitment to High Standards	Does not encourage high standards of teaching and learning or high expectations for achievement with the administrator team, and/or may demonstrate low expectations for faculty and staff.	May ask administrators for commitment to high standards of teaching and learning with high expectations for achievement for all but does not support and/or model it.	Fosters a shared commitment to high standards of teaching and learning, for all administrators, with high expectations for achievement for all.	Leads administrators in developing a shared commitment to high standards of teaching and learning with high expectations for achievement for all. Revisits and renews commitment with administrator team regularly. Is able to model this element.
IV-A-2. Mission and Core Values	Does not develop core values and mission statements for the school.	May develop core values and mission statements but rarely uses them to guide decision making.	Develops, promotes, and models commitment to core values that guide the development of a succinct, results-oriented mission statement and ongoing decision making.	Leads administrators to develop core values and mission statements, share these statements with families and the school district community, and use them to guide decision making. Is able to model this element.
IV-A-3. Meetings	Leads administrator meetings that lack clear purpose and/or are primarily used for one-way informational updates.	May lead administrator meetings that include both one-way informational updates and participatory activities focused on matters of consequence, but does not clearly establish norms.	Plans and leads well-run and engaging administrator meetings that have clear purpose, focus on matters of consequence, and engage participants in a thoughtful and productive series of conversations and deliberations. Establishes clear norms for administrator team behavior.	Plans and facilitates engaging administrator team meetings in which small groups of administrators learn together and create solutions to instructional leadership issues. Team has established norms for behavior and consistently adheres to them. Consistently evaluates the effectiveness of the administrator team meetings. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator IV-B. Cultural Proficiency: Ensures that policies and practices enable staff members and students to interact effectively in a culturally diverse environment in which students' backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected.

IV-B. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-B-1. Policies and Practices	Develops and implements culturally insensitive or inappropriate policies, does not support administrators and staff in building cultural proficiency, and/or creates a culture that minimizes the importance of individual differences.	Takes pride in having a diverse administration, faculty and/or student body, but some policies are not culturally sensitive; and/or provides limited resources for administrators to support the development of cultural proficiency.	Develops and implements culturally sensitive policies that acknowledge the diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges of administrators, students and staff. Provides administrators with relevant resources to support them in building cultural proficiency and promotes a culture that affirms individual differences.	Leads stakeholders to develop and implement culturally sensitive policies that acknowledge the diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges of administrators, students and staff. Empowers administrators with time, resources, and support to build cultural proficiency and collaborates with community members to create a culture that affirms individual differences. Is able to model this element.

Indicator IV-C. Communications: Demonstrates strong interpersonal, written and verbal communication skills.

IV-C. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-C-1. Communication Skills	Demonstrates ineffectual interpersonal, written, or verbal communication skills at times.	May demonstrate adequate interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills but sometimes makes grammatical errors or has difficulty expressing ideas to stakeholders.	Demonstrates strong interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills.	Demonstrates strong context- and audience-specific interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator IV-D. Continuous Learning: Develops and nurtures a culture in which staff members are reflective about their practice and use student data, current research, best practices and theory to continuously adapt practice and achieve improved results. Models these behaviors in the administrator's own practice.

IV-D. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-D-1. Continuous Learning of Staff	Accepts the practice of administrators working largely in isolation, without consideration of data and best practices, and/or discourages reflection among administrators, faculty and staff.	May encourage administrators to reflect on the effectiveness of interactions with faculty and students and to use data and best practices to adapt practice but does not support administrators in these practices.	Leads all administrators and teams to reflect on the effectiveness of interactions with faculty and students. Ensures that administrators use data, research, and best practices to adapt practice to achieve improved results.	Models for administrators how to reflect on the effectiveness of interactions with faculty and students and uses data, research, and best practices to adapt practice to achieve improved results. Supports all educators to work in teams as often as is feasible and appropriate. Is able to model this element.
IV-D-2. Continuous Learning of Administrator	Does not reflect on personal practice or demonstrate new ways of thinking about administration and leadership.	Occasionally reflects on personal practice, sets meaningful goals, and/or researches ways to improve efficiency and practice.	Reflects on and improves personal practice, sets meaningful goals, and develops new approaches in order to improve efficiency and practice.	Demonstrates openness and commitment to learning; reflects on personal practice; and relies on student data, current research, and best practice to improve own leadership. Is able to model this element.

Indicator IV-E. Shared Vision: Continuously engages all stakeholders in the creation of a shared educational vision in which every student is prepared to succeed in postsecondary education and become a responsible citizen and global contributor.

IV-E. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-E-1. Shared Vision Development	Does little to engage stakeholders in the creation of a shared educational vision, or the vision is disconnected from college and career readiness, civic engagement, and/or community contributions.	Engages administrators, staff, students, families, and community members in developing a vision focused on some aspects of student preparation for college and career readiness, civic engagement, and community contributions.	At all grade levels, continuously engages administrators, staff, students, families, and community members in developing a vision focused on student preparation for college and career readiness, civic engagement, and community contributions.	Leads administrators, staff, students of all ages, families, and community members to develop and internalize a shared educational vision around preparation for college and careers and responsible citizenship. Is able to model this element.

Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership

Superintendent Rubric

Indicator IV-F. Managing Conflict: Employs strategies for responding to disagreement and dissent, constructively resolving conflict and building consensus throughout a district or school community.

IV-F. Elements	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-F-1. Response to Disagreement	Does not respond to disagreement or dissent and/or does not use appropriate, respectful, non-confrontational approaches.	May respond respectfully to disagreement and dissent, but responds inconsistently and does not always employ a non-confrontational approach	Employs a non-confrontational approach for responding respectfully and appropriately to disagreement and dissent, using both as opportunities for learning. Models this practice for the administrator team.	Models a variety of strategies for responding respectfully and effectively to disagreement and dissent, using both as opportunities for learning. Provides professional development for the administrator team to build these conflict resolution strategies. Is able to model this element.
IV-F-2. Conflict Resolution	Does not address conflicts in a solution-oriented and/or respectful manner.	May attempt to respectfully resolve conflicts as they arise, but employs only a limited range of strategies.	Consistently employs a variety of strategies to resolve conflicts in a constructive and respectful manner. Models this behavior for the administrator team.	Consistently employs a variety of strategies to resolve conflicts in a constructive and respectful manner and empowers and supports administrators to use these approaches. Is able to model this element.
IV-F-3. Consensus Building	Does not attempt to build consensus within the district community, or attempts at consensus-building around critical school decisions are unsuccessful.	Employs a limited number of strategies to build consensus within the school district community, with varying degrees of success.	Builds consensus within the school district community around critical school decisions, employing a variety of strategies.	Employs a variety of strategies to build consensus within the school district community around critical school decisions, while encouraging dialogue and different points of view. Is able to model this element.

End-of-Cycle Summative Evaluation Report: Superintendent



Superintendent: _____

Evaluator: _____

Name

Signature

Date

Step 1: Assess Progress Toward Goals (Complete page 3 first; check one for each set of goal[s].)

Professional Practice Goal(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded
Student Learning Goal(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded
District Improvement Goal(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Did Not Meet	<input type="checkbox"/> Some Progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Significant Progress	<input type="checkbox"/> Met	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded

Step 2: Assess Performance on Standards (Complete pages 4–7 first; then check one box for each standard.)

Indicators

Unsatisfactory = Performance on a standard or overall has not significantly improved following a rating of *Needs Improvement*, or performance is consistently below the requirements of a standard or overall and is considered inadequate, or both.

Needs Improvement/Developing = Performance on a standard or overall is below the requirements of a standard or overall but is not considered to be Unsatisfactory at the time. Improvement is necessary and expected. For new superintendents, performance is on track to achieve proficiency within three years.

Proficient = *Proficient practice is understood to be fully satisfactory. This is the rigorous expected level of performance.*

Exemplary = A rating of *Exemplary* indicates that practice significantly exceeds *Proficient* and could serve as a model of practice regionally or statewide.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
Standard I: Instructional Leadership	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard II: Management and Operations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard III: Family and Community Engagement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standard IV: Professional Culture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

End-of-Cycle Summative Evaluation Report: Superintendent

Step 3: Rate Overall Summative Performance (*Based on Step 1 and Step 2 ratings; check one.*)

☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Proficient

☐ Exemplary

Step 4: Rate Impact on Student Learning (*Check only one.*)

Low <input type="checkbox"/>	Moderate <input type="checkbox"/>	High <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------------

Step 5: Add Evaluator Comments

Comments and analysis are recommended for any rating but are required for an overall summative rating of *Exemplary*, *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory* or Impact on Student Learning rating of *high* or *low*.

Comments:

Superintendent's Performance Goals

Goals should be SMART and include at least one goal for each category: professional practice, student learning, and district improvement.
Check one box for each goal.

Goal(s)	Description	Did Not Meet	Some Progress	Significant Progress	Met	Exceeded
Professional Practice						
1		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Learning						
2		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
District Improvement						
3		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Goals (if any)						
6		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Superintendent's Performance Rating for Standard I: Instructional Leadership



Check one box for each indicator and indicate the overall standard rating below.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-A. Curriculum: Ensures that all instructional staff design effective and rigorous standards-based units of instruction consisting of well-structured lessons with measureable outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I-B. Instruction: Ensures that practices in all settings reflect high expectations regarding content and quality of effort and work, engage all students, and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I-C. Assessment: Ensures that all principals and administrators facilitate practices that propel personnel to use a variety of formal and informal methods and assessments to measure student learning, growth, and understanding and make necessary adjustments to their practice when students are not learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I-D. Evaluation: Ensures effective and timely supervision and evaluation of all staff in alignment with state regulations and contract provisions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I-E. Data-Informed Decision Making: Uses multiple sources of evidence related to student learning—including state, district, and school assessment results and growth data—to inform school and district goals and improve organizational performance, educator effectiveness, and student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Rating for Standard I (Check one.)	The education leader promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff by cultivating a shared vision that makes powerful teaching and learning the central focus of schooling.
---	---

☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Proficient

☐ Exemplary

Comments and analysis (recommended for any overall rating; required for overall rating of *Exemplary*, *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory*):

Examples of evidence superintendent might provide:

- ☐ Goals progress report
- ☐ Analysis of classroom walk-through data
- ☐ Analysis of district assessment data
- ☐ Sample of district and school improvement plans and progress reports

- ☐ Analysis of staff evaluation data
- ☐ Report on educator practice and student learning goals
- ☐ Student achievement data
- ☐ Analysis of student feedback
- ☐ Analysis of staff feedback

- ☐ Relevant school committee meeting agendas/materials
- ☐ Analysis of leadership team(s) agendas and/or feedback
- ☐ Protocol for school visits
- ☐ Other: _____

Superintendent's Performance Rating for Standard II: Management and Operations



Check one box for each indicator and indicate the overall standard rating below.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-A. Environment: Develops and executes effective plans, procedures, routines, and operational systems to address a full range of safety, health, emotional, and social needs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II-B. Human Resources Management and Development: Implements a cohesive approach to recruiting, hiring, induction, development, and career growth that promotes high-quality and effective practice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II-C. Scheduling and Management Information Systems: Uses systems to ensure optimal use of data and time for teaching, learning, and collaboration, minimizing disruptions and distractions for school-level staff.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II-D. Law, Ethics, and Policies: Understands and complies with state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, collective bargaining agreements, and ethical guidelines.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
II-E. Fiscal Systems: Develops a budget that supports the district's vision, mission, and goals; allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district- and school-level goals and available resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Rating for Standard II (Check one.)	The education leader promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff by ensuring a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, using resources to implement appropriate curriculum, staffing, and scheduling.
--	--

☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Proficient

☐ Exemplary

Comments and analysis (recommended for any overall rating; required for overall rating of *Exemplary*, *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory*):

Examples of evidence superintendent might provide:

- ☐ Goals progress report
- ☐ Budget analyses and monitoring reports
- ☐ Budget presentations and related materials
- ☐ External reviews and audits
- ☐ Staff attendance, hiring, retention, and other HR data

- ☐ Analysis of student feedback
- ☐ Analysis of staff feedback
- ☐ Analysis of safety and crisis plan elements and/or incidence reports

- ☐ Relevant school committee meeting agendas/minutes/materials
- ☐ Analysis and/or samples of leadership team(s) schedule/agendas/materials
- ☐ Other: _____

Superintendent's Performance Rating for Standard III: Family and Community Engagement

Check one box for each indicator and indicate the overall standard rating below.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-A. Engagement: Actively ensures that all families are welcome members of the classroom and school community and can contribute to the effectiveness of the classroom, school, district, and community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
III-B. Sharing Responsibility: Continuously collaborates with families and community stakeholders to support student learning and development at home, school, and in the community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
III-C. Communication: Engages in regular, two-way, culturally proficient communication with families and community stakeholders about student learning and performance.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
III-D. Family Concerns: Addresses family and community concerns in an equitable, effective, and efficient manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Rating for Standard III
(Check one.)

The education leader promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff through effective partnerships with families, community organizations, and other stakeholders that support the mission of the district and its schools.

☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Proficient

☐ Exemplary

Comments and analysis (recommended for any overall rating; required for overall rating of *Exemplary*, *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory*):

Examples of evidence superintendent might provide:

- ☐ Goals progress report
- ☐ Participation rates and other data about school and district family engagement activities
- ☐ Evidence of community support and/or engagement

- ☐ Sample district and school newsletters and/or other communications
- ☐ Analysis of school improvement goals/reports
- ☐ Community organization membership/participation/contributions

- ☐ Analysis of survey results from parent and/or community stakeholders
- ☐ Relevant school committee presentations and minutes
- ☐ Other: _____

Superintendent's Performance Rating for Standard IV: Professional Culture

Check one box for each indicator and indicate the overall standard rating below.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-A. Commitment to High Standards: Fosters a shared commitment to high standards of service, teaching, and learning with high expectations for achievement for all.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV-B. Cultural Proficiency: Ensures that policies and practices enable staff members and students to interact effectively in a culturally diverse environment in which students' backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV-C. Communication: Demonstrates strong interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV-D. Continuous Learning: Develops and nurtures a culture in which staff members are reflective about their practice and use student data, current research, best practices, and theory to continuously adapt practice and achieve improved results. Models these behaviors in his or her own practice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV-E. Shared Vision: Successfully and continuously engages all stakeholders in the creation of a shared educational vision in which every student is prepared to succeed in postsecondary education and become a responsible citizen and global contributor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IV-F. Managing Conflict: Employs strategies for responding to disagreement and dissent, constructively resolving conflict and building consensus throughout a district or school community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Overall Rating for Standard IV

(C h e c k o n e .)

The education leader promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff by nurturing and sustaining a districtwide culture of reflective practice, high expectations, and continuous learning for staff.

☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Proficient

☐ Exemplary

Comments and analysis (recommended for any overall rating; required for overall rating of *Exemplary*, *Needs Improvement* or *Unsatisfactory*):

Examples of evidence superintendent might provide:

- ☐ Goals progress report
- ☐ District and school improvement plans and reports
- ☐ Staff attendance and other data
- ☐ Memos/newsletters to staff and other stakeholders

- ☐ School visit protocol and sample follow-up reports
- ☐ Presentations/materials for community/parent meetings
- ☐ Analysis of staff feedback
- ☐ Samples of principal/administrator practice goals

- ☐ School committee meeting agendas/materials
- ☐ Sample of leadership team(s) agendas and materials
- ☐ Analysis of staff feedback
- ☐ Other: _____