

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



1. Component 1a (Mindset)

Assess your board's readiness with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
<p>(1) Commitment to Serve [Willing to subordinate self-interest]</p> <p>Q: From whom does the board receive its authority? To whom does the board answer?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oath of office; State law defining board responsibilities; Board acts as if...(it accepts/'owns' a duty to serve) <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2002 board had a strong sense of duty to represent the interests of everyone in the community 		X	X	X
<p>(2) Commitment to Lead [Willingness to take charge and give direction]</p> <p>Q: Over whom does the board exercise authority?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Willingness to lead through policy directives given to the superintendent <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2002 the board took its leadership responsibility seriously, but didn't view its own leadership role separately from that of the superintendent We were led around (by the superintendent) 		XXX		
<p>(3) Attitude toward Growth [Response to 'failure']</p> <p>Q: What does the board believe about students' ability to learn?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Elevating' beliefs about student capacity to learn; Growth mindset: belief in achievement based on effort <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2002 board viewed UP students as "above average" and was generally satisfied that our students were achieving their potential The board viewed performance as "where we are" not necessarily "where we could be" 		XXX		
<p>(4) Work Ethic [Locus of control]</p> <p>Q: Is the board committed to 'doing the work' required of a board?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board dedicates time in meetings to the board's own work; The board dedicates time in meetings to board professional development; The board dedicates time to monitoring district performance <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board was willing to "roll up its sleeves" in doing necessary board work, but allowed the superintendent to decide what to work on, and to allocate time in meetings for that purpose The board did not focus on its own work; rather, it focused on staff work. The board was sincere about doing work; but it was not focused on what that (work) was. 		XXX		

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



2. Component 1b (Approach)

Assess your board's readiness with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
(1) Systems Perspective [Board awareness of interconnected system]		xxx		
Q: How does the board mentally connect the many parts of the school system? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board is aware of how various district systems impact one another; Board actions take into account how they are interconnected; Board deliberates before taking action, considering impacts of decisions Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board relied on the superintendent to inform it about how board decisions would impact the district • The board was not operating as a system; cobbled together a “consensus” on what might be considered random ideas 				
(2) Systematic Process [Rhyme/rhythm of board operations.]	x	xx		
Q: How does the board mentally connect the many actions of the school system? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board work follows a systematic pattern (readiness, strategic voice, operational guidance, accountability); Board follows routines that reinforce its chosen approach to governing Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board routine was guided by superintendent decisions re: agenda planning • Board process did not assure complete coverage of all board and district areas of responsibility • We were led around (by the superintendent) 				
(3) Policy [What is policy for? How does the board direct?]	x	xx		
Q: What does the board consider the purpose and use of policy? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board actions occur at the strategic/policy level; Board policy direction targets the superintendent; Board uses policy strategically – broad guidance rather than operational detail Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board approach to policy focused extensively on administrative detail of staff work • Board was passive in using policy to guide the district in achieving its most important work • We were focused on administrative detail • The board followed WSSDA policy guidance but did not use policy as a means of directing the district. 				
(4) Meetings [What are meetings for? What is board work?]	x	xx		
Q: What does the board consider the purposes and use of board meetings? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board employs its time in meetings for strategic purposes; Board sets and follows a protocol for meetings; Board controls the agenda, using meetings to do the board's work Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board exercised little control of its meetings • The board allowed the superintendent to shape and guide its work in board meetings • The board did not focus on its own work; rather, it focused on staff work. • Agenda setting was not our focus. We left it up to the superintendent and board chair • The board meetings dealt with issues in random fashion. 				

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



3. Component 2a (Values)

Assess your board's exercise of strategic voice with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
(1) Transparency/Trust/Teamwork [Openness, Interdependence] Q: What is the board's attitude regarding transparency? How does the board build trust? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board assures internal transparency (for board members and staff); Board assures external transparency (public records, meetings, communications) Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2002 board was dedicated to open public meetings/records • Board members were usually courteous to one another and the superintendent in alerting team members to their thinking 		X	XX	
(2) Board-Community Connection [Connecting with 'the boss'] Q: How does the board learn community values? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for community input on strategic issues; Public reports; public listening sessions Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board was willing to engage the public at meetings, but was limited in reaching out • The board made a sincere effort to connect with constituents. 	X	X	X	
(3) Policy expresses the community's values internally [Internal voice] Q: How does the board give voice to community values within the district? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy based on values and principles Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy was largely directive/instructive in nature • The board always strove to include community values into its work. 		XX	X	
(4) Advocacy expresses community values externally [External voice] Q: How does the board give voice to community values outside the district? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board awareness of public policy that impacts local community schools; Board contacts public officials to advocate for students Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board was passive/inactive in representing community values to external policy makers • The board was fragmented (not unified) in its voice • The board usually spoke as individuals, not as a board. 	X	XX		

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



4. Component 2b (Vision)

Assess your board's exercise of strategic voice with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
(1) Goal-Setting Process [Continuous refinement] Q: How does the board set a vision for the future? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board adopts strategic plan and owns the strategic planning process; Board is open to community input re: desired outcomes for students; Board requires collaboration with community stakeholders in vision setting Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board followed the superintendent's lead in strategic planning • There was a disconnect between the words in the strategic plan and what the district actually needed to do. 		XX	X	
(2) Student Focus [Students' needs, not adult wants] Q: How does the board define success for its vision with respect to students? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board assures that students are at the center of all district efforts; Budget reflects student needs, not adult interests Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board was strongly committed to its informal (but written) motto: Students come first! • The board did not have a consistent idea of how students were actually doing, so did not know their needs. 		XX	X	
(3) Results Orientation [Ends not means] Q: How does the board define success for its vision with respect to results? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of program success are based on the program's results; Board bases decisions on demonstrated and demonstrable results Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board strongly supported goals developed by staff and interpreted by the superintendent • The board did not distinguish programs from their results • The board had no common agreement on what outcomes to prioritize. 	X	XX		
(4) Time Perspective [Long-term not short-term] Q: How does the board define success for its vision with respect to time? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board expects and demands long-term measurement of success; Board holds firm to stable, overarching student learning goals Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board in 2002 had a stable, long-term mission and goals to which it was dedicated • The board could not articulate expectations for progress over time. 	X	X	X	

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



5. Component 3a (Operational Guidance to Board Members)

Assess your board's structured operational guidance with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
(1) Defining the Board Member Role [Role clarity] Q: What is the board member's role? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board has defined its vision of the board member's role; Board expectations of its individual members are documented Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board relied on a generalized understanding of the board member role as defined by others (NSBA, WSSDA) and through superintendent advice • Board member expectations were in policy, but actions as a whole were all over the place • The board did attend training on the board member role, as defined by WSSDA, but there was not a common understanding of the role. • 		xxx		
(2) Setting Boardmanship Protocol [Expectations for behavior] Q: What are the board's expectations for individual board member behavior? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board expectations for boardmanship behavior are clearly and publicly stated; Board SOP/protocol is documented and publicly available Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board relied on a generalized understanding of the board member role as defined by others (NSBA, WSSDA) and as informed by superintendent guidance • The board had set policy for board meetings and agenda setting. 		xx		x
(3) Facilitating Boardmanship [Chair as servant leader] Q: How does the board facilitate Boardmanship? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board assures that all voices are heard; Board chair ensures agreed-on protocol is followed (e.g. Roberts Rules, revised); Board confronts any violations of protocol; Board orientation and periodic professional development Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board generally followed superintendent and board chair joint leadership of boardmanship • Board orientation was done only by the superintendent. Board development was encouraged through outside resources rather than by the board itself • Within the board's capacity at the time, this (facilitating Boardmanship behaviors) was done. • The board provided new members information for orientation purposes and made information available to the community as well. 		x	xx	

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



6. Component 3b (Operational Guidance to the Board)

Assess your board's structured operational guidance with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
<p>(1) Defining the Board Role [Role clarity]</p> <p>Q: What is the board's role?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board role is clearly defined; Board work is distinguished from staff work <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board's view of its role was generalized, and tied closely to the superintendent's role in leading the district as a joint team Board expectations were in policy, but actions as a whole were all over the place Few boundaries were in place The board did not have a definition of the role of the board. 		xxx		
<p>(2) Setting Governance Policy [Expectations, governance process]</p> <p>Q: What are the board's expectations for its own work?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board has set policies for its governance work (apart from policies directing staff); Board holds itself accountable for following its own governance policy <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board had established no expectations of its own work beyond a generalized expectation of good boardsmanship as cooperative with one another and supportive of the superintendent Very few policies defined actual board work The board did not talk about this (governance) separate from the concept of Boardsmanship. 	xx			
<p>(3) Facilitating Governance [Chair as servant leader]</p> <p>Q: How does the board facilitate governance?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Role of the chair is defined as facilitator (servant) vs. manager (boss) of the board; Board chair ensures agreed-on protocol is followed (e.g. Roberts Rules, revised); Board confronts violations of governance expectations; Governance is programmed as an agenda item throughout the year <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board did not explicitly identify any expectations for helping the board perform its role There were end-of-year discussions about governance, but the board did not have any regular agenda items for this purpose The (facilitating governance) happened, but not intentionally or in a systematic way. 	x	xx		

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



7. Component 3c (Operational Guidance to the Superintendent)

Assess your board’s structured operational guidance with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
<p>(1) Defining the Superintendent’s Role [Role clarity]</p> <p>Q: What is the superintendent’s role?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board considers the superintendent as its sole link to the staff; Board views superintendent as responsible for district performance/success <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board generally viewed the superintendent as responsible (to the board) for achieving district goals • The board thought the board-superintendent team was responsible for district success, but didn’t distinguish clear roles for board and superintendent • The superintendent operated as the board chair • There was no unified definition/expectation of the superintendent role. 		XX	X	
<p>(2) Employing the Superintendent [CEO hiring process]</p> <p>Q: How does the board hire its primary employee and create an effective employer-employee relationship?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board is prepared for hiring, with community involvement, contract design, evaluation plans, on a continuous basis (well before known vacancy) based on lessons learned over time; Board assures systematic hiring process emphasizes thorough background checks <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board had no existing procedure for how it would respond to superintendent turnover in a methodical and systematic way to assure the best long-term benefit for the district • Previous superintendent hiring process was conducted in an ad hoc manner, with no background checks • There was no discussion about the superintendent hiring process – no plan was in place. 		XX	X	
<p>(3) Directing with Policy [How the board ‘directs’]</p> <p>Q: How does the board guide the superintendent and staff?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superintendent is answerable to policy directives of the whole board • Policy is written in strategic values/principles rather than specific directives <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any specific non-policy directives were led by the superintendent by drafting resolutions, etc. • The superintendent brought draft policy (prepared by staff) to the board for approval • Board guidance to the superintendent was ad hoc, not written, not systematic, virtually never focused on student outcomes. 		XX		

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



(4) Delegating & Providing Support [CEO authority explicitly defined]

XXX

Q: How does the board facilitate management?

Indicators to look for:

- Board allocates resources aligned with strategic policy direction; Board defines authority delegated to the superintendent, including limits; Board supports superintendent exercise of authority, and supervises same

Remarks:

- The board generally supported superintendent work, yet did not explicitly identify what was or was not delegated, so board intervention or pre-approval of actions was implicitly ok
- The superintendent provided a process for strategic planning and provided what he/she thought the board wanted
- There was no way to monitor or support except at the end of the year
- The board, in the context that existed, allowed the superintendent to do the job assigned. As long as there was no problem the board ignored it.

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



8. Component 4a (District Accountability)

Assess your board's delivery of accountability with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
(1) Setting District Performance Criteria [Establish expectations] Q: What measures of district performance will the board use to define success? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board establishes criteria for district (superintendent) success; Board studies data and trends in student data Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures of success were not clearly defined except in a general nature in the strategic plan • There were no district performance criteria established by the board. 		xxx		
(2) Monitoring District Performance [Achievement, compliance] Q: How will the board check to see if the district meets expectations? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board requires data on goals/criteria for both results and compliance; Board can cite staff efforts designed to improve results for students Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board followed the superintendent's lead in presentation of data on district programs and student progress • Test scores were reviewed by the board on an annual basis; otherwise there was no monitoring. 	x	xx		
(3) Responding to District Monitoring [Making adjustments] Q: What will the board do when it finds the district success criteria are met? Not met? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board makes judgments about monitoring data; Board holds superintendent accountable for monitored district performance; Board makes strategic/policy adjustments based on its judgments Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board member responses to superintendent reports on district progress were verbally communicated during meetings in ad hoc manner, and seldom recorded for later analysis • The board did not respond; it accepted the staff's "report" but did not do anything re: articulating expectations. 	x	xx		

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



9. Component 4b (Board Accountability)

Assess your board's delivery of accountability with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
(1) Setting Board Performance Criteria [Expectations]	X	XX		
Q: What measures of board performance will the board use to define success? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board is aware of model board performance measures; Board has documented criteria for board performance Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board did not establish any criteria for judging its own performance The board did not do this, except for ad hoc instances. 				
(2) Monitoring Board Performance [Compliance]	XX	X		
Q: How will the board check to see if board performance meets expectations? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board regularly (formative) and annually (summative) self-assesses; Board self-assessment is documented and publicly available; Board orientation includes expectations for self-assessment Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The board failed to assess its own performance The board did not monitor its own performance. 				
(3) Responding to Board Monitoring [Making adjustments]	XX	X		
Q: What will the board do when it finds that board success criteria are met or not met? Indicators to look for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board makes judgments about self-monitoring data; Board makes strategic/policy adjustments based on data Remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> n/a (the board did not self-assess) Board self-correction was entirely ad hoc, and only in reaction to incidents of board dysfunction N/A (no monitoring, so no response) 				

Board Assessment using A Framework for School Governance

Board: 2003 UPSD

Assessor(s): 4 Bd Mbrs + Supt



10. Component 4c (Board Member Accountability)

Assess your board's delivery of accountability with regard to:

(From 1=Unsatisfactory to 4=Distinguished)

	1	2	3	4
(1) Setting Board Member Performance Criteria [Expectations]		XX	X	
<p>Q: What measures of board member performance will the board use to define success?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board is aware of model board member performance measures; Board has documented criteria for board member performance <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board relied on boardsmanship guidance found in publications of NSBA and WSSDA • There was (because board members participated in training) a general common understanding of good Boardsmanship, 				
(2) Monitoring Board Member Performance [Compliance]	XX	X		
<p>Q: How will the board check to see if board member performance meets expectations?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board regularly assesses its members' behavior; Boardsmanship assessment is documented and publicly available; Board orientation includes expectations for assessment of boardsmanship <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board did not self-monitor its members' boardsmanship behavior • We did not have a systematic approach to monitoring. • Monitoring only occurred on a "by exception" basis; but there was no board action to monitor this. 				
(3) Responding to Board Member Monitoring [Making adjustments]	XX	X		
<p>Q: What will the board do when it finds that board member criteria are met, or not met?</p> <p>Indicators to look for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board makes judgments about boardsmanship monitoring data; Board makes strategic/policy adjustments based on data <p>Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a (the board did not assess its members' performance) • When issues arose, and were brought to the board's attention, the board did take action to correct board member behavior. 				