Lincoln Public Schools

Ballfield Road
Lincoln, Massachusetts 01773
http://www.lincnet.org/schoolcommittee/index.html

School Committee

Jennifer Glass
Chairperson

Tim Christenfeld
Vice-chairperson

Peter Borden

Jena Salon

Al Schmertzler

Date: January 16, 2015
To: School Committee Members
Dr. Becky McFall, Superintendent
From: Jennifer Glass
Re: Formative Assessment Process

It is the responsibility of the Lincoln School Committee to evaluate the performance of the superintendent using the Massachusetts Model System for Educator Evaluations.

The evaluation system uses a 5-step cycle: self-assessment; goal-setting and plan development; implementation; formative assessment; and summative evaluation. In September, Dr. McFall drafted an Annual Plan that focused on four goals, each with defined benchmarks and measures. We approved the plan, (step 2) and Dr. McFall began implementation (step 3).

We are now in step 4 of the cycle, formative assessment. This is the opportunity for us to reinforce the positive aspects of the Superintendent's leadership and to coach her in areas that require additional focus. Last year there was extensive conversation about the formative assessment process and procedures. In March 2014, policies CBI and CBI-R were revised to reflect both the values of the Lincoln Public Schools and the requirements of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE's) Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Using those policies, the 2015 timeline for the Formative Evaluation is as follows:

- *January 22, 2015*: Dr. McFall will provide a mid-cycle summary of progress toward attaining the goals laid out in her Annual Plan. We will review the evaluation rubric and ask the Superintendent for information that clarifies her work on the goals, standards, and elements beyond the information provided by regular reports or observable information.
    - We will use this information and any other relevant evidence to prepare for a conversation with the Superintendent at the following meeting.

- *February 5, 2015*: In conversation with Dr. McFall, we will reflect on her progress to date, recognize demonstrated strengths, and suggest areas for attention. Any known issues that require remediation should be brought forward now so that there is time for them to be addressed, and so that when the summative evaluation is completed in May/June there are no surprises.
    - Written feedback is not expected during the Formative Evaluation unless we deem it necessary to record specific information for inclusion in Dr. McFall's file.
    - We will identify any further supports that the School Committee can provide to the superintendent.
    - We will vote on whether Dr. McFall's performance warrants a salary increase. Plans for contract negotiations will be conducted in executive session.

LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Lincoln, Massachusetts

EVALUATION OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

Evaluation of the Superintendent is one of the fundamental responsibilities of the School Committee. The School Committee believes that a well-designed performance appraisal contributes to good education by ensuring effective governance and management of the schools. Through the appraisal of the Superintendent, the School Committee will strive to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Ensure that the Superintendent is working effectively to achieve the District goals;
2. Establish priorities that provide the Superintendent with specific direction;
3. Clarify the School Committee's expectations about the role of the Superintendent;
4. Clarify the Superintendent's expectations about the role of the School Committee;
5. Provide the community with a public model of the evaluation system that is used privately for the evaluation of all the professionals in the District;
6. Improve understanding of the daily responsibilities and pressures of the Superintendent's job;
7. Support effective administrative leadership in the schools;
8. Afford School Committee members an opportunity for assessment of District and School Committee performance;
9. Identify problems and possible solutions;
10. Produce a written record of the Superintendent's performance.

The evaluation of the Superintendent will be carried out in accordance with guidelines from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

The timeline and procedures for evaluating the Superintendent are outlined in policy *CBI-R: Procedures for the Superintendent's Evaluation.*

Ref: CBI-R

Adopted at School Committee Meeting of February 22, 1982

Reaffirmed at School Committee Meeting of December 17, 1984

Revised at School Committee Meeting of March 6, 2014

LINCOLN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Lincoln, Massachusetts

PROCEDURES FOR SUPERINTENDENT'S EVALUATION

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education provides guidelines for the annual evaluation of the Superintendent's performance. The School Committee has established the following timeline for this evaluation process in order to respect the DESE guidelines in a manner that makes sense for the district and for the management of the Superintendent's workload.

Specifically, the School Committee aims to integrate the district goals with the Superintendent's goals; and, in setting the September deadline for the completion of the Superintendent's Annual Plan, the School Committee wishes to allow the Superintendent the time to incorporate the conclusions of one year's Summative Evaluation in the establishment of the following year's goals; and, in identifying a subset of priority elements from the complete Evaluation Rubric, the School Committee will further identify and emphasize its priorities for the school year, and it will reduce the amount of work necessary to document the Superintendent's performance.

Accordingly, the timeline that the School Committee will follow every year to evaluate the Superintendent's performance is as follows:

Late May/
Early June: The Administrative Council and School Committee collaborate to establish the District Goals.

Late June:
1) The Superintendent develops personal goals for the upcoming school year based on Summative Evaluation and established District Goals.
2) The outline of the Annual Plan is presented to the School Committee for feedback.

Early
September: The School Committee and Superintendent collaborate to identify ten (10) Priority Elements from the DESE Superintendent Evaluation Rubric, and to determine relevant measures of achievement of the Superintendent's goals and of performance on the identified priorities.

Mid
September The Superintendent presents a complete Annual Plan, which includes the Superintendent's professional goals and the School Committee's evaluative priorities, to the School Committee for final approval.

Early
January: The School Committee reviews the Annual Plan and the DESE evaluation rubric and asks the Superintendent for information that clarifies work on goals, standards and elements beyond the information provided by regular reports or observable information.

Mid January: Mid-Cycle/Formative Review

1) The Superintendent prepares a mid-cycle summary of progress toward attaining goals set forth in the Annual Plan.
2) The School Committee Chair leads the mid-cycle review meeting.
3) The School Committee votes on whether or not it is appropriate to consider an increase in compensation as part of contract negotiations with the Superintendent.

February/ March: According to the outcome of the vote, the School Committee begins discussions with the Superintendent regarding her/his annual compensation, and details of her/his agreement, if applicable. It is the intention of the Committee that the evaluation and the compensation agreement be completed by the Annual Town Meeting.

Mid-May: The Superintendent prepares an end-of-cycle summary of progress toward attaining goals and performance on the Standards.

End-May: Summative Evaluation: The School Committee Chair asks each member to complete relevant end-of-cycle forms. Based on member input, the Chair develops a Summative Evaluation Report and ensures that it contains accurate information and appropriately reflects the individual performance of the Superintendent.
The Superintendent may actively participate in the end-of-cycle evaluation at a regularly scheduled School Committee meeting.

Ref: http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/

Approved at School Committee Meeting of March 5, 1984

Reaffirmed at School Committee Meeting of January 21, 1985

Revised at School Committee Meeting of March 6, 2014

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

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 of any 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 Criteria[1]

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.

End-of-Cycle Summative Evaluation Report: Superintendent

Massachusetts Department of ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY EDUCATION

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)	☐ Did Not Meet	☐ Some Progress	☐ Significant Progress	☐ Met	☐ Exceeded
Student Learning Goal(s)	☐ Did Not Meet	☐ Some Progress	☐ Significant Progress	☐ Met	☐ Exceeded
District Improvement Goal(s)	☐ Did Not Meet	☐ Some Progress	☐ Significant Progress	☐ Met	☐ 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	☐	☐	☐	☐
Standard II: Management and Operations	☐	☐	☐	☐
Standard III: Family and Community Engagement	☐	☐	☐	☐
Standard IV: Professional Culture	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	Moderate	High
☐	☐	☐

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		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student Learning						
2		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
District Improvement						
3		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other Goals (if any)						
6		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

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

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.	☐	☐	☐	☐
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-C. Communication: Engages in regular, two-way, culturally proficient communication with families and community stakeholders about student learning and performance.	☐	☐	☐	☐
III-D. Family Concerns: Addresses family and community concerns in an equitable, effective, and efficient manner.	☐	☐	☐	☐

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.	☐	☐	☐	☐
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-C. Communication: Demonstrates strong interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills.	☐	☐	☐	☐
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.	☐	☐	☐	☐
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.	☐	☐	☐	☐
IV-F. Managing Conflict: Employs strategies for responding to disagreement and dissent, constructively resolving conflict and building consensus throughout a district or school community.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Overall Rating for Standard IV ***(Check one.)***	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: _____