

**Evaluation/AIP Subcommittee**

Wednesday, August 13, 2014  
6:00 PM

School Administration Building  
417 Rock Street  
Fall River, MA 02720

**AGENDA**

- Development of Superintendent's draft composite evaluation.

**MINUTES**

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 PM. A roll call for attendance showed that Mr. Andrade, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Maynard were present.

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

Mr. Andrade read the open meeting law.

Mr. Andrade then explained that they would not be completing the composite because they were missing two items. One was MCAS scores which they would not have until mid-to-late September.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they do have that information and she had sent out an e-mail earlier that day. She explained that the information was not something they could discuss in open meeting but she could give the subcommittee the information after the meeting adjourned.

Mr. Andrade agreed and noted that the second item they were missing was an evaluation from one of Committee members who was unable to submit it in time. He felt the meeting would not be a waste of time and they could get a good amount of the work done and look at the scores submitted by the other members and calculate them. They could add the outstanding evaluation totals in when it was received and complete the evaluation at that time. He continued that he had put together a score sheet for them to work from.

Mr. Hart questioned if they should be using the evaluation that they had completed as the score sheet instead.

Mr. Andrade explained that his thought was that he had the scores submitted by all but one Committee member and they could just put the totals on the score sheet that he put together and then add in the one missing evaluation to the totals and get the averages which would complete the composite. The form he did was based on the evaluation. He distributed the form and asked if the other members were in agreement with using the sheet.

Dr. Kelly asked if there would be discussion about the contingency of a member either not submitting an evaluation or submitting an evaluation that had been graded but was not done in a way that is

consistent with the guidelines that are provided such as not submitting comments if required. He suggested that ground rule decisions be made up front.

Mr. Andrade thought that made sense and that it was better to deal with it before they start.

Mr. Hart asked Dr. Kelly if there was anything to go back to look at what other communities have done because the evaluation tool they are using is new.

Dr. Kelly said that other communities do have ground rules.

Mr. Hart said he understood that when the rating was proficient, a narrative was not necessary but when the rating was exemplary or needs improvement, a narrative was required. He felt that was something they should look at. He asked if a member does not return an evaluation on time, was there something that allowed them some time to submit.

Dr. Kelly said they are able to make whatever ground rule they wanted around that and that the hope is that everyone gets their data in but to allow some time if there is an oversight or someone is sick. He added that the hope is that there is enough time built in to the process that allows them to account for those contingencies.

Mr. Andrade said he felt that after going through this the one week deadline was too short. Also, they did not take into consideration the MCAS score release. He did not think they would be ready for the August meeting and that September would be more realistic. He also thought they should set a deadline for any evaluation that had not been turned in or any comments that had not been done for some time between now and the next meeting with some time to spare.

Mr. Hart asked if when they approved the timeline, if it was contingent on getting the MCAS scores.

Dr. Kelly said that was a legitimate question because he remembered discussion about accounting for performance of students but he did not have an answer for that. He noted that one of the things they need to do is evaluate the evaluation process as they complete the evaluation. If they feel the timeline does not provide them the time to have the information they need then they should recommend a modification of the timeline.

Mr. Hart said that he felt they could keep coming up with things to delay and that they had made a decision. He did not think it was a good idea to change the timeline and felt that should be done during the next cycle. He was not in favor of waiting and felt they should move forward with the evaluation. He also noted that when looking at the worksheet Mr. Andrade handed out, it looked like they would be numerically scoring.

Mr. Andrade explained that the numbers corresponded to the individuals (School Committee members) and not a rating system. He felt if they were going to be getting the averages it would be much cleaner to be able to set numerical figures as opposed to getting averages from the terminology (i.e. needs improvement, proficient, etc.). He thought they would be better off converting and it would be the subcommittee's decision as to the numerical equivalents.

Mr. Hart felt they should not use numerical scoring.

Dr. Kelly said they could construe it any number of ways. The Superintendent is not getting a number but they somehow have to compile the data. He explained ways they could do that.

There was further discussion between subcommittee members and Dr. Kelly on ways that the data could be compiled.

Mr. Maynard asked if Dr. Kelly knew of any School Committee member ever not turning in an evaluation.

Dr. Kelly said from his experience, it has happened. He has also seen all exemplary ratings with no comments as to why which was not helpful to those who were trying to compile a document that was accurate and helpful to the Superintendent.

Mr. Maynard asked if the rules were coming down from the state.

Dr. Kelly responded yes and that the School Committee has accepted the state model. The state does not talk about how committees should handle the scenario of someone not handing in their evaluation. They can make any decision they want on it.

Mr. Maynard felt that the evaluation was cumbersome and that they work with the Superintendent and know how she performs. He asked Dr. Kelly if they gave the Superintendent a bad evaluation if the state would fire her.

Dr. Kelly responded they would not and that it would be the School Committee.

Mr. Maynard agreed and said that he felt they knew what they were doing and didn't agree with the evaluation.

Mr. Andrade said they had three decisions to make:

1. What should they do in an instance of someone not turning in their evaluation? He felt that it was a short time frame and because it was the first year and a more complicated process than expected, they should give the individual who had not turned in their evaluation more time. He questioned how long they should allow. He did not feel they would have the compilation ready for the August meeting.

Mr. Hart disagreed and thought they could have it ready for the August 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. He said he spoke to the individual and felt that they would have the missing evaluation within the week.

Mr. Andrade asked if Mr. Hart wanted to complete it without that input.

Mr. Hart asked what he suggested because it was not discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Andrade said they had not expected it.

Mr. Hart said they were aware that the individual was having surgery.

Mr. Andrade responded that he was not aware.

Mr. Hart felt they should not delay it. He suggested they start the work, get in touch with the individual to get the evaluation, and schedule meetings to get it done by the 18<sup>th</sup>. He did not feel that not having one evaluation should hold up the process.

Mr. Andrade said they had a meeting scheduled for the next meeting. They could compile the evaluations they do have and if they received the other evaluation by the next evening's meeting, they could complete it then. They would also have the MCAS scores.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked to clarify and explained that what she had was similar to what she had provided the Committee with last year. The goal is around PPI and that is the information she has for them which is specific to that goal. She added that she could not disclose it publicly but it could serve as information for those members who needed it in order to make a rating of that goal.

Mr. Andrade asked if it they would be able to get the data to everyone to look at prior to the next evening's subcommittee meeting.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes and that it was one page and straightforward information.

Mr. Maynard asked the Superintendent how she felt about them continuing without one member's evaluation.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that she wanted to be supportive to them but that it was a decision for the subcommittee. She added that she would like the benefit of hearing every member's feedback about her performance. She understands that there is a timeline the Committee committed to and noted that in previous years they have held a special meeting. The intent of the evaluation system is to help individuals improve performance which they can only do with feedback from their evaluators; so she doesn't want to miss that piece of feedback but she also would like to move on with the process so that she can do goal setting in September and October based on the data that would be coming in. If they delay the summative, it pushes the goal setting back. She said she is fine to go along with whatever the subcommittee decides.

Mr. Andrade asked if she felt comfortable with a special meeting prior to the September meeting.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that would be fine and suggested a special meeting toward the end of August.

Mr. Maynard asked if there should be a motion and there was some discussion as to what the motion should be.

Mr. Andrade asked if the Superintendent would like to set a date.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they could or it could end up being during the September meeting depending on when the missing evaluation is submitted and when the subcommittee could complete the compilation. She thought they needed to give themselves some breathing room because it was the first time they were developing a composite but she also wanted to honor what Mr. Hart was saying about holding themselves accountable to the timeline.

Mr. Andrade agreed and felt they would be in a better position the second year in knowing what the timeline should be.

**Motion: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: To accept an evaluation from the missing individual up until no later than a week prior to the September meeting.**

No Discussion

**All were in favor**

**None were opposed**

**Motion passed**

2. Mr. Andrade said the second issue is dealing with someone who has not complied with the instructions for the evaluation and did not include comments. He felt if they were going to accept a late evaluation then they should also accept the comments in the same time frame.

**Motion: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Hart: To accept any missing comments up until no later than a week prior to the September meeting.**

No Discussion

**All were in favor**

**None were opposed**

**Motion passed**

Mr. Andrade said the last item was to decide what the scoring rubric would be.

Dr. Kelly suggested they make a decision on the position of the subcommittee if someone chooses not to provide additional comments or not to submit an evaluation and how it would be handled in the composite.

Mr. Andrade asked the other members for their thoughts.

Mr. Hart said he already said that they should not deviate from what was already agreed to.

Dr. Kelly did not think there had been a decision by the subcommittee on that type of a ground rule.

Mr. Andrade said they have given people up until a week prior to the September meeting and he felt that was a lengthy time and if they had not turned in the comments or the evaluation, his impression would be they should not be considered.

**Motion: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Andrade: If evaluations or comments are not turned in up until a week prior to the September meeting, the evaluation will not be considered.**

No Discussion

**2 were in favor**

**1 was opposed (Mr. Hart)**

**Motion passed**

*\*note, Mr. Andrade stepped down as chair to second this motion.*

3. Mr. Andrade said the last item was to decide what the scoring rubric would be. They said they would look at what the majority answered for any specific item. He questioned what they would do in the event of a tie.

Mr. Hart responded that there were seven members.

Mr. Andrade thought they could have a situation where they have 3, 3 & 1 split.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that is one scenario to consider as well as a scenario where they have a range and no clear category.

Mr. Andrade agreed. He asked if they wanted to consider a numerical average to avoid those situations.

Mr. Hart thought they should go by the language in the evaluation.

Mr. Andrade agreed to do that and if they came up to a sticky area, they could deal with it then. He added that they had to keep in mind that they had to have some consistency in their rulings.

Mr. Andrade asked Madame Secretary to distribute all the evaluations to those present.

At 6:55 PM the subcommittee compiled the data from the individual evaluations to the worksheet Mr. Andrade provided. After each section was compiled, they went over their data to be sure it was accurate.

When the compilation was complete, Mr. Andrade said they would stop there and add in the remaining evaluation and the student learning goal once it is all received and determine what the numbers indicate. He felt that most of them looked fairly clear.

Mr. Hart noted that they had done the student learning goal.

Mr. Andrade said that some had done it but they did not have the evidence and others had not completed it.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked if she could address the evidence piece and explained that the evidence she thinks they are looking for was that the goal was met.

Mr. Andrade said that was correct.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that there was evidence in the binder which supported the action steps being taken and that the benchmarks were met. What they were missing - and she had for them - was the actual outcome of the goal. She thought it was something for the Committee to decide as they go into the next cycle as to how much weight they should give to the action steps and the benchmarks. Meeting the goal is part of the overall piece of it but she questioned how much weight the Committee should give to the steps leading to achieve the goal.

Mr. Maynard said that was something he was going to mention and he had given her good marks because she worked right up to the goal but they were just waiting for the results.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said from a performance perspective and how she thought about it when doing her evaluations "did the educator perform the action steps that we agreed to would be our best theory of action to achieve the goal."

Mr. Maynard said she met 80% of it and they are just waiting for the other 20% to come in.

Dr. Kelly said it was critical to the process because if everything revolves around whether the goal as stated was 100% met; they don't encourage ambitious goals and encourage lowering the bar. If they give credit for agreed upon work to reach those goals and the individual did that, it has to be acknowledged.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she would share with them what she had to help them decide if they wanted to compile that goal. She asked that they let her lead the discussion as it was embargoed data. She then handed out the data.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown went over the Student Learning Goal and explained how that information was reflected on the handout. She noted that the data was the outcome of that goal. She thought as they move forward to the next cycle they needed to consider if the action steps worked and if so, should they continue doing them or talk about making revisions to those actions steps to try to achieve the goal.

Mr. Hart asked if by showing them this data, she was referring to step 1 in student learning.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said yes.

Mr. Hart asked Dr. Kelly how they handle “some progress.”

Dr. Kelly said his opinion would be that there should be some dialogue like what had just taken place regarding the student learning goal before they make their final determination. He added that when it gets advanced, they can speak from an educated perspective having reviewed the substance behind the numbers with the Superintendent.

Mr. Hart said he wanted some perspective on it because he has his own which is “the glass is half full” and there is progress being made.

Dr. Kelly said that the evaluators should have a common understanding of what the definitions mean.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked if in cases of where they have a dialogue around a particular indicator/standard/goal, if the dialogue informed the rating in something that may not be in the majority and wondered what her role was at the table.

There was further discussion around the evaluation tool/process.

Mr. Hart said that after tabulating it, it is starting to make sense and they almost have a clear picture. He added that when it is done, the subcommittee can meet again to see what was right in the process and what needs to be tweaked. He also felt that Mr. Andrade and the Superintendent were correct that moving the evaluation to the end of August or September may be better even though he did not think so at the start of the meeting.

Dr. Kelly said that at this stage one of the important things that will come out of the work they are doing is that the members that hadn't been so involved in the process are going to need their help in understanding how they got to the end point.

Mr. Andrade said if it is the will of the group to use the information they received on the Student Learning Goal from the members who rated it, they could do so. They proceeded to tally that information onto the worksheet.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown asked if the members that didn't have the benefit of seeing the scores would have the opportunity to revise their rating.

Mr. Hart recommended they email the information to the other Committee members.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that Madame Secretary had the information and she preferred it be hand delivered.

Mr. Hart agreed.

Mr. Andrade said they could put the scores they have in and if anyone wanted to revise based on the information, they could do so.

Dr. Kelly said based on the motions they took that evening, he was under the impression that if an evaluation is submitted without explanatory comments, it would not be accepted. He noted there was

one submitted that did not have comments and he asked if they would give that individual an opportunity to review it. He also noted that one of the ratings was inconsistently transcribed as well and felt that information should be shared with the individual as well.

Mr. Andrade said he would contact that individual.

Madame Secretary agreed to put the tabulations into a spreadsheet.

Mr. Hart asked as a next step if they should get a tentative look at what the results are telling them at the next night's meeting.

Mr. Andrade said they have to see if the other evaluation would be coming in. He did not feel it made sense to meet the next evening if they did not have that information.

Dr. Kelly said it was critical that the person who's results were currently ineligible be given a chance to correct that as well.

Mr. Andrade said he would be in touch with him and the other individual to get that information. He would also look over the information on student learning and complete his item and notify the other members that they could do the same.

There was no further business or discussion.

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

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.