EVALUATION/AIP
SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, September 17, 2013
5:00 PM

FRPS Administration Building
417 Rock Street
Fall River, MA 02720

AGENDA

Discussion Items:
- Development of Draft Superintendent's Model Evaluation Tool and Process

MINUTES

At 5:06 PM, Chairman Pavao called to order the Evaluation/AIP Sub-Committee Meeting. A roll call showed that Mr. Costa, Mr. Hart and Mr. Pavao were present.

Also present was Dr. Tom Kelly, Liaison from DESE.

Mr. Pavao stated, with the Committee's indulgence, he was going to ask Dr. Kelly to explain the time line they have been looking at and some of the recommendations he would like to make to adjust it if it meets with the approval of the subcommittee. He added that he would also like the Superintendent to address the subcommittee as to why it would be important for them to adjust the time line to incorporate student achievement.

Dr. Kelly handed out a copy of the time line and explained that the previous evaluation system had a time line associated with it so it was carried forward and recommended as part of the new evaluation system. A time line was developed at a subcommittee meeting in May and on May 30th the School Committee approved that time line. The draft represents the time line that the Committee spoke about at that time and it is different from the previous time in that it captures the activities of the new evaluation system that would occur during each of those periods. He suggested that for their review and in considering this, they look at how those recommendations are categorized. They were taken from the presentation of Glen Kuchar and the documentation that goes with the new State evaluation. "I worked off of the motions that you made. So really, the standards themselves can be modified or obviously, if it suits your purpose, this time line can start at any point and run for a year from any point in time if there is a better point in time to do that."

Mr. Pavao said that in talking with Dr. Kelly and the Superintendent they were looking to move everything up a month. Instead of having the Superintendent complete her self-assessment during the month of July, it would be done in the month of August because at that point in time, the achievement scores would be in hand and that would probably be meeting one of the goals the Superintendent would be setting out to achieve. If the evaluation started in August, she would have all of that data for

her self-evaluation. The time line would be moved from starting in July to starting in August. "It would still be a 12 month cycle, and as Dr. Kelly stated, we can set any time table we want but it makes sense if we are asking the Superintendent to evaluate herself, that she has all of the data in hand to do that and that would also give the Committee a chance to look at the data when it comes in and then have her present that to the subcommittee prior to the Committee's meeting in September. We would have a look at and a say in that evaluation process. I think that would blend in better with the goals that are going to be set for the District."

Mr. Pavao asked Superintendent Mayo-Brown if he captured what they had spoken about.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said he did and asked if the Committee looked at item number one under July where within the first sentence it reads *data about student learning*. The preliminary data is not complete until August when they get the math data in. Her thought in shifting it by a month would be that it would allow her to incorporate that into the self-assessment and the goal setting process. Additionally, the evaluation system that is in place for all other educators in the District has a time line of goals. Self-assessment and goals are due in to the evaluator by October 1st so by moving it a month, it would closely align with the rest of the District as well.

Mr. Costa questioned the District receiving its preliminary data in August.

The Superintendent replied "the math."

Mr. Costa "And then the Committee gets it sometime in October, correct?"

Superintendent: "The end of September."

Mr. Costa said he didn't have a problem moving the time line but wouldn't want it altered too much because he understands the importance of moving the process along. He added that Dr. Connolly reminded them they hadn't done an evaluation in some time and they needed to do one but he also feels that the Superintendent deserves an evaluation by the Committee to set goals and have some feedback. His concern was that if the Committee doesn't see the data until the embargo is lifted, he didn't know how they would take into account the goals the Superintendent may set for herself based on the preliminary data. She would have the opportunity to look at it and make recommendations as to what the goals may be; however, the Committee would not have the opportunity to see those until September which would be after her self-evaluation. "You setting goals on the preliminary data may differ from what the Committee would like to see once we get the data." He added that he was not in favor of having the Superintendent's evaluation cycle run with such events as just data because while it is important and should be incorporated, he believes there is more to an evaluation then just what the data tells and shouldn't be the sole indicator for which the Committee evaluates performance.

Superintendent: She responded it is not and explained that there is one student learning goal, one professional practice goal, and two-four district goals.

Mr. Costa asked Dr. Kelly if he was aware of how other districts incorporated the time frame he just discussed regarding the embargoed data.

Dr. Kelly said he was aware of a variety of cycles that communities are using to evaluate the Superintendent. Some use the budgetary cycle, a school year cycle, and one or two use an election

cycle because there is some sensitivity as to who is evaluating the superintendent. He said for the issue of how to incorporate results of test scores, he is not aware of another community that is pegging them to the receipt of the results. Communities are looking at the fact that during the course of any year there will be one set of test results that will be used as information to develop subsequent goals or to evaluate goals that have been previously developed. "If it works to bump this down a month, and do the activities that way, you might want to consider, because I don't think it would be problematic at all, to leave the mid-cycle review for February. That's a time when there is a discussion about adjusting expectations and either adding or modifying goals."

Mr. Costa responded that he is okay with that but feels that if they want a higher percentage to be gained data wise then what the Superintendent set as a goal for herself, waiting until mid-year to change it is not fair to her because she would lose some time in planning her strategies to get percentages to where the Committee would like to see it them. He added that he is not saying this Superintendent is going to shoot low but there may be occasion for which the Committee's expectations where it comes to improvement may differ. He understands it is just one goal and if it happens, they could revisit it in February but the problem becomes in fairness, "how do you drop something on the Superintendent's lap in February?"

Dr. Kelly said part of the very important discussion is about evidence that will be looked at in terms of making a judgment if satisfactory or exceptional progress has been made. "So even if you are shooting for a bottom line level of improvement, it has to be broken down a little bit. What are we going to do or what is the Superintendent going to do to result some level of improvement and those are the things you are going to look to evaluate." He added that many communities are coming to an understanding that the bottom line goals (i.e. and upward progression of test scores) have to be carried out over more than one cycle. "Because if you agree to something and say okay say you make a goal in September that's going to carry through; well, whatever you decide to do then can't be captured in the budget, for example. What resources are we going to have to achieve those goals until the ensuing budget cycle? Those things are very closely tied together. What you can try to agree on is what are you going to do during the course of this year that is going to result in the increase of test scores and then the part about we want to see a 7% vs. a 4% increase, that is the kind of a discussion to have amongst yourselves around what is the evidence going to be. Then it is a lot easier to feel comfortable with making a number or not making a number."

Mr. Costa said that he is not fixed on a number but more a focus in where the attention should be drawn and how that is communicated and incorporated fairly. He added that he understands what Dr. Kelly is saying and that it certainly makes sense that they would not see the fruits of labor until the next testing data comes out which wouldn't be until the subsequent evaluation cycle anyway. What could be measured are what strategies or what focus could be implemented during that evaluation cycle to hopefully achieve the goals. He added that the only reason he brought it up is because they are trying to shift it in order for the Superintendent to have a look at that data but it is unfortunate that the Committee does not see the data until after. He said he wouldn't want it tied to an election cycle or to a budget cycle which are often times cumbersome.

Dr. Kelly responded that getting back to looking at the evaluation as a whole, there are the standards that the Superintendent is going to be evaluated on and then there are the goals. There is a student learning goal and a professional practice goal. "The professional practice goal is going to be a one year kind of a deal but it is much more likely to get serious work done and to have a discussion that says here are the goals and in order to get to where we want to be it is going to be a 2 or 3 year - or sometimes

longer - process than that to see the gains that you want to see. You need to see what you are going to be satisfied with year to year. In order to create a significant kind of change, there is a lot of groundwork that goes in before you see the fruits of that. So you will have different goals around different initiatives, some of which will be more advanced than others. I think this really talks to a longer range view of district improvement than the former evaluation system."

Mr. Hart said he had asked this regarding the mid-cycle and Glen Kuchar said that once the Superintendent sets her goals and what her plans are for the year the Committee cannot change those particular goals that the Superintendent set based on the DESE format. "We are saying now that at a public meeting the Superintendent presents the report to the School Committee who reviews the report, offers feedback, and then discusses progress and possible adjustments. I was under the impression that we can't do that."

Mr. Costa said if he understands it correctly it is as long as they are mutually agreed upon. "I don't think unilaterally the Committee could make adjustments without her consent."

Dr. Kelly responded that the idea of a productive discussion is what is important and anything that comes out of it that is mutually agreeable. A formative discussion by which everyone's goal is "okay, what do we do to make this work?" rather than drawing a bottom line on how it worked over the past year. He added that there is opportunity there to modify the goals if it makes sense to do that.

Mr. Hart said that was fine and he had no problem moving it a month.

Mr. Pavao said there were two things his colleagues hit on by moving it up a month and he senses they are going to approve that change, but it does put the Superintendent at a disadvantage that she is going to have 30 days less in her process. "On the other hand, with the data she would have in hand with student achievement, she could set a pretty realistic goal as to how improvement would be set (i.e. by 3% or 7%). We wouldn't realize that until the following year to measure the difference, but it does give the Superintendent that opportunity to look at how the kids are progressing in the area of math and say you know I need to set a goal of 3% increase. Once the School Committee gets the data we can either agree or disagree with that and say 3% is low and through mutual agreement we would set a particular goal for that. If I am reading both of you gentleman correctly, that would be the process.   I think the Superintendent having data in hand to set that particular goal puts both her and the Committee on a more solid ground, knowing what the data is and that we are going to look at and adjust it if needed."

Mr. Costa said he agrees with that and that the Superintendent may set a goal and then get the data and see that the improvement she is looking to make has already been made and there may be another area that is best suited to be focused on. He does not have a problem with adjusting it, he is just a firm believer that any evaluation process, no matter what it is, just needs to be clear, concise and fair and it seems like that is the process they are working towards.

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To amend or adjust the time line for the Superintendent's evaluation as outlined here before us.

All in favor	None opposed	Motion Passed

MOTION: Mr. Costa – Mr. Hart: To refer the adjustments to the time line as voted here to the Committee for its consideration at the next meeting.

<div align="center">

All in favor   None opposed   Motion Passed

</div>

The Superintendent handed out a memo she had sent out on September 3, 2013 which outlined the process. Her understanding is that the Committee has adopted the new model system the State has for the evaluation of superintendents; that system includes standards, indicators and elements which are defined in the rubrics as well as the four categories of performance. "So it launches this process where we come together to talk about the tool/time line that we have just done and the overall process. So the first step in that, I believe, is to start with the self-assessment. That is what the model system promotes. I just wanted to capture, also based on what Glen Kuchar had said from MASC, that they are recommending that the Committee adopts one of these initial steps. I think we are in number one, that there is a subcommittee devoted to this to draft the documents for the Committee as a Whole's consideration."

The Superintendent asked if they were all in agreement and they were.

Superintendent: She continued that the second page of the memo was about the self-assessment which is the first step in the five step evaluation process. DESE provides some additional guidance on the self-assessment process. The educators think of it in two parts: 1. analysis of student learning, growth and achievement and 2. assessment practice against the four performance standards that are defined more clearly in the rubric. "So as I considered my self-assessment, I used that guidance (part 1 & 2). My self-assessment is lengthy and I will hand that out in a second. Typically for teachers and other educators in the District, the Department of Ed provides a template for that and it's a one pager with a box and that's where educators complete their self-assessment, in that space. This is much more comprehensive because as I look at it, it is the overall District at large. So with that said, I have the self-assessment. It does contain some embargoed data in it. I tried to do it in a way where I wasn't specifically talking about proficiency rates or things that sort of exposed the sensitivity of the data but that would provide the Committee with the sense of the first part, which is student learning growth and achievement. Again, I don't know how I have this discussion with you unless we talk about the data. So I think that I would ask, Rene specifically, that you not broadcast this until Friday because the data is expected to be released on Friday. So I feel like it is close enough to when I will be sharing the data with you in a more comprehensive way. If that's comfortable for the Committee, I can proceed."

The Committee agreed.

Mr. Costa asked if the Superintendent's self-assessment focused on the analysis of student learning, growth and achievement.

The Superintendent responded yes and assessment of the four standards in the rubric. The biggest piece is student learning, growth and achievement.

Mr. Costa: "All of what is encompassed?"

Superintendent: She needs feedback on what to use to propose the goals. AIP? Is that a good source?

The Superintendent handed out her self-assessment and went over each section:

Part 1: Analysis of Student Learning, Growth, and Achievement

Progress and Performance Index (PPI) and Cumulative PPI

Mr. Costa asked if the Superintendent had comparisons to the ones listed as *Improved Below Target* to help identify how the schools are trending.

Superintendent: She said she did not include this in the report but could get the information.

Mr. Costa noted under Cumulative PPI that a school was listed twice and asked which column was correct.

Superintendent: She thanked him for catching that error and said the correct column for that school was *Improved Below Target*.

She continued that for a school to be considered to be making progress toward narrowing proficiency gaps, the cumulative PPI for all students must be 75 or higher. A number of schools made large gains in their annual PPI. The cumulative PPI is based on the prior 4 years of PPI.

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

SGP measures how students are keeping up with their peers statewide. Typical growth ranges fro 40-60 and above typical is considered 60+. In order to accelerate student achievement and close the gap between the District and the State average, student growth needs to be 60+. The data indicates that the SGP for Fall River is within typical range (except Grades 8 & 10 math).

Composite Performance Index (CPI)

The CPI is calculated by dividing the total number of points by the number of students in the group which results in a number between 0 and 100. FRPS is designated as *Improved Below Target* for math, science, and English language arts.

Accountability and Assistance Level

Those schools that meet their gap narrowing goal are classified as Level 1 and the lowest performing are classified as Level 5.

The Superintendent noted that Doran and Kuss were waiting for their Level 4 exit determination which should be announced in a day or two.

Analysis of Student Learning

The District's SY 2012-13 AIP academic priorities focused on implementation of the Common Core State Standards. On average, the district lags behind the state average in ELA and math performance with the size of the gap varying by grade level and content.

Part 2: Assessment of Practice Against Performance Standards

There are 4 Performance Standards in the Massachusetts Model System for Superintendent Evaluation:

Standard 1 - Instructional Leadership

Indicators focus on curriculum, instruction, assessment, educator evaluation, and data-informed decision making.

- Monitoring reports were considered and reviewed as well as formal/informal observations of schools and their practices.
- Strengths are curriculum, instruction, assessment, and data-based decision-making. Systems are developing to better support teachers to use a variety of practices to meet the needs of their students.
- Response to Intervention (RTI) System is a priority.
- New teacher evaluation tool launched in 2012-13 requires joint collaboration with labor and management in order to develop a system focused on feedback and improvement.

Standard 2 – Management and Operations

Indicators focus on environment; human resource management/development; scheduling and management information systems; law, ethics and policies; and fiscal systems.

- A number of initiatives and systems developed in each of these areas (i.e. Wraparound Zone initiative for schools).
- Priority is recruitment and retention of effective educators as described in the district's AIP.

Standard 3 – Family and Community Engagement

Indicators focus on family engagement within schools, collaboration with community and business stakeholders, student support, addressing family concerns and two-way culturally proficient communication.

- Family and community engagement is an area developing within FRPS.
- District is reviewing initiatives within schools for enhanced family and community engagement.
- Priority is to continue to develop strong systems for addressing family and community concerns and establishing culturally proficient communication practices.

Standard 4 – Professional Culture

Indicators focus on commitment to high standards, and culturally proficient policies and practices, communication skills, culture of continuous learning, shared vision, and conflict management.

- During SY 2012-13 the School Committee, Superintendent, and Teachers' Association agreed to a joint labor management collaboration project called the District Capacity Project.
- DESE review of District Systems of Support notes the district promotes a culture of transparency, accountability, public confidence, collaboration, and joint responsibility for student learning across its schools.
- Priority is to continue to develop the shared vision focused on student preparation for college/career readiness, civic engagement, and responsible citizenship.

Mr. Pavao suggested they review the material they have during another subcommittee meeting prior to the regular meeting in October.

Superintendent: This is a first draft. Goals can be presented at next meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Costa: To refer the Superintendent's self-assessment to the full Committee.
All in favor   None opposed   Motion Passed

The subcommittee agreed and decided on Wednesday, October 9, 2013 at 5:15 PM for their next meeting assuming Dr. Kelly's schedule would allow him to be present.

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

All in favor   None opposed   Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:01 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.