

Superintendent Evaluation

Introduction The Revised School Code requires school boards to evaluate their superintendent's job performance annually as part of a comprehensive performance evaluation system that takes into account student growth data and requires certain additional factors. MASB is pleased to provide this superintendent evaluation instrument based on the requirements of the Revised School Code. The instrument provides school districts a straightforward option for superintendent evaluation. It may be used alone or in conjunction with a facilitated evaluation.

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders This evaluation instrument is based in part on two bodies of research: The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, which were reviewed and published by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration in 2015 and School District Leadership that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement which was conducted by Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) in 2006. For detailed information on the research base, please consult the appendixes of this document.

Requirements, Process, Timeline and Resources Elements that are required in the Revised School Code appear in red in the evaluation instrument. Please consult the appendixes of this document for considerable supplementary information and guidance on superintendent evaluation.

Scoring MASB recommends scoring on the rubric be limited to whole numbers (i.e., 2, 3, etc.); ratings of half numbers may be used if absolutely necessary (i.e., 2.5, 3.5, etc.). Scoring in lesser increments undermine the reliability of the evaluation instrument.

Training The Revised School Code requires Board of Education members to receive training on the evaluation instrument to be used for the superintendent beginning in 2016-2017. Training must also be provided to the superintendent regarding the measures used in the evaluation system and how each measure will be used.

Posting Requirements Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, districts must post comprehensive information on their websites in regards to the evaluation instrument being used. For details in regards to the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument's posting requirements, please visit www.masb.org/postingrequirements.

Who to Contact

Topic Contact Superintendent Evaluation Donna Oser, doser@masb.org or 517.327.5923

Training on Superintendent Evaluation Debbie Stair, dstair@masb.org or 517.327.5904

Legal Questions Joel Gerring, jgerring@masb.org or 517.327.5922

Facilitated Evaluation Donna Oser, doser@masb.org or 517.327.5923

2 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

Table of Contents

A. Governance & Board Relations

..... 4

B. Community Relations

..... 6

C. Staff Relations

..... 8

D. Business & Finance

..... 10

E. Instructional Leadership

..... 12

F. Determining the Professional Practice Rating

..... 14

G. Other Required Components of Evaluation

..... 15

Student Growth

..... 15 Progress Toward District-Wide Goals

..... 15 H. Compiling the Summative Evaluation Score

..... 16

Appendix A – Research Base

..... 17

Appendix B – Process for Completing Year-End Evaluation for Superintendent

..... 18

Appendix C – Conducting the Formal Evaluation and Conference

..... 19

Appendix D – Considerations Related to the Closed Meeting Exception
..... 20

Appendix E – Possible Timelines for Evaluation of the Superintendent
..... 21

Appendix F – Establishing Performance Goals for the Superintendent
..... 22

Appendix G – Evidence
..... 23

Appendix H – Possible Evidence of Performance
..... 24

Appendix I – Contingencies
..... 26

Appendix J – Student Growth
..... 27

Appendix K – Developing an Individual Development Plan for the Superintendent
..... 28

Appendix L – Training
..... 29

Authors
..... 30

A. Governance & Board Relations Weight: 20%

Ineffective (1 pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

A1 Policy involvement Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 9

3

1. Makes decisions without regard to adopted policy.
2. Provides correspondence from policy provider with recommendation(s) for adoption. Follows as written.
3. Is actively involved in the development, recommendation and administration of district policies.
4. Is proactive in the determination of district needs and policy priorities.

A2 Goal development Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 9, 10

3

1. Goals are not developed. Goals are defined by implementing
2. state curriculum and seeking to maximize student scores.
3. Facilitates the development of short- term goals for the district. Provides the necessary financial strategies to meet those goals.
4. Believes in and facilitates the development of short-/long-term goals for the district. Aligns the available resources within the budget to accomplish these goals.

A3 Information Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9

3

1. Does not provide the information the board needs to perform its responsibilities.
2. Keeps only some members informed, making it difficult for the board to perform its responsibilities.
3. Keeps the board informed with appropriate information as needed so it may perform its responsibilities.
4. Keeps all board members informed with appropriate, regular communication so it may perform its responsibilities.

A4 Materials and background

3

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 7, 9

1. Meeting materials aren't readily available. Members arrive at meetings without enough prior information regarding agenda or background information.
2. Meeting materials are incomplete and don't include adequate background information or historical perspective.
3. Materials are provided. Background and historical perspective are included. Recommendations are included.
4. Meeting materials are comprehensive with all adequate background information and previous action included. Recommendations are well thought out.

A5 Board questions

3

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9

1. Board questions aren't fully answered and some information may be incorrect. Some questions may be avoided.
2. Most board questions are answered. All members aren't apprised of all relevant questions/answers.
3. Board questions are addressed with follow-up to members.
4. Board questions are answered thoroughly with communication to all members to ensure understanding.

A6 Board development

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6

3

1. Doesn't promote and does not budget for board development.
2. When prompted, provides members with information about board development.
3. Provides members with information regarding board development opportunities when they arise and budgets for board development.
4. Actively encourages board development by seeking and communicating opportunities. Ensures funding is aligned to board development plan.

Category rating: **3**

Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain: x Meeting agendas/minutes x Board packets Board development materials x Memos/communications Board policies/policy book Retreat agendas/minutes Board development plan x Communication protocols Policy review calendar

4 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

A. Governance & Board Relations – continued Weight: 20%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance: **Effective (3)**

Goal: Indicator:

Evidence: See Board Comments

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education: Dr. Cooper was rated Effective in each subcategory by the majority of each board member. Evidence of asking board opinions on topics before moving ahead, memos, weekly updates, board packets and minutes were used as evidence. Dr. Cooper rated himself as Minimally effective on A4 due to his lack of historical perspective of the district. Trustee Zickus commented on disappointment the BOE lack of involvement regarding NEOLA

Comments by the Superintendent:

5 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

B. Community Relations Weight: 15%

Ineffective (1 pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

B1 Parent feedback

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8

3

1. Doesn't accept input or engage parents in goal setting.
2. Accepts suggestions and input from parents but fails to seek it. Does not engage parents in district-wide goal setting.
3. Readily accepts parent input and engages parents in district-wide goal setting.
4. Actively seeks parental input, creates methods for parents to be actively involved in setting and supporting district-wide goals.

B2 Communication with community: Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8

3

1. Isn't readily available for parents, businesses, governmental and civic groups. Avoids direct communication unless absolutely necessary.
2. Is available for parents, businesses, governmental and civic groups, providing them with information, but doesn't seek their input. Is not proactive.
3. Actively seeks two-way communication with the community as appropriate.
4. Actively seeks communication, as appropriate, and works to provide alternative means of contact with the community.

B3 Community feedback

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8

2

1. Doesn't accept input or engage community in goal setting.
2. Accepts suggestions and input but does not seek it. Does not engage community in district-wide goal setting.
3. Readily accepts community input and engages community in district-wide goal setting.
4. Actively seeks input, creates methods for community to be actively involved in setting and supporting district-wide goals.

B4 Media relations

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8

3

1. Communicates with the media only when requested.
2. Isn't proactive, but is cooperative with the media when contacted.
3. Promotes positive relations and provides the media with district event information.
4. Initiates and actively engages the media.

B5 District image

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8

3

1. Is indifferent or negative about the district. Does not speak well or represent the district well in front of groups.
2. Doesn't actively promote the district. Speaks adequately in public.
3. Projects a positive image of the district as expected. Well spoken.
4. Projects a positive image at all times; is a champion for the district. Articulate, knowledgeable and well-spoken.

B6 Approachability

2

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 8

1. Is neither visible nor approachable by members of the community.
2. Is visible but not necessarily approachable by members of the community.
3. Is visible and approachable by members of the community.
4. Is visible and approachable by members of the community. Attends a variety of events.

Category rating:

2

Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain: Third-party survey data School accreditation survey data Meeting invitations, agendas Press releases Community meeting agendas News clips/interviews Community engagement calendar Strategic planning agenda(s) Communications Service club membership(s)

6 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

B. Community Relations – continued Weight: 15%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance: **Effective (3)**

Goal: Indicator:

Evidence: See Board Comments below

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education: A community survey was issued to collect data regarding the Superintendent's effectiveness to assist the Board in completing his evaluation. Although there was an insufficient number of respondents from the community to give the results significant validity. More time to respond and a better process will be developed for next year. Each board member read through the survey results. Statements of not being involved with certain community groups was discussed. Trustee Zickus commented on "Only attends community events that benefit him". It seems that Dr. Cooper is seen as not very approachable to community members in some areas. The feedback that was received from the survey was highly considered in this section. Evidence used were third party surveys, new paper clip, strategic engagement calendar, press releases, and communications.

Comments by the Superintendent:

7 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

C. Staff Relations Weight: 15%

Ineffective (1 pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

C1 Staff feedback

2

(Teacher feedback is a required component.) Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 7

1. Doesn't accept input or engage teachers and staff in decision-making or goal setting.
2. Accepts suggestions and input from staff but does not seek it. Does not engage staff in district-wide goal setting or decision-making.
3. Readily accepts staff input and engages staff in district-wide goal setting and/or decision-making.
4. Actively seeks staff input in decisions, creates methods for staff to be actively involved in setting and supporting district-wide goals.

C2 Staff communications

2

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 7, 9

1. Doesn't inform staff of matters that may be of concern.
2. Is inconsistent in keeping staff informed of important matters.
3. Keeps staff informed of important matters.
4. Establishes a system of keeping staff continually informed of important matters.

C3 Personnel matters

3

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9

1. There is no system to handle personnel matters in a consistent manner. Some situations may be handled with bias.
2. A system has been established, but it is not applied consistently.
3. A system is used to address personnel matters with consistency, fairness, discretion and impartiality.
4. Establishes a system that is proactive with personnel matters. Personnel policies are routinely discussed and promoted.

C4 Delegation of duties

3

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9, 10

1. Doesn't delegate duties. Maintains personal control over all district operations.
2. Delegates duties as staff members request additional responsibilities.
3. Delegates responsibility to staff within their abilities and then provides support to ensure their success.
4. Delegates responsibility to staff that will foster professional growth, leadership and decision-making skills.

C5 Recruitment

3

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6

1. There is no formal recruitment process and/or hiring is considered in an arbitrary manner.
2. A formal recruitment process is in place, but is not used consistently.
3. Follows a formal recruitment process for each hiring opportunity.
4. Follows a formal recruitment process for each hiring opportunity. Actively recruits the best staff available and encourages their application to the district.

C6 Labor relations

3

(Bargaining) Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 9

1. Is unable to work with union leadership, doesn't work to improve relations.
2. Accepts that collective bargaining is a necessary and difficult process. Works to make the best of it.
3. Is proactive in sharing appropriate information and manages dynamics of the relationship.

4. Actively seeks to improve the bargaining experience through relationship-building, trust and sharing of information.

C7 Visibility in district

2

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 4, 5, 6

1. Seldom visits buildings. Is present at building programs and
2. special activities.
3. Visits buildings/classrooms occasionally.
4. Regular, purposeful visits to buildings and classrooms are a priority.

Category rating: Minimally Effective (2)

C. Staff Relations – continued Weight: 15%

Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain: Third-party survey data School accreditation survey data Hiring process documentation Personnel policies and procedures Recruitment calendar Staff leadership development plan Negotiations documentation School visit calendar Communications Staff meeting agendas/minutes

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Indicator: Minimally Effective (2)

Goal:

Evidence: Staff survey, school visit calendar, legal opinions, communications, staff meeting agendas, and other provided materials.

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicators

Comments by Board of Education: A staff survey was issued to collect data regarding the Superintendent's effectiveness to assist the Board in completing his evaluation. Although only 31% of staff participated in the survey, the Board reviewed and considered the survey results and comments of the staff members. Trustee Zickus made numerous comments about Dr. Cooper's lack of effectiveness in these domains-largely in part, based on the survey. Trustee Haight commented she would like to see Dr. Cooper more "polished" when speaking to the public. (This was not necessarily a negative comment, but rather something to improve on in general. Trustee Breen mentioned the Listening Tour and how it had happened once during the school year. The Board was under the impression it would happen throughout the year. Dr. Cooper said it happened multiple times, just with different groups. (One time per group). Trustee Modderman commented there has to be "something there" with all of the comments on the staff survey. He did not specifically identify any comments, but stated they should be taken into consideration. Trustee Thurkettle stated he had read through each comment and took into consideration of his ratings on the rubrics. The Board considered a report from a staff member regarding inappropriate comments of a sexual nature in determining the Superintendent's overall rating in this domain, though it should be noted that an investigation was done by the Board Vice President and legal counsel for the district regarding this matter and it was determined that Dr. Cooper did not violate board policy. As a result of this and the survey results the Superintendents overall rating will reflect a Minimally Effective.

As a result of the Minimally Effective overall rating in this domain a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) will be created between a committee of the Board (Thurkettle, Zickus, Breen) and Dr. Cooper to be implemented and monitored for the 2018-2019 school year

Comments by the Superintendent:

While I agree that there is a need to improve relationships with the staff, I would like to note that the actual rubric scores warranted an effective rating. The overall score for this domain was adjusted to the minimally effective rating based on the survey feedback and the investigation. I understand the need to do this and am committed to working more closely with the staff this year to create better collaboration, communication and trust.

D. Business & Finance Weight: 20%

Ineffective (1 pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

D1 Budget development and management Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 2, 9 **3**

1. Budget knowledge is limited. The budget is developed and managed without taking into consideration current needs of the district.
2. Works to develop and manage the budget to meet the immediate fiscal issues. Decisions are primarily reactive to current needs of the district.
3. Budget actions are proactive and consider the most current information and data. A balance is sought to meet the needs of students and remain fiscally responsible to the community.
4. Budget actions are proactive and consider both current and long-range information and data. A balance is sought to meet the current and future needs of students and remain fiscally responsible to the community.

D2 Budget reports

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 2, 9 **3**

1. Doesn't report financial information to the board except with the annual audit.
2. Reports the status of financial accounts as requested by the board.
3. Reports to the board concerning the budget and financial status on a regular basis (monthly, quarterly, etc., as agreed upon by governance team).
4. Constant flow of budgetary/ financial information provided with discussion of the ramifications of any changes.

D3 Financial controls **3**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 2, 9

1. Annual audit has revealed areas that are in need of improvement. Financial accounts aren't in order.
2. Annual audit is used to reveal any discrepancies. Internal controls are inconsistent.
3. Is up-to-date with GAAP and state accounting procedures. Maintains internal controls.
4. Promotes appropriate financial controls, including third-party audits and reconciliation of accounts. Is proactive.

D4 Facility management **2**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 5, 9

1. A facilities management plan is not created. Maintenance is only performed when absolutely needed.
2. Facilities needs are discussed internally, but a plan is not created. Issues are addressed on an as-needed basis.
3. A facilities management plan is in place that includes the current status of the buildings and the need to improve any facilities in the future.
4. Facilities management plan in place includes current status of buildings and the need to improve facilities in the future, with a projected plan to secure funding.

D5 Resource allocation **3**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 9

1. Resources are allocated without consideration of district needs.
2. Resources are allocated to meet immediate needs.
3. Resources are distributed based upon district goals and seek to meet immediate objectives.
4. Resources are distributed based upon district goals and seek to meet immediate and long-range objectives.

Category rating: **Effective (3)**

Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain: Strategic plan Auditor's report District budget
 Budget-related communications Election results that impact funding or facilities Evidence of budgetary alignment to
district-wide goals Grants received/applied for Policies/procedures related to fund management Long-term financial
forecast data Facilities maintenance plan Facilities management plan

10 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

D. Business & Finance – continued Weight: 20%

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance; Effective (3)

Goal: Indicator:

Evidence: Bond election, strategic plan, fund balance, Auditor's report, Budget, Grants received/applied for

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education: Overall the Board has no major notes for this section. The Board agrees that this is a strong area for Dr. Cooper. Fund Balance is up and off State List and the Board attributes this to Dr. Cooper's strong sense of fiscal responsibility. The Board has asked for a possible workshop on Financial reports. In domain D4 the overall rating was a Minimally Effective(2) due to the Board did not feel nor had evidence of a facility management plan that shows needs and improvement to all facilities. This did not take away from the overall rating of Effective for Dr. Cooper in this area.

Comments by the Superintendent:

11 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

E. Instructional Leadership Weight: 30%

Ineffective (1 pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

E1 Performance evaluation system Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 9, 10 **2**

1. No performance evaluation system is in place and/or not all evaluations have been completed as required.
2. Evaluations are completed but not entirely in compliance or are inconsistent with state law.
3. Evaluations are completed in a timely manner. Some less than “effective” staff lack individualized development plans.
4. Performance evaluation system in place that is in compliance with state law. Required evaluations completed. Necessary development plans in place. Evaluations are consistent across district.

E2 Staff development **3**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 10

1. Staff development isn't consistently provided. Staff members are responsible for their own improvement.
2. Staff development programs are offered based upon available opportunities.
3. Staff development programs are offered based upon available opportunities that are targeted toward staff growth and increasing student achievement.
4. Staff development programs are individualized, targeted toward district-specific goals and are sustained to increase student achievement.

E3 School improvement **3**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 6, 9, 10

1. School improvement efforts are limited. There is no comprehensive plan in place.
2. School improvement plans are in place at the building level but lack district-wide coordination.
3. School improvement plans are in place at all buildings and align to the district-wide goals.
4. School improvement plans are in place at all buildings and align to the district-wide goals. Systems are in place for implementation of improvement efforts and monitoring of progress.

E4 Curriculum **3**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 4, 7

1. Curriculum isn't a priority in the district and/or is inconsistent across grade levels.
2. Teachers are allowed to define their own curriculum. There is little coordination.
3. A curriculum is in place that seeks to meet the state standards.
4. Curriculum is in place, aligned across grade levels and in compliance with state standards.

E5 Instruction **3**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 4, 6, 7

1. There is little to no focus on instruction. Technology is not utilized in classroom instruction.
2. Teachers are encouraged to enhance their instructional skills and embrace technology, but no comprehensive program(s) is in place.
3. Effort is made to accommodate diverse learning styles, needs and levels of readiness. Some effort is made to incorporate technology into learning.
4. Instructional practices in place that are differentiated and personalized to student needs. Technology is used to enhance teaching and learning.

E6 Student feedback **2**

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 5

1. Doesn't accept input or seek student feedback.
2. Accepts suggestions and input from students but does not seek it.
2. Readily accepts student input and engages students in district-wide goal setting.
3. Actively seeks student input, creates methods for students to be actively involved in setting district-wide goals.

E7 Student attendance

3

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 5

1. Attendance isn't addressed as a policy issue. Attendance rates are decreasing.
2. Attendance isn't an area of focus; and therefore, student attendance is a matter left to itself. Attendance rates fluctuate at will.
3. Attendance is an area of focus. There are plans and interventions in place to address chronic attendance problems. Attendance rates are improving.
4. Attendance is an area of focus. Individual student attendance problems are addressed early and supports are put into place. Attendance rates are being maintained at a high level.

E. Instructional Leadership – continued Weight: 30%

Ineffective (1 pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

E8 Support for students

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 3, 5

3

1. Academic supports are in place, but are inconsistent.
2. Academic supports are in place but social supports to meet the needs of students are lacking.
3. Programs and activities are available for students. Coordination and alignment can be improved.
4. Coherent systems of academic and social supports are in place to meet the needs of all students. Maintains a safe, caring and healthy learning environment.

E9 Professional: Knowledge Professional Standards for Educational Leaders: 1, 4, 6

3

1. Is uninvolved in current instructional programs. Is unaware of current instructional issues.
2. Is somewhat knowledgeable of current instructional programs. Relies on others for information/data.
3. Demonstrates knowledge of current instructional programs, and is able to discuss them. Seeks to learn and improve upon personal and professional abilities.
4. Demonstrates knowledge and comfort with current instructional programs. Seeks to communicate with others how the district is implementing best practices. Participates actively in professional groups and organizations for the benefit of the district.

Category rating: **Effective (3)**

Artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance in this domain: Staff evaluation calendar District performance evaluation system Superintendent professional growth plan Curriculum RtI/MTSS Superintendent professional development Teacher analysis of student achievement data Curriculum audit Strategic plan/district-wide goals Staff development plan Professional development calendar Instructional model(s) Curriculum team agendas Instructional audit Coaching documentation Observational data from staff Documentation of instructional rounds Positive behavior supports/character programs

If a performance goal has been established related to one of the performance indicators above, write it below:

Performance Effective

Goal: Indicator:

Evidence: Curriculum audit, Strategic plan, communications, Growth Plan, and other documentation

Category rating should be reflected within the performance indicator.

Comments by Board of Education: The Board gave Dr. Cooper an overall rating of Effective with some notes in certain Rubrics. E1-Lack of evidence to see if behind on performance evaluations. IDP's are not implemented for staff rated less than effective, or possibly implemented late or not show consistency. E5-Consistent program for instructional skills to embrace technology. Involve parents on how to use technology. Develop a plan for staff responses to parents/ communications with parents. Too many different platforms to receive and send information. E6- Dr. Cooper himself stated an area for improvement. He needs to proactively seek input from students. Will implement a plan. Areas of good are E4- Moving curriculum into alignment with all grades and buildings. E8- SXI and ASD programs, Special Education director, Dr. Reynolds as Curriculum Director

Comments by the Superintendent:

13 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900 2016 Superintendent Evaluation

F. Determining the Professional Practice Rating

Superintendent name: Dr. Garth Cooper

School year: 2017-2018

Item Weight of Category

Category Score

Category (%)

Weighted Score

A. Governance & Board Relations

20% (.2) x 3 = .60

B. Community Relations

15% (.15) x 3 = .45

C. Staff Relations

15% (.15) x 2 = .30

D. Business & Finance

20% (.2) x 3 = .60

E. Instructional Leadership

30% (.3) x 3 = .90

Total Possible 100% Score:

Adjusted (Score / 4) = 2.85

G. Other Required Components of Evaluation

Superintendent name: School year:

Student Growth Weight: 25%

Student growth and assessment data used for superintendent evaluation must be the combined student growth and assessment data used in annual evaluation for the entire district. Districts should establish a student growth model to be used for teacher and administrator evaluations. NOTE: Student growth and student achievement are not the same. Student achievement is a single measure of student performance while student growth measures the amount of students' academic progress between two points in time¹.

Ineffective (1pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

Fewer than 60% of students met growth targets

60-74% of students met growth targets

75-89% of students met growth targets

90% or more students met growth targets

Growth:

Evidence: District Growth Model

Component score: 4 Highly Effective

* For superintendents who are regularly involved in instruction, 25% of the annual evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data for years 2015-2016, 2016- 2017 and 2017-2018; 40% of the annual evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data beginning in 2018-2019.

1 Measuring student growth: A guide to informed decision making, Center for Public Education.

Progress Toward District-Wide Goals Weight: 10%

Progress made by the school district in meeting the goals set forth in the school district's school improvement plans is a required component for superintendent evaluation.

Ineffective (1pt) Minimally Effective (2 pt) Effective (3 pt) Highly Effective (4 pt) Rating

Progress was made on fewer than 60% of goals

Progress was made on 60-74% of goals

Progress was made on 75-89% of goals

Progress was made on 90% or more of goals

Progress:

Evidence: As indicated in District-Wide Improvement Plan

Component score: 4 Highly Effective

H. Compiling the Summative Evaluation Score

Component

Component Weighted Score

Professional Practice (Adjusted score, p. 14)

$$65\% (.65) \times 2.85 = 1.85$$

Student Growth (Component score, p. 15)

$$25\% (.25) \times 4.0 = 1.0$$

Progress Toward District-Wide Goals (Component score, p. 15)

$$10\% (.1) \times 4.0 = .40$$

Total Score: 3.25

Total Possible 100%

Total

Score / 4 = 81%

Evaluation rating as follows: 90-100% = Highly Effective; 75-89% = Effective; 60-74% = Minimally Effective; Less than 60% = Ineffective

Comments by Board of Education: This is Dr. Cooper's first year at Allendale Public Schools as our Superintendent. He is learning the culture and historical values of this district. In the areas of improvement the Board committee along with Dr. Cooper has developed a PIP for the upcoming school year. The committee will be monitoring the plan's progress and will report to the entire Board in a quarterly fashion. Based on an overall rating of Effective, the Superintendent is eligible to receive a merit pay bonus as well as an increase in base salary for the 2018-2019 school year. However, Dr. Cooper stated he will decline both incentives until such time when he earns back the trust of the Board and the Community. The Board feels confident this will happen next year and thanks Dr. Cooper for his dedication and commitment to the Allendale Public Schools, its students and stakeholders.

Comments by the Superintendent:

I appreciate the thoughtful approach the board took to completing this evaluation and look forward to embracing and addressing the constructive feedback. I have felt very supported by the Allendale Board throughout this year and am grateful for the opportunity to improve in the areas they have identified.

Board President's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Superintendent's Signature: _____ Date: _____

(Superintendent's signature indicates that he or she has seen and discussed the evaluation; it does not necessarily denote agreement with the evaluation.)

Component Score (%)

Appendix A – Research Base

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*. Reston, VA: Author.

The 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape. It involved a thorough review of empirical research (see the Bibliography for a selection of supporting sources) and sought the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups to identify gaps among the 2008 Standards, the day-to-day work of education leaders and leadership demands of the future. The National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals and American Association of School Administrators were instrumental to this work. The public was also invited to comment on two drafts of the Standards, which contributed to the final product. The National Policy Board for Education Administration, a consortium of professional organizations committed to advancing school leadership (including those named above), has assumed leadership of the 2015 Standards in recognition of their significance to the profession and will be their steward going forward.

Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (2006). *School District Leadership that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement*. Denver, CO: Author.

To determine the influence of district superintendents on student achievement and the characteristics of effective superintendents, McREL, a Denver-based education research organization, conducted a meta-analysis of research—a sophisticated research technique that combines data from separate studies into a single sample of research—on the influence of school district leaders on student performance. This study is the latest in a series of meta-analyses that McREL has conducted over the past several years to determine the characteristics of effective schools, leaders and teachers. This most recent meta-analysis examines findings from 27 studies conducted since 1970 that used rigorous, quantitative methods to study the influence of school district leaders on student achievement. Altogether, these studies involved 2,817 districts and the achievement scores of 3.4 million students, resulting in what McREL researchers believe to be the largest-ever quantitative examination of research on superintendents.

17 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

Appendix B – Process for Completing Year-End Evaluation for Superintendent

Planning: At the beginning of the year in which the evaluation is to occur, the Board of Education and superintendent convene a meeting in public and agree upon the following items:

- Evaluation instrument
- Evaluation timeline and key dates
- Performance goals (if necessary beyond performance indicators outlined in rubric, district-wide improvement goals and student growth model)
- Appropriate benchmarks and checkpoints (formal and informal) throughout year
- Artifacts to be used to evidence superintendent performance
- Process for compiling the year-end evaluation
- Process and individual(s) responsible for conducting the evaluation conference with the superintendent
- Process and individual(s) responsible for establishing a performance improvement plan for the superintendent, if needed
- Process and individual(s) responsible for sharing the evaluation results with the community

Checkpoints: The Board of Education and superintendent meet at key points in the evaluation year as follows:

- Three months in – Informal update – Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
- Six months in – Formal update – Superintendent provides update on progress along with available evidence prior to convening a meeting in public. Board president collects questions from the board and provides to superintendent prior to meeting. Board and superintendent discuss progress and make adjustments to course or goals, if needed.
- Nine months in – Informal update – Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
- 11-12 months in – Formal evaluation – Superintendent conducts self-evaluation; presents portfolio with evidence to Board of Education (made available prior to meeting). Board members review portfolio prior to evaluation meeting; seek clarification as needed. Board president (or consultant) facilitates evaluation. Formal evaluation is adopted by Board of Education.

Appendix C – Conducting the Formal Evaluation and Conference

Prior to meeting:

1) Superintendent prepares self-evaluation, compiles evidence and provides to Board of Education. 2) Board members seek clarity as needed regarding self-evaluation or evidence provided. 3) Board of Education members receive blank evaluation instrument and make individual notes about their observations.

During meeting:

4) Superintendent presents self-evaluation and evidence. Superintendent remains present throughout the meeting. 5) Board president reviews with Board of Education superintendent's self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates conversation about performance. 6) Score is assigned for each performance indicator via consensus of the Board of Education. 7) Upon completion of all performance indicators within all domains, board president calculates overall professional practice score and identifies the correlating rating. 8) Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to progress toward district-wide goals. 9) Score is assigned for progress toward district-wide goals via consensus of Board of Education. 10) Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to district's student growth model. 11) Score is assigned for student growth via consensus of Board of Education. 12) Board president calculates overall evaluation score based on professional practice, progress toward district-wide improvement goals and student growth ratings. 13) Board president makes note of themes/trends identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation. 14) Board president calls for vote to adopt completed year-end evaluation for superintendent. 15) Superintendent notes his/her comments on evaluation. 16) Board president and superintendent sign completed evaluation form.

Appendix D – Considerations Related to the Closed Meeting Exception

Boards of Education may go into closed session for certain aspects of the superintendent's evaluation but ONLY at the request of the superintendent. A superintendent who has requested a closed session may rescind the request at any time. The following table identifies which aspects of the process need to be in open and closed session:

OPEN PHASE	CLOSED PHASE
only if requested by employee	Scheduling the evaluation
Discuss & deliberate about the evaluation	Choosing and modifying the evaluation instrument
Establishing performance goals or expectations	OPEN PHASE
Determining process for the evaluation	Adoption of the evaluation
Voting to go into closed session	Related board actions and discussions

Consensus That Involves a Closed Session

1. Superintendent requests a Closed Session for the purpose of his/her evaluation. 2. Board of Education votes to go into closed session. 3. Board of Education moves into closed session: the superintendent remains present throughout the session unless he/she chooses to excuse him/herself. 4. Board president reviews with the Board of Education the superintendent's self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates a conversation about

performance. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for each domain score. 5. Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to progress towards district-wide goals. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for

progress towards district-wide goals via consensus of Board of Education. 6. Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to district's student growth model. A consensus of the Board of Education is identified for

student growth. 7. Upon completion of all areas, the board president calculates the overall score and identifies the correlating rating. 8. Board president makes a note of themes that were identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation. 9. Board of Education comes out of Closed Session and returns to an Open Meeting. 10. Board president reads aloud:

- The consensus score/rating identified for each performance indicator and the calculated domain scores
- The score/rating for progress towards district-wide goals
- The score/rating for student growth

- And then the overall rating earned by the superintendent. (This may occur at a subsequent meeting.) 11. Board president calls for a vote to adopt the completed year-end evaluation for the superintendent. 12. Superintendent notes his/her comments on the evaluation. 13. Board president and superintendent sign the completed evaluation form. 14. Board president works with the superintendent to coordinate public statement about the superintendent's performance.

The completed evaluation form reflects the Board of Education's assessment of the superintendent's performance and is subject to FOIA. The forms used by individual board members for notes are not subject to FOIA providing they are not calculated into an average score.

Appendix E – Possible Timelines for Evaluation of the Superintendent

Key dates and deliverables for superintendent evaluation should be mutually agreed upon by the Board of Education and the superintendent at the beginning of the evaluation cycle. Timeline scenarios and key benchmark descriptions are provided below.

Jan. – Dec. July – June April - March

Activity Month Activity Month Activity Month

Instrument, process, timeline and goals mutually established

January

Instrument, process, timeline and goals mutually established

July

Instrument, process, timeline and goals mutually established

May

Informal update April Informal update October Informal update August

Formal discussion and check-in on progress towards goals

June

Formal discussion and check-in on progress towards goals

December

Formal discussion and check-in on progress towards goals

October

Informal update August Informal update February Informal update December

Annual evaluation November Annual evaluation May Annual evaluation March

Advantage: Aligns with election cycle. Board members who establish goals are likely the same board members evaluating performance.

Advantage: Aligns with contract renewal cycle in many cases. Boards of Education must provide superintendents 90 days' notice in the event of nonrenewal of contract.

Beginning of cycle: Board of Education and superintendent mutually agree upon:

- System (instrument) to be used
- Timeline and key dates
- Goals, benchmarks and evidence
- How evaluation will be compiled, i.e., consensus or average
- How evaluation will be shared with superintendent
- How evaluation will be shared with the community

Advantage: Aligns with the school year. Is compatible with natural flow of the school year as well as hiring cycle for most superintendents.

Informal update:

- Board president shares any specific questions/concerns from board members
- Superintendent provides a written update to the board on goals, expectations and indicators of success
- Board offers input on status/progress to-date

Mid-cycle formal update:

- Board president provides questions from the board prior to meeting
- Superintendent provides update on progress with available evidence
- Board seeks clarification if needed
- Discussion on progress and growth
- Adjustments to course or goals are discussed

Annual evaluation:

- Superintendent performs self-evaluation; presents portfolio with evidence to Board of Education
- Board members review portfolio prior to evaluation, seek clarification as needed
- Board president or consultant facilitate evaluation
- Formal evaluation is presented to and adopted by Board of Education
- Board president and superintendent coordinate public statement regarding superintendent performance

21 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

Appendix F – Establishing Performance Goals for the Superintendent

The MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument provides a framework for evaluating the superintendent in critical areas of professional practice as well as the state- required components of student growth and progress towards district-wide goals. Additional performance goals should be established in exceptional circumstances to clarify the board’s expectations and give priority to the work being done. For this reason, performance goals should be limited in number, aligned to district goals and assist in clarifying accountability.

Superintendent performance goals may be developed from:

When establishing performance goals, the following guidelines should be considered:

- A specific district goal
- Involve all board members and superintendent
- A job performance indicator within an evaluation instrument
- Decide on desired results
- Student performance data
- Develop performance indicators
- Identify supporting documentation (evidence)
- Review and approve final performance goals, indicators and evidence
- Monitor progress at scheduled checkpoints

Performance Goal Fundamentals

Performance goals should be S-M-A-R-T:

Specific—Goals should be simplistically written and clearly define what is expected.

Measurable—Goals should be measurable and their attainment evidenced in some tangible way.

Achievable—Goals should be achievable given the circumstances and resources at hand.

Results-focused—Goals should measure outcomes not activities.

Time-related—Goals should be linked to a specific timeframe.

Process for Goal Development

1. Identify the district goal/priority/indicator/student performance data the superintendent’s goal is intended to support
2. Ask the superintendent:
 - a. What will we see next year toward the accomplishment of this that we don’t see now?
 - b. What measure will we use to know that the difference represents meaningful progress?
3. Allow superintendent time to craft a response
4. Once agreed upon, board and superintendent develop SMART goal statements

Appendix G – Evidence

Validity, reliability and efficacy of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument relies upon board members using evidence to score superintendent performance.

- Artifacts to serve as evidence of superintendent performance should be identified at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and mutually agreed upon by the Board of

Education and the superintendent.

- Artifacts should be limited to only what is needed to inform scoring superintendent performance. Excessive artifacts cloud the evaluation process and waste precious time

and resources.

- Boards of Education and superintendents should establish when artifacts are to be provided, i.e., as they originate, at designated checkpoints, during self-evaluation, etc.

A list of possible artifacts that may be used as evidence is provided at the end of each professional practice domain rubric. See the appendixes of this document for additional artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance.

23 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

Appendix H – Possible Evidence of Performance

Evidence helps to demonstrate performance of the superintendent and remove guess work and subjectivity from evaluation. The following artifacts may be used as evidence of performance. The list is not comprehensive.

- 1 Administrative “calendar”—critical dates calendar (RE: due dates, etc.) and board presentation cycle/annual reports
- 2 Administrative team book study (agendas and minutes)
- 3 Administrative team meeting agendas
- 4 Affirmative action plan
- 5 Agendas and/or minutes from community planning meetings, including key communicators meetings
- 6 Auditor’s report
- 7 Background checks verification
- 8 Board and administrative goals
- 9 Board meeting agendas
- 10 Board policy and administrative policy enforcement that’s reflective of a “new” vision with supporting materials
- 11 Bullying/harassment programs
- 12 Character education program data
- 13 Civic group presentations
- 14 Collaboration/sharing incentives/opportunities for efficiency/effective learning (documentation)
- 15 Collaborative partners (documentation)
- 16 Collaborative sharing of programs, etc. (agendas and minutes)
- 17 Common teacher instructional planning time
- 18 Communication “vehicles” that make the school vision visible to stakeholders including using technology
- 19 Communications with parents
- 20 Community survey
- 21 Comprehensive School Improvement Plan
- 22 Customer satisfaction indices
- 23 Curriculum team meeting agendas
- 24 Curriculum and instructional audit
- 25 Data on outreach programs
- 26 Department of Education site visit summative report
- 27 Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills Data
- 28 Development of wikis, blogs, etc., to collect feedback on specific issues in the district
- 29 District Budget
- 30 District-wide School Improvement Plan
- 31 Distribution of research to administrative team and teachers
- 32 Diversity training/awareness plan
- 33 Documentation of coaching for instruction, curriculum or assessment
- 34 Documentation of coaching and evaluation of principals

- 35 Economic vision (participation with community development groups)
 - 36 Election results that impact tax levies
 - 37 Emergency/Crisis Plans
 - 38 Employee handbooks
 - 39 Enrollment plans
 - 40 Equity district-wide program results
 - 41 Evidence of annual review of district's mission statement and alignment to practice
 - 42 Evidence of implementation of formal project management techniques
 - 43 Evidence of relationship building (notes, cards, emails, etc.)
 - 44 Evidence of teachers examining student achievement data
 - 45 Feedback from a wide variety of stakeholders about performance as the superintendent
 - 46 Formal and informal community partnership agreements and plans
 - 47 Formative assessments to inform instruction
 - 48 Grants received/applied for—alignment to goals of the district; sustainability
 - 49 Growth goals for administrators
 - 50 Hiring process (guidelines, procedures, schedules)
 - 51 House calls—contact with parents and partners (documentation)
 - 52 Induction plan of board members for understanding of school finance (confidence of board members' understanding)
 - 53 Involvement with "school safety" organizations (documentation)
 - 54 Instructional model
 - 55 Instruction-related professional development/growth plans
 - 56 iPod audible book study
 - 57 Job-embedded PD on instruction
- 24 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

- 58 Leadership library (documentation)
- 59 Level of volunteerism (documentation)
- 60 Linkage of Professional Development Model to student achievement goals (documentation)
- 61 Log of school visits and conversations with staff (includes emails)
- 62 Log of school visits and presentations
- 63 Meaningful interpretive reports of student achievement data delivered in lay language
- 64 Media—Newsletter/paper articles/website
- 65 Meeting logs of times with administrative staff/support staff
- 66 Membership and service to service clubs (documentation)
- 67 Michigan Student Test of Educational Progress Data
- 68 Michigan Top-to-Bottom School Rankings
- 69 Minutes of the School Improvement Advisory Committee meetings
- 70 Monthly calendars
- 71 National Assessment of Educational Progress Data
- 72 Needs assessments/satisfaction surveys/focus groups
- 73 Notes from state officials
- 74 Number of visits to website

25 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

- 75 Observational data from board, staff, etc.
- 76 Open houses (documentation)
- 77 Opening day PowerPoint-type presentation
- 78 Parenting classes—numbers
- 79 Parent-teacher conference numbers
- 80 Participation in social/fraternal organizations (documentation)
- 81 Participation in youth-oriented organizations (documentation)
- 82 Participation on state, regional, national initiatives (documentation)
- 83 PBS—Positive Behavior Supports— control/theory/SAFE/Olweus/CHAMPS implementation plans
- 84 Podcasts/video communicating district vision and accomplishments
- 85 Policies/procedures for management of funds
- 86 Preschool—community partnership plans
- 87 Presentations to groups, including teachers (shareholders/stakeholders)
- 88 Professional Development Plan
- 89 Program evaluation and process result
- 90 Reflective journals
- 91 Record of solicitation of feedback
- 92 Reports and celebrations of student achievement to board and other audiences
- 93 School comparisons charts from CEPI

- 94 Special Education delivery plan
- 95 Staff handbook
- 96 School Improvement Plans
- 97 Staff recruitment plan
- 98 Student achievement data
- 99 Surveys of staff/community
- 100 Symbolic “pins,” other symbols—celebrations, etc.
- 101 Teacher mentor program
- 102 Trends in Career Development Plan growth goals for teachers
- 103 Work with city council on city/school initiatives (documentation)
- 104 Work with School Improvement Advisory Committee (documentation)
- 105 Written communications
- 106 Written proposals for innovative practices
- 107 Written recommendations on difficult issues

Appendix I – Contingencies

If a superintendent receives a rating of minimally effective or ineffective, the Board of Education must develop and require the superintendent to implement an improvement plan to correct the deficiencies. The improvement plan must recommend professional development opportunities and other actions designed to improve the rating of the superintendent on his/her next annual evaluation. See the appendixes of this document for more information on developing an Individual Development Plan for the superintendent.

If a superintendent receives a rating of highly effective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the Board of Education may choose to conduct an evaluation biennially instead of annually. However, if a superintendent is not rated as highly effective on one of these biennial evaluations, the superintendent must again be evaluated annually.

Appendix J – Student Growth

For all superintendents, the evaluation system has to take into account multiple measures of student growth and assessment data. For superintendents who are regularly involved in instructional matters—and this includes all but the most exceptional situations—the following specific expectations must be met with regards to student growth:

- 25% of the annual evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data for years 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018
- 40% of the annual evaluation shall be based on student growth and assessment data beginning in 2018-2019

Student growth and assessment data used for superintendent evaluation must be the combined student growth and assessment data used in teacher annual year-end evaluations for the entire district.

Student Growth Versus Student Achievement

Student growth and student achievement are not the same measurement. Student achievement is a single measurement of student performance while student growth measures the amount of students' academic progress between two points in time.¹

Student Achievement Example: A student could score 350 on a math assessment.

Student Growth Example: A student could show a 50-point growth by improving his/her math score from 300 last year in the fourth grade to 350 on this year's fifth grade exam.

It's important to note that, in order to measure student growth, the data considered must be from a single group of students, i.e., this year's fourth graders and next year's fifth graders.

What is a Student Growth Model?

School districts should establish a student growth model to be used in educator and administrator evaluations. A growth model is a collection of definitions, calculations or rules that summarizes student performance over two or more time points and supports interpretations about students, their classrooms, their educators or their schools.²

Michigan law requires that multiple research-based growth measures be used in student growth models that are used for evaluation purposes. This may include state assessments, alternative assessments, student learning objectives, nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards or based on individualized program goals. (Note: Beginning in 2018-2019, in grades and subjects in which state assessments are administered, 50% of student growth in core areas must be based on state assessments.)

Michigan law also requires that the most recent three consecutive years of student growth data be used for evaluation. If three years of data are not available, available data should be used.

¹ Measuring student growth: A guide to informed decision making, Center for Public Education. ² A Practitioner's Guide to Growth Models, Council of Chief State School Officers.

27 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

Appendix K – Developing an Individual Development Plan for the Superintendent

Individual Development Plans are an excellent way of helping employees develop their skills. Boards of education should encourage superintendents to develop an IDP in order to foster professional development.

In the event that a superintendent receives a rating that is less than effective, the law requires the creation of an IDP. The following process is a framework for creating and implementing an IDP for the superintendent:

- During the evaluation conference, the Board of Education provides clear feedback to the superintendent in the domain(s) in which he/she received a less than effective rating.
- A committee of the Board of Education is established to support and monitor the superintendent's development.
- The superintendent drafts an IDP and presents it to the committee for feedback and approval. The IDP outlines clear growth objectives, as well as the training and development activities in which the superintendent will engage to accomplish objectives. The committee reviews, provides feedback and approves the IDP.
- The committee meets quarterly with the superintendent to monitor and discuss progress.
- The superintendent reports progress on his/her IDP with his/her self-evaluation prior to the formal annual evaluation.

28 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

Appendix L – Training

MASB provides training on its 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument to board members and superintendents via a cadre of certified trainers. Training is as follows:

Fundamentals of Evaluation: This training covers the fundamentals of evaluation including legal requirements, essential elements of a performance evaluation system and processes for establishing superintendent performance goals and expectations. This session may not be necessary for participants who have attended Board Member Certification Courses (CBA's) 300 and 301, or who have documented participation in in-district workshops focused on superintendent evaluation conducted by MASB trainers. It is offered at various locations on an individual registration basis or as requested in cooperation with intermediate school districts.

Instrument-Specific Training: This training covers the use of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument including the cycle and processes of evaluation, rating superintendent performance on the rubric, as well as the use of evidence to evaluate superintendent performance. This training fulfills the requirement of evaluator training for board members as well as evaluatee training for superintendents whose districts are evaluating their superintendent with the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. It is conducted on-location in districts with board members and superintendent present.

29 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900

Authors

The Michigan Association of School Boards has served boards of education since its inception in 1949. In the decades since, MASB has worked hands-on with tens of thousands of school board members and superintendents throughout the state. Evaluation of the superintendent has been a key aspect of that work – MASB developed superintendent evaluation instruments and trained board members in their use nearly half a century before the requirements.

MASB staff and faculty involved in creating the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument Include:

- Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), East China School District
- Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
- Donna Oser, CAE, Director of Executive Search and Leadership Development, MASB
- Debbie Stair, MNML, former school board member, Board Development Manager, MASB

New York Council of School Superintendents staff and leadership involved in creating the Council's Superintendent Model Evaluation (which significantly influenced MASB's instrument):

- Jacinda H. Conboy, Esq., New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Sharon L. Contreras, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools, Syracuse City SD
- Chad C. Groff, Superintendent of Schools
- Robert J. Reidy, Executive Director, New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Maria C. Rice, Superintendent of Schools, New Paltz CSD
- Dawn A. Santiago-Marullo, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools, Victor CSD
- Randall W. Squier, CAS, Superintendent of Schools, Coxsackie-Athens CSD
-

Kathryn Wegman, Superintendent of Schools (retired), Marion CSD

30 Michigan Association of School Boards | 517.327.5900