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 1\textsuperscript{st} year, 2\textsuperscript{nd} 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES (evidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reorienting the system to serve teaching and learning - Organizational - Leadership - Capacity buildings/PD - Culture</td>
<td>Succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building trusting relationships inside and outside the system; between Board and Superintendent</td>
<td>Work on Core Values (shared throughout organization? Check out “work” against them on ongoing basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A shared strategic planning process that identifies/addresses short- and long-term challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Making Central Office a true schools’ support function</td>
<td>Promote, hire, align, and support skilled staff (to accomplish); build Needed capacity via PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Develop a plan for effective academic intervention for all schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Planning for and implementing Curriculum 2.0 and Common Core Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ensuring that professional development supports student achievement</td>
<td>Plan a revisiting/rewriting/redesign of professional development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

__________________________
P R E S I D E N T

__________________________
S E C R E T A R Y