

EVALUATING THE SUPERINTENDENT

AN EXPLANATION AND GUIDE TO A MEANINGFUL AND MANAGEABLE EVALUATION PROCESS



Massachusetts Association of School Committees

One McKinley Square, Boston, MA 02109

masc.org

December, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page Number
I. Introduction	1
II. Three Components of the Evaluation System	2
• Two-Part Tool	2
• 5 Step Cycle	4
• Rating System	6
III. How Does This All Work? (Implementing the Model Process)	7
• Goal Setting and Plan Development	7
• Formative Assessment	9
• Summative Evaluation	9
IV. Frequently Asked Questions	12
V. Appendix	14
• Procedural Checklist	15
• Pilot Rubric	16
• Sample Evidence	32

INTRODUCTION

In 2010, the Massachusetts Legislature passed *An Act Relative to the Achievement Gap*. The objective of the legislation, along with enabling Massachusetts to qualify for Race to the Top federal funding, was to focus resources and efforts on improving the educational outcomes for all students and close persistent gaps in achievement between student cohorts.

Because a rigorous evaluation can be a valuable tool for helping teachers and administrators be effective educators, the law authorized the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) to establish an educator evaluation model which is now used to evaluate all licensed educators, including teachers, administrators and superintendents throughout the Commonwealth.

The purposes of the evaluation are multifold and include:

- Linking the work of educators to the goals of the district;
- Creating a consistent set of standards throughout the state to measure educator performance;
- Connecting the evaluation to the impact an educator has on student achievement;
- Assisting educators in developing their own professional skills and improving their performance.

MASC was closely involved in developing the general outline for the model system, as well as in revising the Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership in 2019. MASC has trained many school committees on implementing the new evaluation model system since its inception and guided school committees in the development of processes and practices that provide for an objective and fair evaluation of the superintendent in a thorough, yet effective manner.

For many, particularly school committee members and others unfamiliar with the model system, it can seem quite daunting. However, when broken into its component parts, it becomes much more manageable. This guide describes the components of the model system and guides the reader through the superintendent evaluation process and cycle to make it approachable and understandable.

The guide also advises school committees on the important tasks to accomplish at each stage of the evaluation cycle. While the Massachusetts model system for educator evaluation can seem more complex than the tools many committees used in the past, when done well, it has the advantage of being more objective and less subjective than past tools.

The Big Picture – District Goals

Before delving into the evaluation of the superintendent, it's important to take a step back and understand how the work of the superintendent fits in to the big picture of the district. In broad terms, the superintendent guides the district in achieving the district's mission, vision and goals. As school committees work with the superintendent to determine the goals and standards on which the superintendent will be evaluated, this big picture should inform and guide the work.

THREE COMPONENTS OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

COMPONENT ONE: TWO-PART TOOL

The model system for educator evaluation consists of two parts: Goals and Standards.

GOALS:

The evaluation model is GOAL FOCUSED. It is intended to foster growth on the part of the individual educator and, for the superintendent, keep the focus on improvement in student growth and achievement in the district. Keeping the focus on the goals makes the evaluation a tool that is unique to the individual educator and to the school district. In the regulations for educator evaluation, superintendents are required to have one Professional Practice goal, related to their individual professional growth and one Student Learning goal, related to their impact on student achievement. It is also recommended that they have two to four District Improvement goals that relate to the work necessary to drive the district forward.

STANDARDS:

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has defined the Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership in a document referred to as the rubric. The Standards and Indicators are defined in the regulations and are the same for all educators with a similar role throughout the state.

There are four standards for superintendents: Instructional Leadership, Management and Operations, Family and Community Engagement and Professional Culture. Standards are broad categories of knowledge, skills and performance relative to the work of the superintendent.

Standards are further broken down into Indicators. Indicators define more specific knowledge, skills and performance for each of the four Standards.

And then, Indicators are broken down even further into Elements, which define even more specific aspects of practice. Each element has four (4) descriptors, which describe the practice when implemented at an Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient or Exemplary level. To better understand the framework of the Rubric, refer to the Appendix. The full rubric for superintendents has the four (4) Standards, twenty (20) Indicators and thirty-nine (39) Elements.

IMPORTANT - NEW FOR 2019


DESE has introduced a pilot rubric for superintendents which has only the four (4) Standards and twenty (20) Indicators. Each Indicator has descriptors for what that Indicator looks like at different levels of practice. The Elements are not included in the pilot rubric.

This new rubric better addresses the role of the school committee as evaluator and allows the school committee to: maintain its governance role by focusing on the results of the work, make the process more manageable when multiple people contribute to the evaluation, and help make the evaluation more understandable to the public,

The regulations for Educator Evaluation specifically define each of the Indicators. So, the regulatory language for each Indicator has become the description of Proficient in the rubric.

COMPONENT TWO: 5-STEP CYCLE

DESE defines a 5-step cycle for educator evaluations, including those of superintendents. It's important to understand that, for the process to proceed smoothly and be of value, attention needs to be paid to every step in the cycle.



Graphic supplied by MA Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. August, 2019

STEP 1. Self-Assessment

The evaluation process both starts and ends with a self-assessment. One can think of the self-assessment as a recap of the work done and progress made during the previous evaluation cycle. It answers the basic questions of “what has been accomplished in the past year and what work needs to be done?” As part of the self-assessment, the superintendent will provide evidence to support the conclusions of work on the goals and standards. It will also become the basis for informing the goals and standards for the next cycle.

STEP 2. Analysis, Goal Setting and Plan Development

Taking the information and evidence from the self-assessment, the superintendent will recommend, for approval by the school committee, a plan for the upcoming cycle. In this phase, the superintendent and school committee (evaluatee and evaluator) will discuss the work to be accomplished in the cycle, how it supports the work of the district and identify the priorities to be addressed. The plan will include goals that the superintendent will work to achieve, as well as limited selection of Indicators from the rubric (referred to as Focus Indicators) that demonstrate effective practice. The discussion should leave everyone with a clear understanding of the steps that will be taken and the work to be done to accomplish the plan.

According to DESE, goals should be SMART: Specific and Strategic; Measurable, Attainable; Rigorous, Realistic and Results-Focused, and Timed and Tracked. SMART goals also have key actions and benchmarks, which define when actions will happen and measurements of progress. Goals should clearly define an outcome that is understood by all.

STEP 3. Implementation of the Plan

Once the goals are set, it's time to get to work. For the most part, this is the work of the superintendent. There may, of course, be support the school committee must provide to enable the work. For example, certain initiatives might require budget allocations to be successfully implemented. In addition, it is helpful for the superintendent to keep the school committee apprised of progress throughout the cycle.

STEP 4. Formative Assessment

Approximately half-way through the cycle, the superintendent provides the school committee with an update on the progress of the plan. This is not a written evaluation, but rather an agenda item at a school committee meeting. It provides the opportunity for the school committee, as well as the community, to hear about the status of the plan. It gives the school committee the opportunity to ask any questions or voice any concerns it may have. If there is a need to make any adjustments to the goals in the plan, this would be the time to do it. While the Formative Assessment is important, ideally updates on implementation of the plan are occurring throughout the cycle, not just at the time of the Formative Assessment.

STEP 5. Summative Evaluation

At the end of the cycle, the superintendent presents the self-assessment, along with evidence to support the work done to achieve the goals and meet the standards agreed upon at the beginning of the cycle. Individual committee members consider this information, and, along with their own observations, evaluate the superintendent. Most commonly, the individual evaluations are compiled by a member of the committee into a composite evaluation. This composite evaluation is then discussed and voted upon as the final evaluation of the superintendent. In Massachusetts, this is a public process, conducted at a school committee meeting.

COMPONENT THREE: RATING SYSTEM

Lastly, the regulations define a rating system for the evaluation.

At the time of the Summative Evaluation, the superintendent will receive a rating for each Goal.

The possible ratings are:

- Exceeded
- Met
- Significant Progress
- Some Progress
- Did Not Meet

The superintendent will receive a rating on each Standard. The possible ratings are:

- Exemplary
- Proficient
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Each rating for the Standards is broadly defined as follows:

Exemplary: A level of performance that exceeds the already high standard of Proficient. Reserved for performance that is of such a high level that it could serve as a model for leaders regionally or statewide.

Proficient: Performance is understood to be fully satisfactory. This is a rigorous expected level of performance. It is a demanding, but attainable level of performance.

Needs Improvement: Performance that is below the requirements of a Standard, but is not considered to be Unsatisfactory at the time. Improvement is necessary and expected.

Unsatisfactory: The rating is merited when performance has not significantly improved following a rating of Needs Improvement, or performance is consistently below the requirements of a Standard and is considered inadequate or both.

The ratings on the Goals and the Standards are combined into an over-all summative rating of Unsatisfactory to Exemplary.

There are a couple items to keep in mind about the rating system:

- A superintendent must be rated on each of the four Standards.
- In order to receive an overall rating of Proficient, the superintendent must receive a rating of at least Proficient on the Instructional Leadership standard.

HOW DOES THIS ALL WORK?

(Implementing the Model Process)

At every stage of the 5-step cycle, there are tasks to be completed by both the superintendent and school committee. Keep in mind that paying significant attention to the tasks in the Goal Setting and Plan Development stage will reap benefits later in the cycle by ensuring everyone has the same understanding of expected outcomes.

GOAL SETTING AND PLAN DEVELOPMENT

First, set the goals. Remember, this is a Goal-Focused Evaluation. Keeping the focus in the goals keeps the focus on what is important for YOUR district's growth and improvement. Therefore, setting the goals first ensures that you keep this focus.

Using the self-assessment from the prior cycle, along with the district plan, the superintendent will work with the school committee to agree on goals for the coming cycle. If the superintendent is new to the district, this assessment would address the priorities the superintendent identifies upon reviewing the status of the district. The goals should, on the whole, describe the work that the superintendent will do to implement the district plan and goals, and to drive the district forward. As the district vision and plan is implemented, some goals may not change significantly from cycle to cycle, but the action plans should represent the next step in implementing the over-all district plan.

Goals should be SMART:

- Specific & Strategic
- Measurable
- Action-oriented
- Rigorous, Realistic and Results-Oriented
- Timed and Tracked

When a school committee and superintendent take the time to have a thorough discussion about what the goals mean and what they intend to accomplish, the remainder of the evaluation cycle can go much more smoothly. This can also help ensure that, at the end of the cycle, the ratings for the superintendent from the individual members of the school committee are more closely aligned.

At this point, a discussion of the goal OUTCOMES can be extremely beneficial in aligning expectations of everyone on the committee. Some questions to help ensure that the goal adequately describes the outcomes to be accomplished are:

- What is the outcome expected from implementation of this goal?
- How will the district be different a year from now if this goal is accomplished?

A discussion of expected outcomes will help ensure that the goal has a positive impact on the district, rather than being a list of tasks to complete that, in the end, have little or no impact.

Next, consider the Standards. Once the goals are set, then consider the second part of the two-part tool, The Standards and Indicators of Effective Administrative Leadership – the rubric.

While there are 20 Indicators, (and, if the committee is using the longer rubric, nearly 40 Elements) the committee should not use all the Indicators (or Elements) in the evaluation of the superintendent. Rather, pick a limited number of Focus Indicators (DESE recommends 6-8) that most closely relate to the goals you have set, or that you agree need attention. A limited number will help streamline the end of the process. And, again, it will help ensure that the ratings of individual school committee members are more closely aligned.

However, keep in mind that the superintendent must be evaluated on every Standard. So, in your choices, ensure that at least one Indicator from each Standard is selected.

Discuss the evidence. At this point it is very helpful to discuss the evidence that the superintendent might provide to show progress on the goals and implementation of the Standards. This serves a couple of purposes. First, it helps the superintendent consider the types of evidence that may be provided to the committee. Most importantly, it's another check to ensure everyone is viewing the goals and standards, and what will be accomplished during the cycle, through the same lens. Again, at the time of the summative evaluation, this can help keep the ratings of all the individual evaluators aligned more closely than they might be otherwise.

It should be noted that, especially when the goals and standards are aligned with each other, there are not necessarily two sets of evidence that the superintendent must provide, one for the goals and one for the standards. The same pieces of evidence will likely suffice for both. It's important to consider the evidence that truly supports the work, rather than expecting a large body of evidence that may or may not be relevant to the goals and standards.

Once the goals are set, Focus Indicators identified and evidence discussed, the school committee and superintendent can create a plan to monitor progress. One of the most effective ways to accomplish this is to create a year-long agenda for presentations at school committee meetings. This provides the opportunity for both the school committee and community to hear about the progress that's been made. It provides the opportunity for the school committee to provide feedback, lessening the chances of surprises at the end of the evaluation cycle. It also means that members are building an understanding of progress as the plan is implemented. So, at the end of the cycle, the review of evidence is just that, a review of information that's been conveyed all year rather than a "data dump" to be absorbed all at once.

Some superintendents and school committees have also found it beneficial to create a tool, such as a Google Docs or Dropbox folder where evidence related to goals and standards can be placed as it becomes available. This can help streamline the work of the superintendent in gathering the evidence as well as help school committee members build an understanding of progress during the entire evaluation cycle.

FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Part-way through the evaluation cycle, somewhere near the half-way point, there should be a formative assessment, a check-in on progress. This is not intended to be a written assessment, but rather a chance to discuss accomplishment to that point in time. The formative assessment takes place at a school committee meeting. It would generally be listed as an agenda item. The superintendent reports on progress and answer questions that the committee may have. It's an opportunity to keep the committee apprised of progress and to verify that the committee has a common understanding of the goals. Should there be a need to adjust the goals for any reason, this would be the time to do so. As noted above, while the Formative Assessment is beneficial, it is also wise to be monitoring progress throughout the entire evaluation cycle.

SMART goals delineate the actions that will be taken to complete them. Often, there are dependencies that must be in place for the goal to be achieved. There could be instances where a change in circumstances mean that the goal can't be accomplished as anticipated. In this case, it would be appropriate to revise the goal to fit the new circumstances. For example, if a goal was written in anticipation of receiving a grant, and the grant did not come through, the goal may need revision to adjust to the new circumstances.

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

The summative evaluation is the public evaluation of the superintendent. The superintendent has only one evaluator, the committee as a whole and, therefore, only one evaluation. The final evaluation of the superintendent is intended to provide feedback that will help the superintendent know where the committee believes the superintendent has been successful and where improvement may be warranted. To serve the district and the superintendent well, the summative evaluation should provide objective feedback. It should also be limited to the goals and standards agreed upon at the beginning of the cycle and limited to the timeframe of the cycle.

Completion of the final summative evaluation generally takes place over several meetings. The superintendent will first provide a self-assessment to the committee, recapping the work completed and progress made during the cycle. Evidence to support the assessment will be presented and/or reviewed. This presentation allows members to ask the superintendent any clarifying questions as they prepare to complete the evaluation.

The process for preparing the committee's evaluation, often referred to as the Composite Evaluation can be accomplished in different ways, depending on committee preference. Most commonly, all members complete an individual evaluation which is collected by one compiler, usually the chairperson or a designee. Some committees may use a subcommittee to create the composite evaluation and some committees utilize someone outside the committee, such as a school committee administrative assistant. Alternatively, some committees forego the creation of individual evaluations and discuss and create the composite together at a public meeting.

Whatever process is utilized, however, it can be very beneficial to make sure everyone is clear on the process before it begins. This prevents surprises and potential contention at the end of the process, when the focus should be on the content of the evaluation itself.

After the superintendent's self-assessment is presented, committee members will have the material needed to complete individual evaluations. They will have the self-assessment, the evidence presented and the form to complete the evaluation. Everyone should also be clear on the deadline for returning the individual evaluation to whoever will compile the Composite Evaluation. Enough time should be allowed for individual committee members to ask the superintendent or chairperson any questions that arise as they complete their evaluations. And, of course, enough time should be allowed for the composite to be drafted.

In discussing preparation of the Composite Evaluation, committee members should be clear on the process for determining ratings and for drafting the narrative portion of the document. For the ratings, it's important to remember that, since the superintendent has only one evaluator, at the end there is only one rating for each goal, for each standard and for the overall summative rating. Therefore, the compiler must have a method for arriving at the composite rating. This should be more than assigning a number to each rating descriptor, adding them up and taking an average. The final composite rating should reflect a preponderance of the individual ratings. (Note that, however, committees can certainly present the individual ratings when discussing the evaluation in public.) Again, this is where a thorough discussion of the expected goal outcomes and the expectations for the standards back at the beginning of the evaluation cycle can make preparation of the composite much easier.

The process for preparing the composite narrative, a summary of member comments, should also be discussed in advance. Particularly in the comment section of the evaluation, the compiler has the challenge of creating one document that reflects the entire committee, but ensures that every individual can hear their voice reflected in the comments. Often, members agree that at least two members must make a similar comment for it to be reflected in the composite. Should a member feel an important comment was left out, they have the

opportunity to persuade their fellow committee members to include the comment during the public discussion of the evaluation.

Whatever process a committee uses to arrive at the composite evaluation of the superintendent, the final piece of the process is the public evaluation. According to the Open Meeting Law, discussions of professional competence - which is what the evaluation is - take place in public. In addition, employees of public boards are evaluated in public. So, whether individual evaluations are compiled into a draft composite, or whether the committee creates the document jointly, there is a public discussion and vote on the final evaluation. This may be the chairperson simply reading the composite or it may be a more extensive discussion. Completing the evaluation of the superintendent, however, lets the community know that the school committee is fulfilling one of its most important responsibilities and is monitoring and evaluating progress of both the superintendent and the district.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

How does the evaluation relate to the superintendent's contract?

This is left to the discretion of the committee and superintendent. The evaluation can be used to determine a salary increase, bonus and/or contract extension. Some specifics of the evaluation, such as the timetable for the evaluation, the process for aggregating feedback from individual members may be in the contract. There may also be provisions about which school committee members are allowed to participate in the evaluation. Some contracts specify that members must be on for a specific amount of time before contributing to the evaluation.

Some contracts also call for a "mutually agreeable" process, timetable and tool. Others may require that school committees "confer and consult" with the superintendent regarding the evaluation. While the regulations are clear that the evaluator has the final decision on the goals in an evaluation, this does leave room for discussion and potential disagreement on other parts of the evaluation content and process. To avoid potential stalemates, MASC recommends "confer and consult" language in the contract.

What is the timing of the evaluation cycle?

The timing of the evaluation cycle is left to local discretion. As the new goal-focused evaluation model becomes established, many committees are adjusting the cycle to fit with the goal setting and planning that occurs in the rest of the district. The superintendent is evaluated at the end of the school year, with planning occurring over the summer and goals set no later than early fall.

Some committees may tie the evaluation cycle to the municipal elections, or to the release of state test scores, as they may be a piece of evidence for the evaluation. The rationale for tying the cycle to elections is to ensure that the committee sitting at the time the evaluation document was created is the same committee that completes the summative evaluation.

When committees choose a cycle that does not coincide with elections, it is useful to consider what happens if the composition of the committee changes during the cycle. Members stepping off the committee can prepare an individual evaluation that cover the period up until the point they leave the committee and this can become part of the composite. Members that join the committee part-way through may contribute to the evaluation based on the time they have been on the committee. They may choose not to participate, depending on how up-to-speed they feel. Or, they may decide to participate in part or fully participate. Of course, as members of the committee at the time of the actual evaluation, they are fully able to vote on the final evaluation if they choose.

How long is an evaluation cycle?

In the past, DESE defined an annual cycle for superintendents. With the new guidance in 2019, the Department now defines a two-year cycle for experienced superintendents. Simply put, the entire process spans two years rather than one. The formative, mid-cycle review would occur at the end of year one of the cycle and the summative evaluation would occur at the end of the year two.

An experienced superintendent is a superintendent who has been in the role for three years or longer and/or in the district for three years or longer. The decision to use a one-year or two-year cycle for an experienced superintendent is at the discretion of the school committee. Defining the length of the cycle in contract language, in this case, could be helpful.

Are the evaluations of individual members public?

Yes. If the individual evaluations are used in the creation of a composite document, they are considered public records.

Here is the answer from the Open Meeting Law Division of the Attorney General's office:

Yes, if those evaluations are used by the public body during an open meeting. The Open Meeting Law states that "materials used in a performance evaluation of an individual bearing on his professional competence," that were created by members of a public body and used during a meeting are public records, and cannot be withheld from public disclosure. See G.L. c. 30A, §22(e). Thus, employee evaluations that members of a public body create and then use during an open meeting to evaluate an employee are public records. Comprehensive evaluations that aggregate the individual public body members' evaluations are also public records if they are used during the course of a meeting. <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/frequently-asked-questions-about-the-open-meeting-law#frequently-asked-questions-about-evaluations->

What is the Supreme Judicial Court ruling regarding evaluations that is sometimes mentioned?

The SJC ruling refers to the release of the composite evaluation of the superintendent to the public. The Court determined that the composite evaluation contains the opinion of the individual members of the committee. As such, it rises, in the Court's eyes, to the level of deliberation. Therefore, as soon as the composite evaluation is available to the committee members, it must also be available to the public. This is to meet the requirements of the Open Meeting Law that deliberation by a public body is to occur in public. If the composite evaluation is made available to the committee in advance of the meeting, it must also be made available to the public through posting on a website and be available in paper form if requested.

APPENDIX

	Page
Superintendent Evaluation Procedural Steps Worksheet	15
Indicator Rubric for Superintendents (from DESE)	16
Examples of Common Types of Evidence by Indicator (from DESE)	32

Superintendent Evaluation Procedural Steps Worksheet

<u>Task</u>	<u>Date</u>
1. Establish Goals and Focus Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine process to establish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Superintendent recommendation to full committee? ○ Superintendent work with subcommittee? • Discuss criteria to assess performance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key actions and benchmarks ○ Ensure goals are SMART ○ Examples of evidence that could be provided 	_____
2. School Committee vote to approve Goals and Focus Indicators	_____
3. Committee and superintendent discuss Formative (mid-cycle) Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda item, not written assessment 	_____
<hr/>	
4. Superintendent provides end-of-cycle report	_____
5. Committee members receive evaluation form <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert agreed-upon Goals into evaluation form • Highlight agreed-upon Indicators • Provide copy of rubric • Discuss: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who will compile? ○ How will ratings be determined? ○ How will ratings be presented? ○ How will narrative be composed? ○ Will individual evaluations be shared with committee? 	_____
6. Committee members submit completed individual evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow enough time to ask clarifying questions 	_____
7. Compiler creates composite evaluation	_____
8. Final evaluation presented, discussed and voted in a public meeting	_____

DRAFT Indicator Rubric for Superintendent Evaluation

The Indicator Rubric for Superintendent Evaluation is an evaluation tool intended to support a shared understanding of effective leadership practice between a superintendent and school committee members.

Designed around the 21 Indicators from the Standards of Effective Administrative Leadership (603 CMR 35.04), the Indicator Rubric includes descriptions of a superintendent's practice for each *Indicator* and articulates the specific responsibilities that a school committee may be expected to reasonably evaluate. This is a significant departure from the more detailed, *element-level* rubrics associated with other educator roles in the model system for educator evaluation.

While this structural difference results in a shorter, less complex evaluation tool, it does *not* simplify the responsibilities of a superintendent. All 21 Indicators associated with the four Standards of Effective Administrative Leadership remain in place, and the superintendent is still expected to meet expectations associated with each Standard, typically assessed by focusing on one to two Indicators per Standard each year. Describing practice at the Indicator level rather than at the element level acknowledges the following unique components of an educator evaluation process conducted by a school committee:

- **The Role of the School Committee:** The school committee's role is governance, rather than management. A school committee thereby focuses on the *what* and the *why* (governance) of superintendent leadership, rather than the *how* (management). The Indicator Rubric does the same.
- **The Composition of a School Committee:** The school committee as "evaluator" is comprised of multiple individuals, rather than a single evaluator. This demands consensus building, a process made exponentially easier when focused around fewer descriptors of practice.
- **The Focus of a School Committee:** School committee members, many of whom are often non-educators, focus primarily on the outcome of a superintendent's work, rather than the details of implementation. The Indicator Rubric guides committee members to maintain this focus.
- **A Public Process.** The superintendent's evaluation is the only educator evaluation conducted in public. The Indicator Rubric includes the practices to which a committee can reasonably be expected to have access or insight, such that the public process of collecting and evaluating evidence may be conducted with transparency and integrity.

The 2019-2020 Rubric Pilot. DESE is supporting a year-long pilot of the draft Indicator Rubric to evaluate its use and impact on the superintendent evaluation process. The objectives of the pilot include:

- ✓ Assess the implementation of the rubric by superintendents and school committees. *Is it accessible and relevant to all involved?*
- ✓ Assess the impact of the rubric. *Does it promote a comprehensive evaluation of superintendent practice? Does it support consistency and transparency in aspects of the evaluation process, including analyzing evidence, providing feedback, and using professional judgment to determine ratings?*

DESE will collect input from pilot districts through a qualitative survey and interview process. For more information on participating as a pilot district, please contact Claire Abbott at cabbott@doe.mass.edu.

STANDARD I: Instructional Leadership

The education leader promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff by cultivating a shared vision that makes powerful teaching and learning the central focus of schooling.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-A: Curriculum	Does not ensure the implementation of standards-based units of instruction across the district (e.g. fails to provide adequate resources or training).	Ensures that most instructional staff implement standards-based units of instruction consisting of well-structured lessons, but curricula in some schools or content areas lack appropriate rigor or alignment to state standards.	Monitors and assesses progress across all schools and content areas to ensure that all instructional staff implement effective and rigorous standards-based units of instruction consisting of well-structured lessons with measurable outcomes.	Empowers administrators to ensure all instructional staff collaboratively plan, adapt as needed, and implement standards-based units comprised of well-structured lessons aligned to state standards and local curricula. Continually monitors and assesses progress, and provides additional supports as needed. Models this practice for others.
I-B: Instruction	Does not ensure that instructional practices across schools and content areas reflect high expectations for teaching and learning, are engaging and motivating, or meet the diverse learning of all students; or establishes inappropriately low expectations for teaching and learning.	Supports instructional practices in some schools or content areas that reflect high expectations, engage all students, and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness; but allows lower expectations and/or insufficiently engaging instruction to persist in parts of the district.	Monitors and supports principals and instructional staff through observations and feedback to ensure that instructional practices in all settings reflect high expectations regarding content and quality of effort and work, engage all students, and are personalized to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs, interests, and levels of readiness.	Sets high expectations for the content and quality of instruction and empowers all administrators to do the same, such that instructional practices throughout the district are engaging, inclusive, and personalized to accommodate diverse learning needs of all students. Stays informed of new, evidenced-based instructional practices and provides resources and supports to implement them as needed. Monitors principals and instructional staff in support of these practices through observations and feedback.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-C: Assessment	Does not set expectations around or ensure the use of a variety of formal and informal assessment methods throughout the district.	Encourages most principals and administrators to facilitate practices that propel personnel to use a variety of formal and informal methods and assessments to measure student learning, growth, and understanding, but assessment use and analysis is inconsistent throughout the district.	Monitors and supports principals and instructional staff through observations and feedback to ensure that all principals and administrators facilitate practices that propel personnel to use a variety of formal and informal methods and assessments to measure student learning, growth, and understanding and make necessary adjustments to their practice when students are not learning.	Empowers teams of administrators and instructional staff to use a comprehensive system of informal and formal assessment methods to measure each student's learning, growth, and progress toward achieving state/local standards, and to use findings to adjust instructional practice and implement appropriate interventions and enhancements for students. Ensures alignment of assessments to content and grade level standards, and monitors administrators' efforts and successes in this area. Models this practice for others.
I-D: Evaluation	Does not supervise and evaluate administrators in alignment with state regulations or contract provisions, such that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators' goals are neither SMART nor aligned to school and/or district goals, and/or Administrators rarely provide quality supervision and evaluation to other staff; and/or Administrators are rarely, if ever, observed and provided with feedback on their own leadership practice. 	Supervises and evaluates administrators in alignment with state regulations and contract provisions, but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some administrator goals may not be SMART or aligned to school and district priorities; and/or Observations of and feedback to staff by other administrators is inconsistent or nonspecific; and/or Observations of and feedback to administrators by the superintendent are inconsistent or nonspecific. 	Provides effective and timely supervision and evaluation of all staff in alignment with state regulations and contract provisions, as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to all administrators in developing SMART goals aligned to school and district priorities, Guidance, support and monitoring for all administrators to ensure they observe and provide useful feedback to faculty and staff, and Frequent observations of and feedback to administrators on effective leadership practice. 	Provides effective and timely supervision and evaluation of all staff in alignment with state regulations and contract provisions, as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support to all administrators to develop and attain SMART goals aligned to school and district priorities, and sharing best practices and success with the district community; Guidance, support and monitoring for all administrators to ensure they observe and provide useful feedback to faculty and staff; Frequent observations of and feedback to administrators on effective leadership practice. Models this process through the superintendent's own evaluation process and goals.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
I-E: Data-Informed Decision Making	Gathers limited information on district strengths and weaknesses and writes district and annual action plans that lack data-informed goals.	Identifies multiple sources of evidence related to student learning to assess the district's strengths and areas for improvement, but these data are not comprehensive and/or analysis is insufficient, such that district and annual action plans lack focused or measurable goals.	Uses multiple sources of evidence related to student learning, including state, district, and school assessment results and growth data, to inform district goals and improve organizational performance, educator effectiveness, and student learning. Regularly monitors and shares progress with the community. Supports principals to align school improvement goals to district plans and goals.	Leads administrator teams in identifying and using multiple sources of evidence including state, district, and school assessment results and growth data, educator evaluation data, district culture and climate information, to assess and communicate the district's strengths and areas for improvement. Involves stakeholders in the creation of district improvement and annual action plans comprised of measurable, results-oriented goals, and empowers principals to develop and implement similarly robust and aligned school plans and goals. Regularly monitors and shares progress with the community.
I-F: Student Learning	<p>Demonstrates expected impact on student learning based on multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement, including student progress on common assessments and statewide student growth measures where available.</p> <p><i>There are no associated performance descriptors for the Student Learning Indicator. For administrators, evidence of impact on student learning based on multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement must be taken into account by the evaluator(s) when determining a performance rating for Standard I. Evaluators and educators should identify the most appropriate assessments of student learning and anticipated student learning gains associated with those measures when developing the Educator Plan. For superintendents and other district leaders, multiple measures of student learning might include (but should not be limited to) statewide assessments, assessments from curricular materials used in multiple schools, district-created common assessments, or others measures that provide information about student learning across the district.</i></p>			

STANDARD II: Management and Operations

Promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff by ensuring a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment, using resources to implement appropriate curriculum, staffing, and scheduling.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-A. Environment	Fails to establish plans, procedures, routines, and operational systems that address the safety, health, and emotional and social needs of students throughout the district, such that schools and other buildings are not generally clean, attractive, welcoming, or safe.	Oversees plans, procedures, routines, and operational systems that address the safety, health, and emotional and social needs of students, but allows for variation in implementation and/or quality across the district, such that not all students have equitable access to clean, safe, and supportive learning environments.	<p>Develops and executes effective plans, procedures, routines, and operational systems to address a full range of safety, health, and emotional and social needs of students throughout the district, as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> orderly and efficient student entry, dismissal, meals, transitions, assemblies, and recess; school and district buildings that are clean, attractive, welcoming, and safe; and safe and supportive learning environments for all students. 	<p>Empowers all administrators to develop and execute effective plans, procedures, routines, and operational systems to address a full range of safety, health, and emotional and social needs of all students throughout the district, as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> orderly and efficient student entry, dismissal, meals, class transitions, assemblies, and recess; school and district buildings that are clean, attractive, welcoming, and safe; and safe and supportive learning environments for all students. <p>Assesses efficacy using feedback from students, staff, and families, and other data sources; and makes adjustments as necessary. Models this practice for others.</p>

DRAFT Indicator Rubric for Superintendents

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-B. Human Resources Management & Development	Does not implement any formal processes for the recruitment and hiring of faculty and staff, and/or fails to provide sufficient induction, development, or career growth supports to educators, as evidenced by an inability to reliably hire and retain educators that meet the learning needs of district students.	Oversees processes for recruitment, hiring, induction, development, and career growth, but systems are inadequately or inconsistently implemented throughout the district, and/or do not consistently promote the hiring, retention, and support of a diverse, effective educator workforce.	Monitors and supports the implementation of a cohesive approach to recruitment, hiring, induction, development, and career growth that promotes high-quality and effective practice , as evidenced by districtwide systems that support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hiring and retaining a diverse workforce; Comprehensive induction supports for new educators; Job-embedded professional development aligned with district goals; and Distributed leadership opportunities to support educator career growth. 	Ensures a districtwide system for recruiting, hiring, and retaining an effective and diverse workforce of administrators and educators who share the district's mission and meet the learning needs of all students, as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehensive induction supports for all new educators; job-embedded professional learning that (a) reinforces district goals, (b) results in high-quality and effective practice; and formalized distributed leadership and career growth opportunities. Empowers all administrators to implement these systems consistently.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-C. Scheduling and Management Information Systems	Does not implement systems to ensure optimal use of time for teaching, learning, or collaboration, such that instructional time is inadequate and/or routinely disrupted, and administrators have limited to no opportunities to collaborate around meaningful practice.	Encourages the use of scheduling and management information systems that promote time for teaching and learning, but does not monitor efficacy throughout the district and/or allows for frequent schedule disruptions; provides inadequate time for administrators to collaborate around leadership practice.	Uses systems to ensure optimal use of time for teaching, learning, and collaboration, as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> school schedules that maximize student access to quality instructional time and minimize school day disruptions; and regular opportunities for administrators to collaborate. 	Empowers administrators and teams to contribute to the design and monitoring of district systems that maximize access to quality instructional time for all students, and minimize disruptions and distractions for all school-level staff. Supports ongoing administrator collaboration within and across schools.
II-D. Laws, Ethics and Policies	Demonstrates lack of awareness or consistent non-compliance with some or all state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, or collective bargaining agreements, and/or fails to adhere to ethical guidelines.	May know state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, and collective bargaining agreements, but inconsistently complies with some laws or policies, and/or ethical guidelines.	Understands and complies with state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, collective bargaining agreements, and ethical guidelines, and provides the resources and support to ensure district-wide compliance.	Provides the resources and support for all school personnel to understand and comply with state and federal laws and mandates, school committee policies, collective bargaining agreements, and ethical guidelines. Models this practice for others.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
II-E. Fiscal Systems	Develops a budget that does not align with the district's goals or mismanages available resources. Does not communicate budget rationale or financial shortfalls to staff, community members, municipal stakeholders, or the school committee.	Develops a budget that loosely aligns with the district's vision, mission, and goals, and/or inconsistently manages expenditures and available resources. Does not effectively communicate budget rationale to staff, community members, municipal stakeholders, and the school committee.	Develops a budget that supports the district's vision, mission, and goals; allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district/school-level goals and available resources; and effectively communicates budget rationale to staff, community members, municipal stakeholders, and the school committee. Provides regular updates on implementation of the budget.	Leads the administrator team to develop a district budget aligned with the district's vision, mission, and goals that addresses the needs of all students. Allocates and manages expenditures consistent with district/school-level goals, and seeks alternate funding sources as needed. Proactively communicates budget rationale to staff, community members, municipal stakeholders, and the school committee. Provides regular updates on implementation of the budget.

STANDARD III: Family and Community Engagement

Promotes the learning and growth of all students and the success of all staff through effective partnerships with families, community organizations, and other stakeholders that support the mission of the school and district.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-A. Engagement	Does little to welcome families as members of the district, classroom or school community, or tolerates an environment that is unwelcoming to some families.	Invites families to participate in the classroom and school community, but efforts are limited or insufficient, leading to limited family involvement throughout the district.	Promotes, monitors and supports comprehensive, culturally responsive and collaborative engagement practices that welcome and encourage every family to actively participate in the classroom and school community , and engages community stakeholders to contribute to the classroom, school, and community's effectiveness.	Ensures that all personnel to use culturally responsive and collaborative practices that engage all families to contribute to district, classroom, school, and community effectiveness, including but not limited to families with limited access to technology, and families whose home language is not English. Actively engages stakeholders from all segments of the community, including residents, municipal officials, and business leaders, in furthering the mission of the school and the district. Models this practice for others.

DRAFT Indicator Rubric for Superintendents

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-B. Sharing Responsibility	Does not ensure that administrators are identifying student learning and development needs and working with families to address them.	Encourages administrators to work with families to address students struggling academically or behaviorally, but does not consistently monitor these activities to ensure that student needs are being met, either within or outside of schools.	Monitors adherence to district-wide policies and practices that promote continuous collaboration with families to support student learning and development both at home and at school , as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the collaborative identification of each student's academic, social, emotional, and behavioral needs; and connecting families to the necessary resources and services within the school and the community to meet students' learning needs. 	Empowers all administrators to regularly collaborate with families to address each student's academic, social, emotional, and behavioral needs, and to access as needed necessary services within and outside of schools to address those needs. Monitors these processes to ensure all student needs are being met. Models this practice for others.
III-C. Communication	Does not set clear expectations for or provide support to administrators regarding regular or culturally sensitive communication with families, and/or allows culturally insensitive, inappropriate, or disrespectful communications with families to occur. District communication regarding student learning and performance occurs primarily through school report cards.	May set expectations regarding regular, two-way, culturally proficient communications with families, but allows occasional communications that are culturally insensitive to some families' home language, culture, and values. District communication primarily occurs through school newsletters and other one-way media.	Engages in regular, two-way, culturally proficient communication with families and community stakeholders about student learning and performance , that is provided in multiple formats and reflects understanding of and respect for different families' home languages, culture, and values.	Supports and empowers all administrators to engage in regular, two-way, culturally responsive communications with families about student learning and performance. District-wide communications with families are provided in multiple formats and respect and affirm different families' home languages, culture, and values.

DRAFT Indicator Rubric for Superintendents

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
III-D. Family Concerns	Does not address most family concerns in a timely or effective manner, fails to provide systems or supports for administrators to do the same, and/or allows responses to be inconsistent or insufficient. Resolutions are often not in the best interest of students.	Ensures that most family concerns are addressed as they arise, but responsiveness is inconsistent across the district. Supports administrators to reach solutions to family concerns, but may not ensure equitable resolutions that are in the best interest of students.	Addresses family concerns in an equitable, effective, and efficient manner, and supports administrators to seek equitable resolutions to both academic and non-academic concerns that (a) reflect relevant information from all parties including families, faculty, and staff, and (b) are in the best interest of students.	Ensures that all family concerns are addressed in a timely and effective manner throughout the district; empowers administrators to proactively respond as academic or non-academic concerns arise; and promotes collaborative problem solving processes informed by relevant input from all families, faculty, and staff that result in equitable solutions that are in the best interest of students. Models this practice for others.

STANDARD IV: Professional Culture

Promotes success for all students by nurturing and sustaining a school culture of reflective practice, high expectations, and continuous learning for staff.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-A. Commitment to High Standards	<p>Does not encourage high standards of teaching and learning or high expectations for achievement among administrators, as evidenced by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a failure to develop or articulate the district's mission or core values; and 2. an inability or unwillingness to lead administrator leadership meetings that inform school and district matters. 	<p>May articulate high standards for teaching and learning, but expectations are inconsistently applied throughout the district, as evidenced by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission and core values are present but may not reflect district-wide buy-in, or are rarely used to inform decision-making. 2. Meetings: Leads administrator leadership meetings that address matters of consequence but may not result in meaningful decision-making. 	<p>Fosters a shared commitment to high standards of teaching and learning with high expectations for achievement for all, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission and core values: Develops, promotes, and secures staff commitment to core values that guide the development of a succinct, results-oriented mission statement and ongoing decision-making. 2. Meetings: Plans and leads well-run and engaging meetings that have clear purpose, focus on matters of consequence, and engage participants in a thoughtful and productive series of conversations and deliberations about important school matters. 	<p>Established a district-wide commitment to high standards of teaching and learning with high expectations for achievement for all, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mission and core values: Collaborates with educators and community members to develop, secure and/or promote core values and an aligned mission, and to use them to guide decision making. 2. Meetings: Empowers administrators to share responsibility for leading team meetings that address important district matters, and foster collaborative learning and problem-solving around instructional leadership issues. <p>Models this practice for others.</p>

<p>IV-B. Cultural Proficiency</p>	<p>Develops and implements culturally insensitive or inappropriate policies and practices, does not support administrators and staff in building cultural proficiency, and/or fosters a culture that minimizes the importance of individual differences.</p>	<p>Takes pride in having a diverse administration, faculty and/or student body, but some policies and practices are not culturally responsive; and/or provides limited resources for administrators to support the development of culturally responsive learning environments and school culture that affirms individual differences.</p>	<p>Ensures that policies and practices enable staff members and students to interact effectively in a culturally diverse environment in which students' backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges are respected, as evidenced by the sufficient provision of guidance, supports, and resources to all schools to promote culturally responsive learning environments and school cultures that affirm individual differences of both students and staff.</p>	<p>Leads stakeholders to develop and implement culturally responsive policies and practices that acknowledge the diverse backgrounds, identities, strengths, and challenges of administrators, students and staff. Empowers administrators with time, resources, and supports to build culturally responsive learning environments and collaborates with community members to create a culture that affirms individual differences. Models this practice for others.</p>
-----------------------------------	--	---	---	--

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-C. Communications	Demonstrates ineffectual interpersonal, written, or verbal communication skills at times, such that staff, families and community members, and/or the school committee lack accurate or sufficient information.	Demonstrates adequate interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills, but outreach to staff, families and community members, and/or the school committee may be inconsistent or unclear.	Demonstrates strong interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills , as evidenced by regular and informative outreach to staff, families and community members, and the school committee in a manner that advances the work of the district. Regularly seeks and considers feedback in decision-making.	Utilizes and models strong context- and audience-specific interpersonal, written, and verbal communication skills. Actively seeks and incorporates feedback into decision-making and in communicating rationale for the decisions to staff, family, community members and school committee.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-D. Continuous Learning	Accepts the practice of administrators working largely in isolation, without consideration of data and best practices. Does not reflect on leadership practice or demonstrate new ways of thinking about administration and leadership.	Encourages administrators and teams to reflect on the effectiveness of instruction and student learning and use data and best practices to adapt practice, but does not monitor administrators in these practices to ensure consistency or efficacy. Occasionally reflects on their own leadership practice.	<p>Develops and nurtures a culture in which staff members are reflective about their practice and use student data, current research, best practices and theory to continuously adapt instruction and achieve improved results, as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting regular opportunities for administrators and teams to reflect on and collaborate around the effectiveness of a wide range of practices related to instruction and student learning, and Engaging in their own continuous learning to improve leadership practice. <p>Models these behaviors in their own practice.</p>	<p>Develops, nurtures, and models a culture in which all staff members are reflective about their practice and use student data, current research, best practices and theory to continuously adapt instruction and achieve improved results, as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Empowering all administrators to collaborate and share knowledge and skills of best practices that improve student learning within their own buildings, and Regularly reflecting on and improving their own leadership practice in order to develop new approaches to improve overall district effectiveness.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Proficient	Exemplary
IV-E. Shared Vision	Does not engage stakeholders in the creation of or commitment to a shared educational vision, such that the vision is not one in which all students will be prepared to succeed in postsecondary education and become responsible citizens and community contributors.	Engages some administrators, staff, students, families, and community members in developing and committing to a shared educational vision focused on student preparation for college and career readiness, civic engagement, responsible citizenship, and community contributions, but stakeholder engagement is limited and/or the vision is unrepresentative of the district community.	Continuously engages all stakeholders in the creation of (or commitment to) a shared educational vision focused on student preparation for college and career readiness, civic engagement, community contributions, and responsible citizenship. ¹	Leads administrators, staff, students of all ages, families, and community members to develop and internalize a shared educational vision around student preparation for college and careers, civic engagement, community contributions, and responsible citizenship. Ensures alignment of school and district goals to this vision. Models this practice for others.
IV-F. Managing Conflict	Does not respond to disagreement or dissent and/or does not address conflict in a solutions-oriented or respectful manner. Does not attempt or fails to build consensus within the district and school communities.	Responds respectfully to most cases of disagreement and dissent, but employs only a limited range of strategies to resolve conflict and build consensus within the district and school communities, with varying degrees of success.	Employs strategies for responding to disagreement and dissent, constructively resolving conflict, and building consensus throughout district and school communities , while maintaining a commitment to decisions that are in the best interest of all students.	Models a variety of strategies for responding respectfully and effectively to disagreement and dissent, and resolves conflicts in a constructive manner such that all parties are able to move forward productively. Regularly strives to achieve consensus within the district and school communities, while maintaining a commitment to decisions that are in the best interest of all students. Empowers and supports administrators to use these approaches in their own leadership.

¹ The original indicator language is modified in this rubric to reflect a more expansive definition of student success that is inclusive of college and career readiness. This definition is reflected in the other model rubrics as well as Massachusetts policies and initiatives to improve outcomes for all students.

SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION: EXAMPLES OF COMMON TYPES OF EVIDENCE BY INDICATOR

In addition to relevant and publicly available artifacts such as school committee reports and presentations, accountability data, and school and district improvement plans, the following list includes *examples*² of common types of evidence² associated with each Standard and Indicator. It is meant to guide—not prescribe—the collection of evidence of Focus Indicators that have been agreed upon by School Committees and Superintendents. This list should not be seen as comprehensive, nor should a superintendent or committee attempt to gather all of the examples cited below.

STANDARD I: Instructional Leadership		STANDARD II: Management and Operations		STANDARD III: Family and Community Engagement		STANDARD IV: Professional Culture	
A. Curriculum Indicator ✓ Curriculum maps ✓ Example unit plans	A. Environment Indicator ✓ Analysis of safety and crisis plan elements and/or incidence reports ✓ Analysis of student support systems, structures, or programs	B. Human Resources Management and Development Indicator ✓ Staff hiring and retention data ✓ School and district PD plans ✓ Annual Induction and Mentoring report	A. Engagement Indicator ✓ Family and community engagement/participation rates and trends ✓ Examples of outreach to community stakeholders and organizations ✓ Example communications to representative cultural groups	B. Sharing Responsibility Indicator ✓ Reports of family participation in district/school services ✓ Compilation of family referrals to and use of outside services ✓ Compilation of parent feedback	A. Commitment to High Standards Indicator ✓ Example leadership team meeting agenda items and analysis ✓ School-site walkthrough data and follow-up reports	B. Cultural Proficiency Indicator ✓ Implementation updates for relevant policies/practices ✓ Compilation of student/staff feedback on learning environments ✓ Related PD descriptions and/or feedback analysis	C. Communications Indicator ✓ Memos/newsletters to staff and public ✓ Compilation of procedures and protocols to communicate effectively with the School Committee
C. Assessment Indicator ✓ Report on district assessments ✓ Aggregated classroom walkthrough/observation data ✓ Report of data team meetings and/or protocols	C. Scheduling and Management Information Systems Indicator ✓ Analysis of master schedules and time on learning ✓ Report on common planning time and professional development opportunities	D. Law, Ethics, and Policies Indicator ✓ Relevant leadership team meeting agenda items ✓ Policies and protocols governing	C. Communication Indicator ✓ Compilation of survey results from parents/community stakeholders ✓ District website and newsletters ✓ Example agendas for Back-to-School Night and similar events	D. Family Concerns Indicator ✓ Compilation of parent feedback ✓ Observations of superintendent at school committee meetings	D. Continuous Learning Indicator ✓ Professional development for principals/administrators ✓ Report on professional		
D. Evaluation Indicator ✓ Compilation of educator goals ✓ Analysis of school and classroom observation data							

² Any evidence collected by or shared with a school committee as part of the superintendent's evaluation—particularly when such evidence may communicate information about students, families, and/or staff—must adhere to all confidentiality rules and regulations.

SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION: EXAMPLES OF COMMON TYPES OF EVIDENCE BY INDICATOR

STANDARD I:		STANDARD II:		STANDARD III:		STANDARD IV:	
Instructional Leadership		Management and Operations		Family and Community Engagement		Professional Culture	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Analysis of student and staff feedback data 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ confidentiality and district code of ethics 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and other public settings 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development/continuous learning for superintendent 	
E. Data-Informed Decision-Making Indicator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ District/school improvement plans ✓ Examples of status updates and other reports for school committee 		E. Fiscal Systems Indicator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Budget analyses and monitoring reports ✓ Budget presentations 				E. Shared Vision Indicator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Example leadership team meeting agenda items and analyses ✓ District communications with staff, families, and community 	
F. Student Learning Indicator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Statewide assessment data ✓ Common assessment data ✓ Analysis of other performance data 						F. Managing Conflict Indicator <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Compilation of feedback from staff, parents, and/or other community members ✓ Observations of superintendent at public meetings 	

Model Guidance on the Superintendent Evaluation Process is available at

www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/