Governance Rubric for Continuous Improvement

	1	2	3	4
Goals	The district has no annual goals for improving student outcomes.	The SUP and the SC have agreed on goals for the district but they are not discussed that often. The goals may not have been voted on by the full board.	The SC and SUP have agreed, and voted on goals and they are posted on the website. Once a year they are used by the SC to evaluate the SUP	The SC and SUP have agreed on goals and the SUP has used them in creating an improvement strategy for the district. The goals are a frequent topic of discussion in the school community, and at SC meetings, where they often drive budget decisions and other policies.
Operating Protocols	Individual members and the SUP communicate separately based on personal relationships and prior traditions. Some members may feel left out; or speak negatively in public about each members and the board's decisions.	Because of some tension on the board, the superintendent and some members of the SC have talked about making some rules for working together, but they may not be written down and have not come to a vote.	The SUP and the SC Chair have developed some guidelines for how the SC and SUP will work and communicate with each other and with the public. Not all members follow them, however, and this sometimes causes problems.	The SC and the SUP have agreed to, and put in writing, operating protocols for the board and they are followed most of the time. Periodically, the SC and SUP come together to talk about how they are working and to make adjustments. Problems are addressed in private conversations or in informal workshops or retreats. The level of trust between members and the superintendent is high.
Meetings	Meetings are not well planned, are long and sometimes contentious. Very little time is spent talking about student achievement. Members feel free to bring up new proposals at meetings, surprising other members and the SUP. Some members dominate and meetings often get "stuck" due to personal agendas.	In general, the SUP and SC Chair set the agenda and surprises are kept to a minimum. However, when there is a major improvement initiative, meetings can be long and contentious. Engaging the community in the decision, while desired, is not typical.	The SUP and SC have an agreement on how the agenda will be set, and student outcomes are often discussed. The SUP will schedule a special meeting if he/she needs to discuss a major initiative in advance of a major decision.	Meeting agendas are set well in advance and often feature a presentation related to the school district's improvement agenda. Difficult decisions are often discussed in informal meetings well before votes. The SC and SUP work together to include the community in major decisions, and make use of task forces and other joint committees to explore options.
Monitoring	The SC is only aware of the district's progress in student outcomes when the SUP informs them. The data that is presented is limited or random and there is no clarity about which data or measures should be a priority.	The SC and the SUP review state test scores once a year as well as data that individual members may be interested in, but there is little sense how these numbers connect to district improvement initiatives and the SC has few means for holding the SUP accountable for student outcomes.	The SC and SUP periodically review student outcome data when working on the budget or at evaluation time. There is general agreement on what data is important to track.	The SC and SUP have agreed on a set of measures to judge the success of the superintendent's strategy and other goals the community has for its students. These are made easily assessable in a "data dashboard" or similar means, and meeting agendas are planned to periodically review data and to discuss progress. When the time comes to evaluate the SUP, the SC has a clear sense on what has been accomplished and what has not; and why.
Community Engagement	Decisions are made in a vacuum. There is no public comment period, public engagement or other opportunity for the community members and stakeholders to engage the SC. There is little or no interest in feedback from others.	The SC has authorized strategies for feedback, including public forums, public comment periods and district climate surveys. Policies on public input are clear and accessible.	The SC uses feedback to inform budget, policy and planning. Regularly avenues for communication are scheduled, promoted and conducted in a way to encourage public input and follow-up, especially around big decisions.	The community expects and appreciates that the SC will engage stakeholders and other citizens in discussion and in search of feedback to make important decisions. There is a communication plan or policy and the district enjoys a positive image in the community.

Source: District Governance Support Project, Massachusetts Association of School Committee