

**Evaluation/AIP Subcommittee**

Tuesday, September 2, 2014  
5:45 PM

School Administration Building  
417 Rock Street  
Fall River, MA 02720

**AGENDA**

- Development of Superintendent's draft composite evaluation
- School Committee goals

**MINUTES**

The meeting was called to order at 5:55 PM. A roll call for attendance showed that Mr. Andrade, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Maynard were present.

Also present were Superintendent Mayo-Brown, Dr. Tom Kelly, School Committeewoman Panchley and a member of the press.

Mr. Andrade read the Open Meeting Law. He then stated that he would be taking the second agenda item first.

1. School Committee goals

Mr. Andrade said that he had gotten the goals out to the subcommittee members prior to the meeting and asked them if they had any changes they would like to see made.

Mr. Hart said he did not at that time but questioned if they were going to be the goals for the School Committee for the upcoming year.

Mr. Andrade said that was correct.

Mr. Hart stated that they were the goals the School Committee would adhere to for the upcoming school year and for them to meet the goals, they were going to have to score themselves.

Dr. Kelly said they had generated the goals based on their review of the data which was the self-evaluation of the School Committee. The goals before them are a draft of the proposed goals which the full Committee will need a chance to review/modify/agree to. Once agreed to, the process would be similar to the process they are using with the Superintendent.

Mr. Hart asked about an ad hoc committee potentially being created and what kind of role they would play.

Dr. Kelly said it is a suggestion and the full Committee could decide if it is a duty of one of the existing subcommittees rather than make a separate committee.

Mr. Hart said that is what he was thinking.

Dr. Kelly said that discussing the vision, having input in the vision, and receiving input on the vision would be something that could be done quarterly or some other schedule that is set up just to strengthen the connection between that protocol and the practice. This would create a mechanism that could facilitate that.

Mr. Hart said it does state the creation of an ad hoc Committee but on another page it is said that “we will establish an ad hoc subcommittee.” He said he did not have a problem with that and asked Dr. Kelly if around the Commonwealth there were committees similar to this that have been created by School Committees that do not just have School Committee members on it.

Dr. Kelly said different districts do it in different ways and one of the things he has spent some time doing is looking at other School Committees around the state around the issue of subcommittees. The number of subcommittees varies from community to community and some are very similar and other communities have other committees around issues that are important to them and this might be a way to do that.

Mr. Hart said he knows it is not something that is etched in stone and can be discussed but feels if they are going to do something like that, they should include other members of the learning community.

Dr. Kelly said he thought that implication was there and that they had the flexibility to day that and ask themselves who is involved in providing input.

Mr. Maynard asked if this item was going to the full School Committee.

Mr. Andrade explained that they will have to take a vote to refer it to the full Committee.

Mr. Maynard asked if they did, if the full Committee would receive it early enough to review it.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said they could get it the next day if it was voted on.

Mr. Maynard said that would be good so that they could have time to review it.

**MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Maynard: To refer to the full body of the School Committee.**

**Discussion**

Dr. Kelly suggested sharing with the full Committee the compiled data so that they can make a connections between the input they provided and the goals that were generated so that they will be in a better position to understand it.

**All were in favor      None Opposed      Motion Passed**

2. Development of Superintendent’s draft composite evaluation

Mr. Andrade said he took the information home to work on because he felt some of the items may be no-brainers that they could get through very quickly and it ended up being easier than that. He suggested going through it section by section to see where they have agreement.

Copies were handed out and the sections were tallied. Mr. Andrade noted that some were very easy to figure out and others he worked out mathematically and explained how he did that. All members were in agreement with the ratings for each section except one.

When discussing the "*Step 1: Assess Progress Toward Goals*" section, it was noted by Mrs. Caron that there were errors in the tallies and she gave the subcommittee the correct totals.

There was then discussion and some disagreement around the scoring of the *Professional Practice Goal* and Dr. Kelly interjected by clarifying that there was a discrepancy in the way that one School Committee member rated in that they had listed the Superintendent as "*did not meet*" for this section but gave a different rating of "*some progress*" in the same category under a different section (*Professional Practice under Superintendent's Performance Goals*) but they should actually have the same rating. Mr. Andrade noted that this person was consistent in the way he rated everything and that it should have most likely been listed as "*some progress*" and not "*did not meet*."

Dr. Kelly said from his perspective it made sense and without speaking for anyone, he agreed with Mr. Andrade's interpretation.

Mr. Andrade felt it made sense to make the change and noted with the final tallies it was not an easy one to rate with 3 some progress, 1 significant progress and 3 met.

Mr. Maynard questioned the changing of the rating and Mr. Andrade explained the reasoning and discrepancy.

Mr. Hart said when they had discussed the ratings at the previous meeting, significant progress and some progress is progress being made.

Mrs. Panchley explained how she tallied the rating using the 1-5 rating and dividing by 7 and Mr. Andrade said that was going to be his suggestion as well. When doing this, they came up with 3 which equated to significant progress.

Mr. Hart questioned the "*did not meet*" rating again and Mr. Andrade explained again how they handled the discrepancy.

The subcommittee agreed that the rating should be *significant progress* for the Professional Practice goal.

They continued by reviewing the remaining sections and were in agreement with the ratings.

Mr. Hart questioned *Step 4: Rate Impact on Student Learning*.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that was not applicable for this year but would be the following year for all districts.

It was noted that they had not discussed *Step 3: Rate Overall Summative Performance* and Mr. Andrade explained that most sections were proficient; therefore, the overall has to be rated proficient.

Dr. Kelly further explained that it was consistent with the overall ratings they gave and is not an issue.

**MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Hart: To approve the composite.**  
**All were in favor      None Opposed      Motion Passed**

Mr. Andrade said the last item was the comments.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown interrupted that on the composite – goals 3 through 5 on the bottom of the sheet had to be tallied as well.

The subcommittee agreed and took the time to tally those goals and rate them as well.

Dr. Kelly said as an observation on those goals; they are pretty clearly stated which should make the rating easy to determine.

Mrs. Panchley said she felt that the evidence provided sometimes made it difficult to determine if the goal had been met or not.

Dr. Kelly said that is why the discussion is necessary.

Mrs. Panchley added that a few had great examples but sometimes it was hard to determine if the work was done. She thought it was good to have the conversations now so they could improve for the next cycle because some of the ratings might have been higher if she had other information.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said she thinks as they are talking about it for next year they will need to agree on the evidence up front.

Mr. Andrade agreed.

They continued to tally the remaining goals.

**MOTION: Mr. Maynard – Mr. Hart: To approve.**  
**All were in favor      None Opposed      Motion Passed**

Mr. Andrade said they could now move on to the comments section and that Mrs. Caron had put together the comments and had them to hand out the subcommittee.

The comments were handed out and the subcommittee took the time to read the comments to themselves.

*Transcriber's Note: Mrs. Panchley exited the meeting at 6:52 PM.*

Mr. Andrade asked if there was any reason they could not include this as part of the composite.

Mr. Hart asked if they are putting the comments in ...

Dr. Kelly interrupted by explain that the concept behind the composite evaluation is for the rating to represent a fair assessment of the individual ratings that the School Committee made. The comments are not supposed to be the individual comments of everyone but a composite of the sense of their input. If a category is rated as proficient and some Committee members did not rate it proficient, then

it can be captured in the comment. He noted that it is a difficult thing because it is not consistent. He also explained that the individual remarks will be public record because they have been submitted as part of the process but the Superintendent's evaluation that goes into her personnel folder is intended to have a summary statement that captures the thinking of the Committee as a governing body, not the individual thinking of specific members.

Mr. Andrade asked Dr. Kelly if he would revise the comments and the comments would not be attributed to specific School Committee members but there would be some sense where people might disagree.

Dr. Kelly said that was correct and gave some examples of how that might be done.

Mr. Andrade gave an example of something he may write.

Dr. Kelly said that was one way to do it and that "the position of the Committee is that the performance was proficient and everybody on the Committee is a member and if they didn't feel that in a certain area it was proficient, they are free to do that and provide input but it does not represent the position of the Committee."

Mr. Hart asked Mr. Andrade if he wanted to meet with Dr. Kelly to go over the comments if it was okay with him.

Dr. Kelly said he was happy to help in whatever way he could.

Mr. Andrade said he felt he could work on it but was concerned about time. He thought Mr. Hart and Mr. Maynard should get to see what he put together.

There was further discussion as to how the comments would be compiled.

Mr. Maynard had concerns with "changing" people's comments.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown explained that the seven individual's evaluations will always be on public record but this is what will actually go in her personnel file.

Mr. Andrade explained that the comments are more for the Superintendent.

Superintendent Mayo-Brown said that was correct and to her represented what the majority of the Committee feels about her performance and also areas that she is getting feedback on. She is aware of the comments.

Mr. Andrade said he would put together the comments and email them to the subcommittee.

**MOTION: Mr. Hart – Mr. Maynard: To adjourn.**  
**All were in favor      None Opposed      Meeting adjourned at 7:08 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.