

APPROVED
6-2012

Rockville, Maryland
January 30, 2012

The Board of Education of Montgomery County held a work session at the Rockville Library, Rockville, Maryland, on January 30, 2012, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Ms. Shirley Brandman, President
in the Chair
Mr. Christopher Barclay
Ms. Laura Berthiaume
Dr. Judy Docca
Mr. Michael Durso
Mr. Philip Kauffman
Mrs. Patricia O'Neill
Mr. Alan Xie
Dr. Joshua Starr, Secretary/Treasurer

Absent: None

Facilitators: Dr. Barbara Anderson
Mr. Andrew Gelber

RESOLUTION NO. 30-12 Re: **RESOLUTION FOR CLOSED SESSION**

In open session at 9:00 a.m., on motion of Mr. Kauffman and seconded by Mr. Barclay, the resolution for closed session was approved unanimously:

WHEREAS, The Board of Education of Montgomery County is authorized by the *Education Article* and *State Government Article* of the *Annotated Code of Maryland* to conduct certain meetings or portions of its meetings in closed sessions; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Education of Montgomery County conduct a closed session on January 30, 2012, at the Rockville Public Library, 21 Maryland Avenue, Rockville, Maryland 20850, in the Director's Board Room (3rd floor) from 9:00 to approximately 10:30 a.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That the superintendent of schools brief the Board on the state of the organization and central office personnel matters as they relate to his plans for the organization, which is an administrative function outside the purview of the *Open Meetings Act* and, to the extent any individual employee or other personnel matters are discussed, as permitted under Section 10-508(a)(1) of the *State Government Article*; and be it further

Resolved, That the meeting continue in closed session until the completion of business.

Re: WORK SESSION

At 11:22 a.m., the work session began with the stated objectives:

- 1 - Board members and Superintendent attain a shared understanding of the purposes of establishing a performance evaluation for the Superintendent, and of the respective roles and responsibilities of Board and Superintendent in contributing to a robust performance evaluation process.
- 2 - Board members and Superintendent attain preliminary agreement on the key content of the performance evaluation tool (i.e., the specific goals and objectives in regard to which the Superintendent will be evaluated, as well as the indicators or metrics that will be used to assess and describe performance).
- 3 - Board members and Superintendent attain preliminary agreement on some of the key processes of the performance evaluation (e.g., the frequency and format of a reflective, learning-focused "feedback loop" between Board and Superintendent).

After providing background information, the facilitators posed various questions to which the Board and Superintendent responded with the following:

What constitutes an effective performance evaluation? What shared understandings between/among Board and Superintendent are most important?Effective Performance Evaluation

- Clear standards and expectations
- Objective and fair
- Useful feedback for continuous improvement
- Board speaks with one voice
- Appropriate scope for work of the superintendent
- 360° component
- Provide warm/cool feedback
- Mutually agreed upon standards
- Recommendations for the future
- Contextual 1st year, 2nd year, and beyond (*Board composition -- *expectations)
- Timely – issues within a relevant timeframe
- Consistent growth process
- Clarity on frequency
- Building trust
- Dialogue on-going
- Short and long-term goals
- Self-assessment
- No surprises
- Shared indicators of progress
- Easily understood by public – process

What are the roles and mutual responsibilities of Board and Superintendent with regard to the evaluation process?

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SUPERINTENDENT	BOARD
Need for clear communication Goals Indicators	Need for clear communication Goals Indicators
Mutual responsibility for complete process	Mutual responsibility for complete process
Be candid and honest	Be candid and honest
Self-evaluation	Consensus on Board (one voice) Tie back to mission and values Stay at 20,000 view Distinguish between goals for – District Superintendent
Doable stretch goals with resources	Clear and specific feedback
Clarify what is confidential	Do not micromanage
Action Plan: How the work gets done. By whom? How will be get there?	No gotcha
No surprises	Be disciplined and manage expectations
Take process seriously	Create reasonable timelines Clear about priorities Be clear about what is being measured Considering salary increase Evaluation process Consider input from stakeholders

Clarify what is confidential

Take process seriously

Within those goals and objectives, what is the right mix of professional standards (as developed by AASA and NSBA, for example) vs. goals and objectives that are specific to the context and work of MCPS?

Performance Standards

1. AASA/NSBA standards (Harford) (includes Labor Relations)
2. Customize Harford descriptors for MCPS
3. Make room for strong vision for teaching and learning

What are the most important goals and objectives for the evaluation to focus on?

GOALS	OBJECTIVES (evidence)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reorienting the system to serve teaching and learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organizational - Leadership - Capacity buildings/PD - Culture 	<p>Succession planning</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Building trusting relationships inside and outside the system; between Board and Superintendent 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. A shared strategic planning process that identifies/addresses short- and long-term challenges 	<p>Work on Core Values (shared throughout organization? Check out "work" against them on ongoing basis</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Making Central Office a true schools' support function 	<p>Promote, hire, align, and support skilled staff (to accomplish); build Needed capacity via PD</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Develop a plan for effective academic intervention for all schools 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Planning for and implementing Curriculum 2.0 and Common Core Standards 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Ensuring that professional development supports student achievement 	<p>Plan a revisiting/rethinking/redesign of professional development</p>

MODEL

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT -- "Listen and Learn"
Internships / externships

What kinds of metrics or indicators shall we use to distinguish among different levels of performance? How can we distinguish appropriately between goals for the current year vs. goals for subsequent years? How can we distinguish appropriately between "system" goals and "superintendent" goals?

METRICS

Narrative

- Specifics
- Self-assessment
 - Goals
 - Clear evidence

Observable / not observable

- Assess
- Identify what needs improvement
- What was accomplished
- Scale / grid / descriptors
- Review New Jersey criteria (page 92)
- Review language in professional growth system
- Draft tool should also have draft language

What expectations shall we establish regarding the frequency and format of a reflective, learning-focused "feedback loop" between Board and Superintendent, which will form part of a robust performance evaluation process focused on continuous improvement?

Timeline

- Board self-evaluation/tool – FEBRUARY 27
- First year evaluation – JULY
- AASA/NSBA Standards (Harford) -- JULY
- Quarterly conversation – MARCH/APRIL
 - Board/Superintendent relationship
 - Update
 - Conversations
- Self-evaluation – JULY
 - Superintendent
 - Board

Written superintendent's evaluation done for this meeting

- Draft Performance Standards/Indicator Templates – APRIL
- Draft Goals and Objectives for 2012-2013
Template – JULY

The President decided that an ad hoc committee would be formed to work on the evaluation tool. Board members interested in volunteering to be part of the ad hoc committee should contact Ms. Brandman.

The meeting adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

PRESIDENT

SECRETARY