

Mt. Abraham Unified School District Board Policy Governance Monitoring Report

Policy Area: Board Operations A3

Policy Subject: Board - Management Delegation

Monitoring Report for Policy A3.4 - Monitoring Superintendent's Performance

Reporting Period: January 23, 2018 - November 27th, 2018

Reporting Responsibility: School Board Directors for the Public Record

Report Submitted By: Caleb Elder, MAUSD School Director, Starksboro

Policy Language:

Systematic and rigorous monitoring of Superintendent's job performance will be solely against the only expected Superintendent's job outputs: organizational accomplishment of Board policies on ends and organizational operation within the boundaries established in Board policies on Executive Limitations.

Interpretation:

I interpret "*systematic and rigorous monitoring*" to mean the evaluation process is an ongoing, constant and consistent process, based on the established monitoring reports.

I interpret "*organization*" to mean the Mount Abraham Unified School District including all schools, staff and students within the MAUSD Education System.

I interpret "*Superintendent's job performance will be solely against the only expected Superintendent's job outputs*" to mean that the Board will evaluate the performance of the Superintendent by evaluating two main areas:

- o Organizational Achievement: The Board will assess the Superintendent's performance based on the organization's reasonable progress toward achievement of the A1 ENDS policies. Evidence will be considered that demonstrates that the District's ENDS policies are being met or will be met within a reasonable period of time.
- o Organizational Operation: The Board will assess the Superintendent's performance based on the "*organizational operation*" of the MAUSD, within the boundaries established in Board policies. This includes assessing whether the organization and Superintendent followed the guiding principles of the policy, including Executive Limitations.

Evidence:

Background: The MAUSD board took over the governance of the newly formed unified district on July 1st, 2018. Prior to the merger the ANESU Policy and Governance Committee ("PGC"), in collaboration with the Superintendent, had put in place and exercised a collaborative method to establish reasonable interpretation of policies and possible evidence. The former Executive Committee Chair, PGC and Superintendent worked together to create an annual calendar with a two year cycle to review all policies and to insure systematic and rigorous monitoring of the Superintendent's job performance. The MAUSD has adopted this work plan and is continuing monitoring accordingly.

Data for assessing Organizational Achievement under 3.4: [A1 ENDS Monitoring Report](#) from October, 2018. Other evidence includes the Draft MAUSD Strategic Plan, and will include

it's final version.

Data for assessing Organizational Operation under 3.4: Executive Limits monitoring reports, including monthly Accepted Financial Reports from [9/25/2018](#) and [10/30/2018](#) MAUSD Board meetings as recent examples.

Conclusion: I report compliance. There is a comprehensive plan in place to systematically measure the Superintendent's performance in these two areas of organizational achievement and operation. The Board is in its first year of active governance of MAUSD but the plan is being executed on schedule to this point. Evidence is more regular in the area of "*organization operation*" due to the consistent appearance of Executive Limitations reports at monthly business meeting. The annual A1 ENDS monitoring report is a relatively comprehensive document when it arrives, but some interstitial evidence throughout the year would facilitate more "*systematic and rigorous*" Board monitoring in the area of "*organizational achievement*."

Policy Language:

Accordingly:

1. Monitoring is simply to determine the degree to which Board policies are being met. Information that does not do this will not be considered to be monitoring information.

Interpretation: I interpret "*Monitoring*" to mean the presentation of information to demonstrate that the Superintendent is in compliance with Executive Limitations policies and making reasonable progress towards expected student results (ENDS). If the information provided does not prove policy compliance or reasonable progress toward the ENDS, it will not be considered as monitoring information.

Possible evidence: Board evaluation of Superintendent should be based on appropriate criteria and does not include evidence outside the scope of what is defined by the policy.

Conclusion: I report compliance. This Board has used appropriate evidence to monitor the Superintendent's performance. Only information that determines the degrees to which Board policies are being met has been used.

Policy Language:

2. The Board will acquire monitoring information by one or more of three methods: (a) by internal report, in which the Superintendent discloses interpretations and compliance information to the Board; (b) by external report, in which an external, disinterested third party selected by the Board assesses compliance with Board policies; or (c) by direct Board inspection, in which a designated member or members of the Board assess compliance with the appropriate policy criteria.

Interpretation: I interpret this to mean the Board will obtain monitoring information by one or more of three possible ways. One method being an "*internal report*", this report will contain information from the Superintendent that presents interpretations and policy compliance. An "*external report*" will be defined as a report given by a third party. I interpret this to mean a party that is not connected to the organization; this said party will be selected by the Board. A third

party report will also provide proof of policy compliance to the Board. The third and final method of monitoring will be by “*direct Board inspection*”. I interpret this to mean Boards or selected members of Boards will evaluate policy compliance with suitable, relevant policy principles.

Evidence: Monitoring reports mainly come from the Superintendent and are then discussed and accepted by the Board. Third party audits are used for Executive Limitations. To this point the MAUSD has not used the third method of “direct inspection”

Conclusion: I report compliance, since 2 of these 3 methods are currently being used and the policy requires at least one.

Policy Language:

3. In every case, the Board will judge (a) the reasonableness of the Superintendent’s interpretation and (b) whether data demonstrate accomplishment of the interpretation.

Interpretation: I interpret “*reasonableness*” to mean the sensibleness of the Superintendent’s understanding/interpretation and whether the information provided proves that interpretation to the satisfaction of the Board. The Board will be the only judge of the reasonableness of the Superintendent’s work.

Evidence: Acceptance forms are used when accepting a self-monitoring report from the Superintendent. Collaboratively completing these forms provides Board members regular opportunity to focus on the job of assessing the reports appropriately and consistently.

Conclusion: I report compliance. This process has more opportunity to play out in the area of “operation” than “achievement” simply due a difference in the frequency of reporting.

Policy Language:

- **Accordingly:**

4. In every case, the standard for compliance shall be any reasonable Superintendent interpretation of the Board policy being monitored. The Board is the final arbiter of reasonableness but will always judge with a “reasonable person” test rather than with interpretations favored by Board members or by the Board as a whole.

Interpretation: I interpret this to mean the Board will use the reasonableness/sensibleness of Superintendent’s interpretation as the measure for policy compliance on all policies. The Board will make the final decision about the sensibleness of the interpretation. I interpret “*reasonable person*” to mean a person of sound judgement and reasoning. The Board will use “*reasonable person*” as the yardstick by which they evaluate compliance, rather than individual Board member’s attitudes or even the Board’s versions of policy compliance.

Evidence: The common language used in the acceptance form helps the Board to stay focused on judging the interpretation with the “reasonable person test” rather than a single Board members perspective. The collaborative process for feedback on reasonable interpretation has helped the Board with this work.

Conclusion: I report compliance.

Policy Language:**Accordingly:**

5. All policies that instruct the Superintendent will be monitored at a frequency and by a method chosen by the Board. The Board can monitor any policy at any time by any method but will ordinarily depend on a routine schedule.

Interpretation: I interpret this to mean that all policies that direct the Superintendent will be examined at a rate and method that the Board determines. This rate and method will be outlined in the yearly Board calendar and policy. The Board may monitor any policy, at any time using any method but in general, the routine, planned schedule (Board annual work plan) will be used.

Evidence: The Annual MAUSD Board work plan is in place and being used for our Monitoring Schedule. It has been referenced many times by the Board members and Superintendent in the monitoring process.

Conclusion: I report compliance. At this time we are monitoring at the frequency set out in our current work plan. In the future, the Board could also increase the frequency of monitoring certain policies at its discretion and still be in compliance.