

**EVALUATION/AIP
SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Thursday, December 19, 2013
6:00 PM**

**School Administration Building
417 Rock Street
Fall River, MA 02720**

AGENDA

Discussion Items:

- School Committee Evaluation Tool

MINUTES

At 6:03 PM, Chairman Pavao called to order the Evaluation/AIP Sub-Committee Meeting. A roll call showed that Mr. Hart and Mr. Pavao were present. Mr. Costa was absent.

Also in attendance: Superintendent Mayo-Brown, Dr. Thomas Kelly, School Committee-elect Melissa Panchley, Mr. Joseph Martins, and a representative of the Herald News.

Mr. Pavao explained that as part of the Accelerated Improvement Plan they had submitted to DESE, one of the issues that they had to resolve before they were in full compliance with their findings was to have the School Committee review and issue a self-evaluation instrument that would encompass the setting of goals and the attainment of those goals on a yearly basis.

At 6:04 PM, the Superintendent asked Mr. Pavao for a short recess.

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Pavao: To recess.

2 in favor

1 absent (Mr. Costa)

Motion passed

At 6:07 PM the meeting reconvened. A roll call showed that Mr. Hart and Mr. Pavao were present. Mr. Costa was absent.

Mr. Pavao informed the subcommittee that Mr. Costa, a member of the subcommittee, had just called in with a conflict and was unable to attend but noted that he would support any recommendation the subcommittee made to the Committee as a whole.

Mr. Pavao continued that the AIP plan included the review and issue of a self-evaluation for the School Committee. He and Dr. Kelly spoke several times over the last few months and Dr. Kelly was able to put together a protocol that meets what DESE is looking for in a self-evaluation instrument for the School Committee. The difference between the current (monthly) tool is that recommendation before them would be an annual review and evaluation of the School Committee. Also, it would be recommended that the evaluation run in concurrence with the Superintendent's evaluation with a mid-year review and then findings at the end of the evaluation period. The recommendation is to set

two or three goals which can be measured and discussed as the process goes on. The other big difference is that not any single member is being evaluated, the Committee as a whole is instead being evaluated to see how the School Committee is operating as a body rather than looking at individual participation at meetings.

Mr. Pavao added that in speaking to Dr. Kelly and Dr. Connolly, they had run it by representatives in Malden and they seemed to agree with this recommendation. Dr. Connolly thought it was a good plan and one that should be discussed and hopefully approved by the Committee.

Mr. Pavao continued that Dr. Kelly had outlined several other protocols as it lines up to Policy DAA of the Evaluation of School Committees. He asked if Dr. Kelly would like to elaborate.

Dr. Kelly explained that he was trying to provide a context for considering a proposed, revised School Committee self-evaluation. He tried to put that task into the context of the existing policy , the AIP that had been submitted, and the recommendations of the senior advisor. It was an attempt to address a log jam that seemed to develop around the issue of the School Committee self-evaluation. He continued that they originally developed a self-evaluation process which they started to use and then with the Oversight Committee, a different practice arose. It was in limbo trying to put it into a form that aligned with policies and proposals made to the Department of Education. He added that the new tool creates the context for that and brings the members of the Committee to a place of common thinking. It is not his role to direct them to do anything but to create conditions under which they can consider the responsibilities they have before them and find a way to best address those.

Transcriber's Note: At 6:11 PM, Mr. Gabriel Andrade joined the meeting.

Mr. Pavao said he felt Dr. Kelly has met that role and has not forced anything on them. He explained that one of the things the Committee will need to focus in on by adopting the evaluation process is that it will hopefully go a long way in closing the circle and completing all of the phases of the Accelerated Improvement Plan especially in addressing the School Committee where the governance has been in question by the DESE for a couple of years. He said he has shared this with the Committee as a whole and again, explained that it was unique in that it looked at the whole Committee and not individual members and sets specific goals to be sure the Committee is on the right track. It is the same process used for the Superintendent and her evaluation and he thinks it is a good process. He has spoken with Chairman Flanagan and he expressed that he likes the document and would like to pilot it in the Spring to get acquainted with it and then implement the process in July to align with the Superintendent's and other educator's evaluations.

Mr. Hart said he noticed that the Oversight Committee was mentioned in item number four and asked if they are going to be as involved as they have been.

Mr. Pavao responded that they definitely will be involved and he would need to clarify with the Chairman if he would need to re-appoint them.

Mr. Martins referred to the first operational protocol on the self-evaluation form and asked how that would be measured.

Mr. Pavao thought by the support the Committee gives on curriculum issues or approving programs that have been recommended by the Superintendent. He used ELT at Morton Middle School as an example.

Mr. Martins said it states “ALL students” which means students with special education needs all the way up to gifted and talented. He asked, “what if the Committee disagrees with the recommendation of the Superintendent? Does that mean we do not represent their needs and interests?”

Mr. Pavao responded no and said they would have the opportunity to explain.

Dr. Kelly pointed out that the difference between this evaluation and the other is that when they look at other educator evaluations, there is a very intensive and very detailed rubric that breaks down every one of the points of evaluation. That doesn’t exist for School Committees. It is loosely structured by intent because the idea is that it generates a discussion among the School Committee members and leads to a clarification on each of the points as to how they feel about them and what, if anything, they need to do about it.

Mr. Martins said when he looks at the *Current Conditions* column he questions what agreeing or disagreeing means.

Dr. Kelly explained that if they have School Committee members with opposite answers/differences of opinion, it opens up the discussion and the particulars of how the Committee views that responsibility come to light. If there is disagreement on an issue, it probably warrants a discussion to have a clearer understanding. “The point is, it is supposed to generate a discussion that may lead the School Committee towards action on any of these.”

Mr. Martins said he understands what Dr. Kelly is saying but when he reads the statement “The School Committee represents the needs and interests of ALL the children in the district”, under the *Importance* column, it would be extremely important. He asked if they could use that analogy in interpreting “strongly agree” all the way down to “strongly disagree” in the *Current Conditions* column.

Dr. Kelly said he thinks it initiates the discussion.

Mr. Pavao said they had to stay on topic and he thought the focus should be that the evaluation is on the School Committee and not on any individual member who either strongly agrees or strongly disagrees. Although that is put into the content, they don’t talk about the individual School Committee person but the actions of the School Committee as a whole. If the majority of the Committee strongly agrees with an item but one or two members do not, it opens the door for discussion. The current instrument does not do that. It needs to be looked at as not “me” agreeing or disagreeing but looking at it as what the Committee is doing as a whole. This is why he and the Mayor thought a pilot process was a good idea to get members in the mind frame of thinking as a Committee and not as individuals.

Mr. Martins said he is looking at a statement and thinks anyone reading that statement would say that the statement is very important but questioned what the result was.

Mr. Pavao said that would give him the opportunity to ask what the Committee has done to show they have represented all the needs of the neediest child to the most gifted child. What are those things that they have done as a Committee?

Mr. Martins asked where he would put that.

Mr. Pavao said he could put anywhere and suggested on the back of the form.

Mr. Martins said but he wouldn't put it under *Current Conditions*. He is trying to understand the relationship between the importance of the statement versus the end result of Committee action. He asked where the data is to substantiate the interest of all students. In looking at the data then the evidence is shown that there is a good number of students that are being lost in the shuffle. How does that relate?

Mr. Pavao said that can be represented in a goal setting statement. They set the goal that the Committee will represent all the interests of the kids in the district. They then get their data based on that goal. A goal can be set that represents a number of items and then they can break it out into the data needed to represent what that goal is and if they have achieved that. If the Committee has not reached a goal then they have to score it as intended.

Dr. Kelly said they also have to keep in mind that the statements come from the operational protocols that were passed by the Committee as part of the Accelerated Improvement Plan. They are basically statements that say "we as a Committee are committed to representing the needs and interests of all the children in the district." So every Committee member will form over the course of their work an impression of whether or not they think the Committee is doing that.

Mr. Martins asked what happens if they feel that they are not doing that.

Dr. Kelly said that then becomes the discussion. Members might disagree for different reasons. Then they decide what needs to be done about it to get everyone feeling over time that they are now meeting those needs.

Mr. Martins asked if from that discussion, the rating of Current Conditions is not a matter of that they agree or disagree with the statement but the application of the statement as to whether they or are not meeting the needs of all students.

Dr. Kelly said it is how good of a job they are doing "today." It is the individual members of the Committee's personal assessment of how they are doing as a Committee and then the discussion that follows hopefully gets them to a consensus of what can be done better to move in the direction of aligning to that goal.

Transcriber's Note: At 6:33 PM, Mrs. Panchley left the meeting.

Mr. Pavao asked Dr. Kelly if he agreed or disagreed if it was in the best interest of the Committee to score all of the items first as a Committee and look at them to see what the scores are. Based on that information, if they get an item that is strongly disagree or disagree by the majority, then they can set a goal to meet that particular statement where they can improve the actions of the School Committee to meet that particular statement.

Dr. Kelly said he agreed and that they cannot do everything they want to at once. The second column helps them think about and prioritize what they can do first.

Mr. Pavao added that it is a working document and would probably change over the next year. If there was an item that they are consistently doing well in, they can take it off and put something else in.

Dr. Kelly said it is a set of protocols and they want to get to a point where they are consistently doing all of them.

Mr. Pavao said the mission that evening is to bring this back to Committee at the January meeting to be discussed by the Committee as a whole and then either approve or disapprove the tool. Dr. Kelly has recommended that the School Committee adopt the instrument and Mr. Pavao feels it is an instrument that should be looked at seriously and should be adopted to go through the pilot program so that all members of the Committee are looking at the same instrument and evaluating the statements that are being made and setting the goals. It will be an abbreviated period of time, February through June. Some time in April they would have the self-review to process mid-year and look at the goals that have been set for that short period of time. The instrument would go into full operation in July 2014 and run for that school year.

Mr. Andrade said he likes the idea and that they had used a MASC form at Diman which evaluated the Committee as a whole and he finds that to be a very positive thing.

Dr. Kelly said stepping back and looking at the big picture, this is the last task piece that is associated with the Accelerated Improvement Plan for the School Committee that they committed to. A lot of things had to do with how they operate their practice but there were also a couple of tasks. One had to do with the policy of the School Committee. One had to do with the evaluation process for the Superintendent and this was the third piece. He is interested in helping them move towards the point where they can say they feel they have satisfactorily completed the requirements made through the AIP. It is important not to lose sight of that piece which is a practical aspect of it. He added that this type of evaluation is much more conducive to the work of the governing body. This will allow them to set their agenda based on their assessment of how they are doing in relation to the commitment they have made. To him, it makes the most sense and he thinks it will evolve as they use it. It changes the focus to a realistic yearly evaluation which has the goal of improving the operations of the Committee as a governing body.

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Pavao: To refer this instrument to the Committee as a Whole at the January meeting with the recommendation that it be adopted.

2 in favor

1 absent (Mr. Costa)

Motion passed

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Pavao: To adjourn.

2 in favor

1 absent (Mr. Costa)

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:44 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Rebecca L. Caron
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.