

Evaluation/AIP Subcommittee

Thursday, July 31, 2014

5:00 PM

School Administration Building

417 Rock Street

Fall River, MA 02720

AGENDA

Discussion: Process and timeline of the Superintendent's Evaluation

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 PM. A roll call for attendance showed that Mr. Andrade, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Maynard were all present.

Also present were Superintendent Mayo-Brown and Dr. Tom Kelly.

Mr. Andrade explained that this meeting was to discuss the timeline and the Superintendent's evaluation. He asked that Superintendent Mayo-Brown explain further.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she had two documents for them. One was the approved timeline and the second document was from the MASC guideline book from when Mr. Koocher did the training which provided information to the Committee around open meeting.

1. Timeline for Evaluation

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that they had modified the timeline last year in order to include the MCAS results in the goal setting process. What they didn't do - and should consider moving forward for the next cycle - is to modify the timeline for the inclusion of state performance assessment data. The way it is currently from August to August, they can never include the state assessment results as part of the summative evaluation. That is something they will need to fix for the next evaluation.

Mr. Andrade asked when the data is made available.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it is usually the third week of September. She thought if they did an October to October cycle, they would be able to capture the MCAS data in the summative evaluation. This was not something they thought about with the current cycle.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown handed out the two documents she had mentioned. She explained that she is putting together binders that will go out to the Committee on Monday with the evaluation tool. She explained in detail how the binders were set up. She noted that she did not include anything the Committee would have received as part of the formative. It is all newer information or a summary of what took place over the year.

She continued that what was difficult for her was trying to understand how to capture a year's worth of work in a two inch binder as well as having to remind herself that it is not everything that she does but what they all agreed would be the emphasis of the evaluation. She asked the subcommittee if she was correct in her thinking and they agreed.

Dr. Kelly explained that the Superintendent had identified certain goals upon which the Committee will base their formal evaluation. There is a difference between the specific body of goals and evidence that will be used to evaluate the Superintendent and all of the things the Superintendent is responsible for doing in order to run the system. They can choose wherever they want the focus to be and there is an opportunity during the course of the year if something comes up that is problematic or that they want to create a focus for to modify the evaluation packet in order for them to be able to do that. The purpose of this approach is to make this a credible process.

Mr. Andrade asked if he meant for future evaluations in terms of modifying goals.

Dr. Kelly said that was correct. That could not happen during this cycle because they are at the summative evaluation stage but when they start the new cycle, they are able to have a formative discussion half way through the cycle.

Mr. Hart asked when they would be receiving the packets.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they would get them Monday or Tuesday morning at the latest.

Mr. Andrade stated that the evaluation should be completed by the Committee for the 18th.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown responded yes but she thought there was a step in between as the timeline describes. She explained that the individual members complete their evaluations but the composite is what needs to be presented at the August meeting. In terms of process, they need to figure out what makes the most sense to put the composite together because that is what is presented to the Committee of the Whole. The Committee of the Whole is not a discussion of seven individual evaluations; it is the discussion of the composite. She questioned how the subcommittee would do the composite evaluation based on the seven individual evaluations that would be submitted.

Mr. Hart thought they should do it in an open evaluation subcommittee meeting once the results came in.

Mr. Andrade questioned if the compiling of the composite should be in open session and asked if Dr. Kelly had that answer.

Dr. Kelly said everything would be done in an open meeting and a critical decision that the Committee needs to think about is the issue of taking the individual evaluations and turning them into one evaluation. He explained what a composite might look like. He added that when the composite is developed and then discussed in open meeting, any member is free to register their comments as to what their own evaluation stated. He said as a result of that the composite might even be modified but that the whole idea was to take it from the multiple, individual evaluations and turn it into a single evaluation. He explained ways in which that might be done. He added that once it is compiled, the individual evaluations are public record, but are not the final evaluation. His opinion is that the evaluation subcommittee is well-structured to undertake the task.

Mr. Hart thought that it would be a better and transparent way to have the subcommittee deliberate in an open meeting and develop the composite.

Dr. Kelly said the question would be if they do the task as a subcommittee or take the individual documents to a Committee of the Whole and sit down to try to do that job. His belief is that it would be more efficient and fairer for the subcommittee to do it.

Mr. Hart felt that is why the subcommittee is formed and that it is their job. He felt going through the subcommittee was the best approach.

Dr. Kelly said the subcommittee is bound by what the individual documents say and they cannot come up with a composite piece that is opposite to the individual input. In a sense it is grunt work.

Mr. Hart said they would need Dr. Kelly's input as well.

Dr. Kelly said he is happy to play whatever role in the process that they want because it is a learning process for everyone.

Mr. Andrade said if they wanted to set structure, they would have to give the Committee a certain amount of time to get their evaluations done and then a week prior to the meeting on the 18th, they could set up a meeting to get together. He explained what he thought that meeting might look like.

Dr. Kelly said the composite evaluation is more to the standard itself and not so much the specific individual statements in the rubric. If the three of them read through the individual submittals and come to the conclusion that it is saying that the Superintendent is proficient, and then it is just a question of drafting a statement that reflects how the evaluations say the Superintendent is proficient. He added that there should be ground rules that everyone is aware of and followed. He gave some examples.

Mr. Hart said if they get the binders on Monday/Tuesday and had the evaluations in to Mrs. Caron by the 11th; once they are received, the subcommittee could meet between the 12th and the 15th.

Mr. Andrade said between the 12th and the 18th which would be the date of the full School Committee meeting.

Mr. Maynard said that gave them two weeks to get them done and questioned if that would be enough time.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said it would give them a week to complete the individual and then a week to get together to do the composite.

Mr. Hart wondered if it would be too much to ask if they received the binders on the 4th to ask that they be completed by the 7th or 8th.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she thought it is a comprehensive process and there are three steps to the evaluation. She went over what those steps were. She wanted to give members adequate time to complete the evaluation.

Mr. Andrade said he recalled when the evidence was presented the first time; it was quite lengthy in terms of the reading and going through it thoroughly.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown agreed.

Dr. Kelly asked if there is a summary direction sheet in the packet the Superintendent had.

She said there was so that they would know what was in each section.

Mr. Andrade thought it would also make sense for individuals doing the evaluation to put a rationale for why they rated the Superintendent either *needs improvement* or *exemplary*. When they put it together, they would draw from that and there would be no guess work as to why she was rated the way she was.

Dr. Kelly said if their composite of the Superintendent is exemplary or needs improvement, they will have the input from the individual members to help them draft a fair composite statement.

Mr. Hart asked if proficient required a narrative.

Dr. Kelly said it did not require further detail but there was no prohibition against it and they could comment on anything.

Mr. Andrade said they would expect the individual evaluations by August 4th at the end of the day.

Mr. Hart thought the 4th or the early morning of the 5th and have them returned to Mrs. Caron by the 11th. The subcommittee could then meet between the 12th and the 16th for the 18th meeting.

Mr. Andrade asked if there was anything further. He added that he would take a look at it over the next couple of days and see if he had any questions for the Superintendent or Dr. Kelly and directed the other subcommittee members to do the same.

Mr. Andrade added that they also have to make a presentation on the School Committee self-evaluation for the next meeting and that Dr. Kelly had emailed him some information.

Dr. Kelly said it restates the conversations they have had and he tried to make it easier to present it in a way that would help the Committee to make some goals for the coming year.

Mr. Andrade said he would look at it and try to get it to Mr. Hart and Mr. Maynard to be discussed at the next meeting to discuss to present to the full Committee.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked that they include the AIP for their review and approval. The approval of the submission of their next AIP triggers the release from monitoring should the AIP be approved. It is just about ready to go and she was going to present it to the Committee at the 18th meeting and she can give an overview of it at the next subcommittee meeting so they are informed about it prior to the 18th.

Mr. Andrade asked if there was anything further and there was not.

MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Hart: To adjourn.
All were in favor None Opposed Meeting adjourned at 8:13 PM

Mr. Andrade read the open meeting law.

Respectfully submitted,



Interim Administrative Assistant for
School Committee Services

Please note: A videotape/DVD of this meeting is on file in the School Committee Office and is available for review by contacting the Interim Administrative Assistant for School Committee Services.