

# **EVALUATION/AIP SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Thursday, November 7, 2013  
7:00 PM**

**Henry Lord Middle School  
151 Amity Street  
Fall River, MA 02721**

## **AGENDA**

### Discussion Items:

- Review of Superintendent's Proposed Goals

## **MINUTES**

At 7:27 PM, Chairman Pavao called to order the Evaluation/AIP Sub-Committee Meeting. A roll call showed that Mr. Costa and Mr. Pavao were present. Mr. Hart was absent.

Also in attendance: Superintendent Mayo-Brown, Dr. Thomas Kelly, Mr. Martins, Leadership Team members, community members and representatives of local media outlets.

Mr. Pavao explained that their agenda item was to review the Superintendent's proposed goals. He noted that the timeline the Committee had set is shrinking very quickly and they need to key in on the goals the Superintendent has set forth and that those goals be forwarded to the Committee as a Whole on November 12. Upon the acceptance of the goals by the Committee as a Whole, they can then revert back to the Superintendent for her to write a plan for the goals. They have all had the opportunity to review the goals the Superintendent has submitted and he asked at the last meeting if there were any recommendations, comments, or changes to any of the goals, to send them into the office. As of that evening, no recommendations or changes had been submitted.

Mr. Pavao opened up the discussion but noted that Mr. Martins was also in attendance and if he had any issues he would like to bring up that he would recognize him as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. Costa: He wondered if any further consideration was given to his suggestion regarding a goal that captures the work that is required of the district with the AIP. He does not want to make the process more cumbersome and feels the goals that have been presented are thoughtful and represent each of the areas in which they would like to have the Superintendent evaluated on. He just wonders where the Committee's opportunity is to evaluate the Superintendent with the progress on the Accelerated Improvement Plan (AIP). He thinks it would be prudent for the Committee to capture that in an evaluation considering that seems to be what their focus is and what the State's expectation and focus is.

Mr. Pavao asked the Superintendent if she feels that any of this is captured in the five goals she presented to the Committee.

*Evaluation Sub-Committee Minutes of November 7, 2013*

Superintendent: She understands Mr. Costa's point. "Is there one goal that captures the whole plan?"

Mr. Costa: He sees she has built her goals around sections of the AIP but is wondering if they can formulate a goal that will capture the work she is doing around what the AIP has set out to accomplish. He feels it is incumbent upon the Committee to make that a focus of her work because that is essentially what is going to drive that. He added that she could end up with a stellar evaluation by only accomplishing key pieces of the AIP. He noted that he is not saying that the end result of the goal is that she will accomplish everything but that she will work with the district leaders as well as the Committee to meet the objectives set out in the AIP.

Superintendent: Her thinking around that was that the AIP is designed to ensure that the District continues to make progress as measured by the Progress and Performance Index (PPI) targets that the State sets. She attempted to capture that in the first goal. She understands what Mr. Costa is saying and would like to craft a goal around that with no objections but is trying to figure out how it would be written. If they agree that the goal of the AIP is to help them meet their PPI which has the State less involved with them because they are hitting their targets.

Mr. Costa: There are elements of the AIP that aren't necessarily driven by PPI.

Superintendent: The theory of action is if you do everything as written in the AIP, you will meet your goal.

Mr. Costa: He agreed and said that is why he is trying to capture a goal that reflects that the work will be towards achieving what is set out in the AIP. If they do that, then essentially they have moved the district toward student achievement.

Mr. Pavao: He asked Dr. Kelly if he has faced the same type of question that Mr. Costa is bringing up.

Mr. Costa: He thinks that is an interesting question that the Chair brings up because he doesn't know that there are many districts dealing with an AIP right now.

Dr. Kelly: While he hasn't had specific experience with that question, he thinks that he would just reflect in what the discussion is about. The Superintendent has proposed some specific goals which she feels connect very integrally with the work she is doing in helping the system improve performance. This dialogue is really important that the School Committee brings up an issue and suggests ways it can be made clearer for them. He feels it is a very appropriate thing. At the end of the day the discussion is about everything that is going on in the district which the Superintendent is ultimately responsible for. The question as a Committee is how do you bring into focus those particular things that you want to evaluate about the Superintendent's performance across a wide spectrum of things. This is designed to allow both the Superintendent to say these are the things I think are really important that I'm integrally involved in, and it provides an opportunity for the School Committee to adjust the dialogue and say can we also have something from our perspective that accomplishes this and would involve these measurable outcomes.

Mr. Costa: He agreed and said he foresaw that evidence being the monitoring reports about the progress they are making. Some of the other evidence could be the data that is collected and provided to the State to make their determination. He thinks there is a way to capture that but if it is too cumbersome they can have that discussion and he is okay with that. He just doesn't want to fall short when it comes to the AIP and what is expected of them.

*Evaluation Sub-Committee Minutes of November 7, 2013*

Dr. Kelly: The way the process is really designed is for the School Committee to have a dialogue about not only expanding on the goals the Superintendent proposes, but suggesting changes and ideas as well.

Mr. Costa: He does have some other areas but doesn't want to make this a process by which there are so many goals that the intent of the evaluation gets lost. That is why he is in agreement with the Superintendent that the focus should be the AIP because that is what is before them and the road map they have been on for the last few years.

Mr. Pavao: He accepts everything that his colleague said and Dr. Kelly suggested. He thinks it would be appropriate to have the Superintendent get back to her desk and look at the AIP and generate a goal that captures what Mr. Costa is alluding to.

Mr. Costa said only if the Superintendent is in agreement with that.

Mr. Pavao pointed out to the Superintendent that there may even come a point where she may want to eliminate a goal she had previously set.

Mr. Costa added that she could just add to an existing goal as well.

Superintendent: She thinks that is very reasonable. She pulled up the quarterly progress monitoring report that Dr. Connolly does because at the end of that report they have a rating system and rubric with it.

Mr. Costa: He agreed and suggested that they could use that as the evidence.

Superintendent: She will use the rubrics.

Mr. Costa: He said using the rubrics would allow the Committee to go back and look at that document and see tangible evidence that the district is making progress because upon evaluation of systems put in place it shows concretely that they are making that progress.

Superintendent: She will write something for Tuesday night and present it at that time. It will be a separate goal and she will get it to them by e-mail prior to the meeting.

Mr. Martins: He has reviewed the goals several times and finds it extremely difficult because he doesn't know who they are evaluating. Are they evaluating the team or the Superintendent? His second issue is that when she is making reference to improvement, he thinks it is already built in by achieving the targets by 2017. "However, on a district level as I have calculated out if you look at Doran and Kuss - fantastic job and the Superintendent is to be commended; but if you look at Watson and a few other schools, it is not so much of an accolade. I ask what we are measuring here if indeed you have targets that the Department of Education has set? If you look at what has happened over the years as far as the Composite Performance Index. When I plot out the CPI, I find it relatively flat as far as the district is concerned. How do you go about measuring this and as you look at the MCAS results the Superintendent provided, how many schools met and did not meet the targets. If you look at the overall rating of the schools which goes from 1 to 99, the highest school in the district is Spencer Borden with a 50. How do you rate this? I find it very difficult to say the Superintendent is a superstar with Kuss and Doran but not so on some of the others. I would like to see something that is fair, I just don't know how to do this."

*Evaluation Sub-Committee Minutes of November 7, 2013*

Mr. Pavao explained that that is a question he needs to keep in mind as the evaluation process proceeds and the mid-year review is when he would ask. He referenced the first goal, second bullet; she will be measuring the progress of Watson at a level four and Kuss which is a level one. "So, in fact, you will be able to measure progress or lack of at the mid-year term because the Superintendent will be supplying the Committee with those types of reports that she compiles during the course of that period. Some of the questions or concerns you have, they specifically will be dealt with as the process goes along and the Superintendent makes her reports to the Committee as a Whole."

Mr. Martins: "Then why isn't the target - the District target, not individual school targets - the District target as that to be achieved in any particular year? Mid-year, but that is for the year."

Superintendent: She asked Mr. Martins if he had a chance to read the email she sent him regarding this discussion.

Mr. Martins: He had not.

Superintendent: She explained he had asked her for a blank copy of the principal's evaluation tool because he was trying to understand it. As part of her response she talked about the team piece of it and who they are evaluating. "You are evaluating me, not the team. I am clear on my professional responsibilities. The regulations state all educators will be expected to consider team goals as a clear indication of the value the new process places on collaboration and accountability. So the regulations actually call for the consideration of team goals. To me that doesn't mean you are in any way evaluating the team that supports the work you are evaluating me souly on, but I did want to recognize, as it says in the regulations, that there is collaboration to meeting the goals."

The Superintendent continued: "Secondly, as you talk about targets, the regulations are clear that multiple measures must be used. I felt the PPI which 80% is CPI and 20% student growth; that calculation gives you the PPI. Therefore, there are multiple measures in that. If we don't make our PPI - if schools aren't making their PPI - the District is not going to make it. So I felt it was more transparent and more specific to identify the schools and the progress they need to make and I thought I was very clear in terms of how those are measured. Also, as you consider developing a smart goal, they have to be attainable. So we will have our level 1 schools and we want them to sustain that progress. We have schools that we want to hit their target of 75, and then we have low performers that we want to have an incremental movement this year and then get them on the right trajectory. That is how I developed my targets. To me, I think the Committee can look at this very clearly and is very measurable."

**MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Pavao: To refer the Superintendent's goals to the Committee as a Whole for consideration with the addition of the goal that will be presented that evening which will reflect an overall goal to capture the entire progress for AIP.**

**2 in favor**

**1 absent (Mr. Hart)**

**Motion passed**

Mr. Martins: He asked if this is the total scope of the Superintendent's evaluation.

Superintendent: It is not. She is evaluated on all of the standards. As they discussed at a previous subcommittee meeting, greater weight would be given to the goals but it doesn't neglect all the other standards.

*Evaluation Sub-Committee Minutes of November 7, 2013*

Mr. Pavao: She is responsible for everything in the AIP. She brought out five specific goals which she wants the Committee to evaluate her on and they are adding one more. Ultimately, she will be evaluated on the total package.

Mr. Costa: There are a number of other areas they can evaluate her on as part of the Superintendent's evaluation tool that was adopted.

Dr. Kelly: "You have the goals and then you have the standards. The goals connect to the standards and in that sense there will be greater priority to how they connect; but you will be evaluating all four of them."

Mr. Martins: He asked where those standards could be found.

Superintendent: They are in the handbook. She added that it is based on evidence. She has to provide the Committee with evidence of those standards but there is also a component where the Committee has to have evidence as well.

No further questions or discussion.

<b>MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Pavao: To adjourn.</b>		
<b>2 in favor</b>	<b>1 absent (Mr. Hart)</b>	<b>Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:59 PM</b>

Respectfully submitted,  
*Rebecca L. Caron*  
Interim Administrative Assistant for  
School Committee Services