Student Outcomes Focused Governance A Continuous Improvement Framework

TABLE OF CONTENTS		ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
	1	The journey toward this framework began in 2014 when a group of rambunctious CGCS board members and
Framework Vision & Goals	2	superintendents came together with the intention of defining and supporting effective governance throughout the CGCS family of member school systems. Referring to themselves as
Values & Guardrails	3	"TeamRogue" a designation intended to describe the break from existing governance doctrine they believed necessary to
Monitoring & Accountability	4	position boards as entities capable of driving improvements in student outcomes they began by reviewing existing
Communication & Collaboration	5	research and asking a great number of questions. After
Unity & Trust	6	conducting what was, at that time, the nation's most comprehensive survey of urban board members and
Continuous Improvement	7	superintendents on the topic of improving governance effectiveness, the group began formulating a series of
Definitions	8	workshops geared toward new board members, board chairs, and whole board teams. Those early efforts have since
Examples	11	evolved into this framework. None of this would be possible without significant contributions from each of the following:
Sources	13	water of grinearie contributions from each of the following.
Board Quarterly Self Evaluation	16	Michael Casserly (CGCS), Airick Leonard West (Kansas City), Darienne Driver (Milwaukee), Cindy Elsbernd (Des Moines),
Board Monthly Time Use Evaluation	17	Eric Gordon (Cleveland), Leslie Grant (Atlanta), Ray Hart (CGCS), Pamela Knowles (Portland), Larry Nyland (Seattle),
Board Continuous Improvement Evaluation	18	Michael O'Neill (Boston), Moses Palacios (CGCS), Ashley Paz (Fort Worth), Josh Reimnitz (Minneapolis), Miguel Solis
Superintendent Annual Evaluation	19	(Dallas), Teri Trinidad (CGCS), Steve Zimmer (Los Angeles)
Notes	23	

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Student outcomes don't change until adult behaviors change. Or said differently when placed in the context of governing, patterns of behavior that are exhibited in the boardroom can reasonably be expected to be found paralleled in the classroom. This concept, which offers a summation of the current literature on board behaviors and their relationship to improving student outcomes, is as simple as it can be confounding. The intention of the Council of the Great City Schools' (CGCS) Student Outcomes Focused Governance framework is to translate existing research and the collective experience of dozens of CGCS board members and superintendents into a set of tools that boards can use to identify their strengths and weaknesses as well as to track progress along their journey toward improving student outcomes.

The framework is built around six research-informed competencies that describe school board behaviors and the degree to which they create the conditions for improvements in student outcomes: Vision & Goals, Values & Guardrails, Monitoring & Accountability, Communication & Collaboration, Unity & Trust, and Continuous Improvement.

How To Use

This document is best used by the full board and superintendent with guidance from a facilitator specifically trained in its application. After receiving an orientation to the framework, each individual board member and the superintendent should fill out the Board Quarterly Self Evaluation. Using the self evaluation instrument will reveal a score between 0 and 100, where a 0 indicates that the Board is not at all focused (yet) on its goals for student outcomes and a 100 which indicates that the Board has mastered the behavior of focusing on its goals for student outcomes. Then the facilitator should lead the board through a process of collectively completing the self evaluation for the first time. This will create the Board's starting point data which, in addition to providing a measurable score, provides the board with clarity about its strengths and weaknesses relative to being focused on improving student outcomes.

Once a baseline has been set, the board should schedule time during a public meeting every three months to complete the self-evaluation again as a means of monitoring the board's progress over time. Ideally each quarter the board's focus on improving student outcomes meaningfully increases -- a process tracked for the first two years using the Board Continuous Improvement Evaluation.

Not Student	Approaching Student	Meeting Student	Mastering Student
Outcomes Focused (0)	Outcomes Focus (10)	Outcomes Focus (25)	Outcomes Focus (35)
The Board is Not Student Outcomes	No items from the Not Student	All items from the Approaching Student	All items from the Meeting Student
Focused if any of the following are true:	Outcomes Focused column, and:	Outcomes Focus column, and:	Outcomes Focus column, and:
The Board has not adopted goals . The Board has not consistently demonstrated the ability to distinguish between inputs , outputs , and outcomes . The Board has not hosted opportunities to listen to the vision of the community during the previous thirty-six month period.	 starting point, an ending point, a starting date, and an ending date. The Board has adopted no fewer than one and no more than five goals. Fewer goals allow for greater focus; more allow for less. The Superintendent has adopted, in collaboration with the Board, one to three interim goals to progress monitor each goal, and each interim goal is SMART. The status of each interim goal is 	In addition to the goal ending points, the Board has adopted annual targets , goal ending points for each year leading up to the ending dates. The Superintendent has provided interim goal ending points for each year leading up to the ending date. All interim goals pertain to student outputs or student outcomes, not inputs or adult outputs. The Board included students, parents, staff, and community members in the goal development process. All Board goals last from three to five years; all interim goals last from one to three years.	The Board used a process that included students, parents, staff, and community members in a way that leads them to express ownership of the adopted goals. All of the interim goals are predictive of their respective goals, and are influenceable by the Superintendent (and the Superintendent's team). Predictive suggests that there is some evidence of a correlation between the interim goal and the goal. Influenceable suggests that the Superintendent and through them, the staff has authority over roughly 80% of the inputs the interim goal is measuring. The Board relied on a root cause analysis, comprehensive student needs assessment, and/or similar research-based tool to inform identification of and prioritization of potential goals.

Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)	Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (5)	Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (10)	Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (15)
	Outcomes Focus (5) No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and: The Board has adopted, in collaboration with the Superintendent, guardrails based on the community's values and that do not hinder pursuit of the goals. Each guardrail describes a single operational action or class of actions the Superintendent may not use or allow in pursuit of the goals.	Outcomes Focus (10) All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and: The Superintendent has provided interim guardrail ending points for each year leading up to the ending date. All interim guardrails pertain to outputs or outcomes, not inputs. The Board included students, parents, staff, and community	-
	than one and no more than five guardrails. Fewer guardrails allow for more focus; more allow for less. The Superintendent has adopted, in collaboration with the Board, one to three interim guardrails for each guardrail, and each interim guardrail is SMART.	members in the guardrail development process. The Board has considered adoption of one or more theories of action to drive the school system's overall strategic direction. If there is a permanent Superintendent, that person was included in the theory consideration process.	Superintendent (and the Superintendent's team). Predictive suggests that there is some evidence of a correlation between the interim guardrail and the guardrail. Influenceable suggests that the Superintendent and through them, the staff has authority over roughly 80% of whatever the interim guardrail is measuring.
	is able to be updated multiple times during each school year. The Board publicly posted the guardrails and interim guardrails for public comment prior to adoption.	All Board guardrails last from three to five years; all interim guardrails last from one to three years. The guardrails, interim guardrails, and theories of action will challenge the organization and require change in adult behaviors.	In addition to the guardrails on the Superintendent's authority, the Board has adopted one to five guardrails on its own behavior and evaluates itself against them at least quarterly.

Not StudentApproaching StudOutcomes Focused (0)Outcomes Focus		Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (20)	Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (30)
The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:	No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and:		All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:
The Board has not adopted goals or guardrails. The Board does not schedule each goal to be monitored at least four	The Board invests no less than 10% of its total Board-authorized public meeting minutes monitoring its goals and interim goals.	25% of its total Board-authorized public meeting minutes monitoring	The Board invests no less than 50% of its total Board-authorized public meeting minutes each month into monitoring its goals.
times per year. The Board does not schedule each guardrail to be monitored at least	The Superintendent led the interim goals/guardrails and monitoring calendar development processes while working collaboratively with the Board.	monitored per month. Every goal is monitored at least four times per year.	Only Board work was discussed and/or acted on during Board-authorized public meetings. The Board modifies its goals,
The Board has not adopted a monitoring calendar .	The Board has a Board-adopted monitoring calendar.	Every guardrail is monitored at least once per year.	of the Board's adopted goals (unless they are met sooner). A
The Board does not track its use of time in Board-authorized public meetings .	The Board's monitoring calendar spans the length of the Board's goals. A longer span allows for more focus; shorter allows for less.	copies of but, unless required by law, did not vote to approve /	longer period allows for more focus; shorter allows for less. The school system has achieved at
The Board has not consistently demonstrated the ability to distinguish between customer	The Board has received monitoring reports in accordance	plan(s) for implementing the Board's goals and worked to ensure that the plan included both an	least half of its interim goals during the previous twelve month period.
service/issues and owner service/issues.	with its monitoring calendar. The Superintendent is evaluated	implementation instruments.	If the Board approves an annual budget, it does so only after determining that the Board's goals
The school system has not achieved any of its interim goals during the previous twelve month period.	only on performance regarding the Board's goals, guardrails, and interim goals/guardrails. The Board considers Superintendent performance to be indistinguishable from school system performance.		are the first priority for resource allocation.

COMMUNICATION & COLLABORATION: The Board will lead transparently and include stakeholders in the pursuit of the goals.

Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)	Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (1)	Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (5)	Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (10)
The Board is Not Student Outcomes Focused if any of the following are true:	No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and:	All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and:	All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:
	All consent-eligible items were placed on the consent agenda and	There are no more than four Board-authorized public meetings	There are no more than two Board-authorized public meetings
The Board did not receive the final	all but a few were voted on using a consent agenda.	per month and none lasts more than three hours.	per month and none lasts more than two hours.
the Board-authorized public	The Board tracks its use of time in		The Board schedules no more than
would be considered.	Board-authorized public meetings, categorizing every minute used as one of the following:	five topics for discussion during any one Board-authorized public meeting.	three topics for discussion during any Board-authorized public meeting.
There were more than six	- Goal Setting: reviewing,		
Board-authorized public meetings in	• • • •	The Board limits its adoption of	The Board has adopted few enough
a single month during the previous twelve month period (Board	- Goal Monitoring: reviewing, discussing, and/or approving/not	Board policies regarding school system operations to matters that	policies that the full Board as a whole is able to review every policy
	approving goal monitoring reports	are 1) required by law or 2) an	at least once during every length of
total).	- Guardrail Setting: reviewing,	· · · ·	time equal to a Board Member's
,	discussing, and/or selecting	oversight authority as defined by	term of office.
Any meeting of the Board lasted	guardrails	the Board's adopted goals and/or	
more than eight hours during the	- Guardrail Monitoring: reviewing,	guardrails. Existing policies that do	The Board received the final
	discussing, and/or approving/not	not meet one of these criteria have	version of materials to be voted on
	approving guardrail monitoring	been removed from the Board's	at least seven calendar days before
	reports	policy manual (though the	the Board-authorized public
agenda.	- Leadership Evaluation: Board self eval, Board time use eval, and	Superintendent may retain them as administrative policy/regulation).	meeting during which the materials would be considered.
The Board has not hosted	Superintendent eval		
opportunities to listen to the vision	- Voting: debating and voting on	The Board made no edits to the	The Board used a process that
	any item (these activities are never	Board's regularly scheduled	included students, parents, staff,
	a form of goal/guardrail monitoring)		and community members in a way
	- Community Engagement:		that led them to express ownership
	two-way communication between	before the meeting unless a state of	of the adopted goals and guardrails.
	the Board and community members - Other	emergency was declared.	

Not Student	Approaching Student	Meeting Student	Mastering Student	
Outcomes Focused (0)	Outcomes Focus (1)	Outcomes Focus (3)	Outcomes Focus (5)	
The Board is Not Student Outcomes		All items from the Approaching Student	All items from the Meeting Student	
Focused if any of the following are true:		Outcomes Focus column, and:	Outcomes Focus column, and:	
	Outcomes Focused column, and: Attendance at all regularly scheduled Board meetings was over 80% during the previous three month period. The Board has adopted a policy or procedure requiring that information provided by the Superintendent to one Board Member is provided to all Board Members. The Board reviews all policies governing Board operating procedures at least once during every length of time equal to a Board Member's term of office. The Board has adopted an Ethics &	Outcomes Focus column, and: The Board has included language in its Ethics & Conflicts of Interest Statement requiring that Board Members do not give operational advice or instructions to staff members. The Board has included language in its Ethics & Conflicts of Interest Statement requiring that Board Members are responsible for the outcomes of all students, not just students in their region of the school system. The Board has included language in its Ethics & Conflicts of Interest Statement requiring that Board	Outcomes Focus column, and: The Board unanimously agreed during the most recent quarterly self-evaluation that all Board Members adhered to all policies governing Board operating procedures during the previous three month period. All Board Members and the Superintendent agreed during the most recent quarterly self-evaluation that none of the Board Members have given operational advice or instructions to staff members. All Board Members have memorized all of the Board's goals	
	all Board Members have signed the statement during their current term of office. All Board Members agree that if the Board has committees, their role is only to advise the Board, not to advise the staff.		and the current status of each. The Board conducted a quarterly self-evaluation during the previous three month period and unanimously voted to adopt the results.	

. . . .

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT: The Board will invest time and resources toward improving	its focus on the goals.

Not Student Annualships Officient		Marstin n Otalat	
Not Student Outcomes Focused (0)	Approaching Student Outcomes Focus (1)	Meeting Student Outcomes Focus (3)	Mastering Student Outcomes Focus (5)
,	. ,	. ,	
	No items from the Not Student Outcomes Focused column, and:	All items from the Approaching Student Outcomes Focus column, and:	All items from the Meeting Student Outcomes Focus column, and:
rocused in any of the following are true.			outcomes rocus column, and.
	The Board tracks its use of time	The most recent Board annual	The Board included students as
	and reports monthly the percentage	•	presenters in at least one of the
	of Board-authorized public meeting	than 45 days before the most	Student Outcomes Focused
•	time invested in monitoring the	recent Superintendent evaluation.	Governance training sessions
twelve month period.	Board's goals and interim goals.		during the previous twelve months.
		The Board has hosted and the	
	The Board tracks the average		Prior to being selected, all newly
0 1	annual cost of staff time invested in	at least one training session on Student Outcomes Focused	selected Board Members received
•	governance during its annual self-evaluation. This includes the	Governance during the previous	training on Student Outcomes Focused Governance from fellow
•	time of any staff members invested	twelve month period.	Board Members on their Board or
	in preparing for, attending, and		from a certified Student Outcomes
	debriefing after meetings. This	The Board has continuously	Focused Governance Coach.
•	includes all Board-authorized public	updated the status and targets of all	
	meetings as well as all closed	goals, guardrails, and interim	The Board conducted the most
during the previous twelve month	sessions and all hearings.	goals/guardrails, and publicly	recent quarterly self-evaluation and
period.	-	displays them in the room in which	unanimously voted to adopt the
	The Board has provided time during		results.
	regularly scheduled	regularly scheduled Board	
	Board-authorized public meetings	meetings.	
	to recognize the accomplishments		
	of its students and staff regarding	The Board conducted the most	
	progress toward goals and interim	recent quarterly self-evaluation and	
	goals.	voted to adopt the results.	
	The most recent Board		
	self-evaluation took place no more		
	than 12 months ago using this		
	instrument or a research-aligned		
	instrument.		

DEFINITIONS

Adult Outcomes: A measure of school system results that are not student results; outcomes that are not student outcomes. [see Outcomes, Student Outcomes definitions]

Adult Outputs: The adult experiences resulting from a particular set of inputs that are usually knowable in the midst of a cycle and that are a measure of the adults' role in the implementation of the program or strategy. Outputs that are not student outputs. [see Outputs, Student Outputs definitions]

Annual Targets: Goal/interim goal ending points for each year leading up to the ending dates.

Board-Authorized Public Meeting: Any non-privileged meeting authorized by the Board or Board Chair including, but not limited to, Board workshops, Board hearings, and Board committees. Legally mandated hearings are exempted from this definition. Trainings led by a certified Student Outcomes Focused Governance Coach may be exempted from this definition. [see Board Work definition]

Board Work: Items that are discussed and/or acted on during Board-authorized public meetings because either state or federal law/rule requires the Board to do so or because the items directly pertain to the Board's adopted goals or guardrails. Items that are not legally required and that the Board has not designated as Board work through the Board's goals or guardrails are, by default, Superintendent work. [see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Superintendent Work definitions]

Community Engagement: Time invested by the Board in two-way communication between the Board and community members.

Consent-Eligible Items: Matters on the Board agenda that include, but that are not limited to, personnel actions, contract renewals, previous meeting minutes, policy updates, construction amendments, non-monitoring administrative reports, committee reports, enrollment updates, and regular financial reports where financial activities remained within budgetary parameters. [see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Board Work definitions]

Customers: The organization's recipients of services and/or transactional beneficiaries -- such as students and staff -- for whom the staff is better positioned to address and/or resolve issues in a timely and effective manner. In a school system, customers and owners can be the same people, and therefore care must be taken to distinguish customer issues from owner issues. [see Owner definition]

Ending Date: The month/year by when the goal will reach the ending point. In goal setting, the ending date can be no less than one and no more than five years away. The ending date is often represented by the 'Z' in sample goals: "the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z." [see Ending Point, Goal Setting, SMART definitions]

Ending Point: The goal's desired number/percentage at the time of the ending date. The ending point is often represented by the 'Y' in sample goals: "the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z." [see Ending Date, Goal Setting, SMART definitions]

Goals: Policy statements that are SMART, that are student outcomes focused, and that describe the Board's top priorities during the timeline for which they are adopted. The first priority for resource allocation in the school system should be toward achieving the Board's goals. Once those allocations are complete, remaining resources may be allocated in a manner that addresses the additional needs and obligations of the school system. Goals generally are set for a three to five year period.Goals generally take the form of "student outcome will increase from X to Y by Z." [see Goal Examples section; see SMART, Student Outcome definitions]

Goal Monitoring: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing and/or accepting/not accepting goal monitoring reports. No fewer than 50% of the minutes spent in Board-authorized public meetings should be invested in goal monitoring or goal setting. Debating and voting on Board items is never a form of goal monitoring. [see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Goal, Goal Setting, Interim Goal, Monitoring definitions]

Goal Setting: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting goals. No fewer than 50% of the minutes spent in Board-authorized public meetings should be invested in goal monitoring or goal setting. [see Board-authorized Public Meeting, Goal, Goal Monitoring, Interim Goal, Monitoring definitions]

Governance Team: All Board Members and the Superintendent. The Superintendent is not a member of the Board, but is a member of the governing team.

Guardrail: An operational action or class of actions, usually strategic not tactical, the Superintendent may not use or allow in pursuit of the school system's student outcome goals. Guardrails are based on the community's values and should not undermine the school system's ability to meet the goals — though guardrails will often require the Superintendent to accomplish the goals in a different way. [see Examples section; see Guardrail Monitoring, Guardrail Setting, Interim Guardrail, Theory of Action definitions]

Guardrail Monitoring: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing and/or accepting/not accepting guardrail monitoring reports. [see Guardrail, Interim Guardrail, Monitoring definitions]

Guardrail Setting: Time invested by the Board in reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting guardrails. [see Guardrail, Interim Guardrail, Theory of Action definitions]

Implementation Instruments: Measures that describe the quality of effort that goes into execution of inputs or outputs. This document is an example of an implementation instrument for the governing team's outputs.

Inputs: Resources and activities invested in a particular program or strategy that are usually knowable at the beginning of a cycle and that are a measure of effort applied. [see Outcomes, Outputs definitions]

Interim Goals: A measure of progress toward a defined goal that can be expressed as a number or percentage. [see Goal Examples section]

Interim Guardrail: A measure of progress toward a defined guardrail that can be expressed as a number or percentage. [see Guardrail Examples section]

Leadership Evaluation: The Board conducting routine self-evaluations and Superintendent evaluations. It is recommended to include months during which leadership evaluation will take place on the monitoring calendar.

Measure: The instrument, assessment, or other means used to quantify something. In the context of goals, this is often an evaluation of student performance such a school system or state exam. [see Goal Setting, SMART definition]

Monitoring: A Board process that includes the Board receiving monitoring reports on the timeline indicated by the monitoring calendar, discussing them, and choosing to accept or not accept them. The intention of monitoring is to determine whether reality matches the Board's goals / guardrails.

Monitoring Calendar: A Board-adopted multi-year schedule that describes months during which goals, interim goals, guardrails, and interim guardrails are reported to the Board.

Monitoring Report: A report that provides evidence of progress to the Board regarding their adopted goals and guardrails. Each monitoring report must contain 1) the goal/guardrail being monitored, 2) the interim goals/guardrails showing the previous three reporting periods, the current reporting period, and the annual and ending point numbers/percentages, 3) the Superintendent's evaluation of performance ("red/yellow/green" or "on track/partially off/off track" or "compliant/partially compliant/non-compliant" or whatever other status labels the school system uses for progress monitoring), and 4) supporting documentation that shows the evidence and describes any needed next steps.

Outcomes: The impact of the program or strategy that is usually knowable at the end of a cycle and that is a measure of the effect on the intended beneficiary. [see Adult Outcomes, Inputs, Outputs, Student Outcomes definitions]

Outputs: The result of a particular set of inputs that is usually knowable in the midst of a cycle and that is a measure of the implementation of the program or strategy. [see Inputs, Outcomes definitions]

Owners: The organization's moral and legal authority -- such as residents and taxpayers -- for whom the board is better positioned to address and/or resolve issues in a timely and effective manner. In a school system, owners and customers can be the same people, and therefore care must be taken to distinguish customer issues from owner issues. [see Customers definition]

Population: The group of students who will be impacted and/or who are being measured. [see Goal Setting, SMART definition]

SMART: An acronym for "specific, measurable, attainable, results-focused, time-bound." Goals and interim goals partially accomplish SMART-ness by having a specific measure, population, starting points, ending points, starting dates, and ending dates. [see Ending Date, Ending Point, Measure, Population, Starting Date, Starting Point definitions]

Starting Date: The month/year that the goal is set. The starting date is often represented by the 'X' in sample goals: "the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z." [see Goal Setting, SMART, Starting Point definitions]

Starting Point: The goal's current number/percentage at the time of adoption. The starting point is often represented by the 'W' in sample goals: "the measure will move from W% on X to Y% by Z." [see Goal Setting, SMART, Starting Date definitions]

Student Outcomes: A measure of school system results that are student results rather than adult results; outcomes that are a measure of what students know or are able to do. Student outcomes are distinct from adult outcomes. [see Adult Outcomes, Goals, Outcomes definitions]

Student Outputs: The student experiences resulting from a particular set of inputs that are usually knowable in the midst of a cycle and that are a measure of the students' role in the implementation of the program or strategy. Student outputs are distinct from adult outputs. [see Adult Outputs, Outputs definition]

Superintendent Work: Items that are not legally required and that the Board has not designated as Board work through the Board's goals or guardrails. [see Board Work definition]

Theory of Action: A set of high level strategies to which all school system inputs and outputs must be aligned. Unlike other guardrails, theories of action do not have interim guardrails. [see Examples section; see Guardrail definition]

Values: The shared understanding of what the community considers important but that is not the vision. Where the vision describes what the community wants to see happen, values describe what the community does not want to see happen. Values describe protections the community wants to see put into place. It is not appropriate for the Board to allow the community's values to be violated, even if doing so would support the accomplishment of the vision. The values are most often expressed as a guardrail or a theory of action. Guardrails generally are set for a three to five year period; theories of action generally are set for a five to ten year period.

Vision: The shared understanding of what the community ultimately desires to accomplish for all students. Where values describe what the community does not want to see, vision describes what the community does want to see happen. Vision describes the direction the community wants to see the school system go. A vision is most often expressed as an aspirational policy statement that describes what the Board understands the community's desire for the future to be. Vision statements generally are set for a five to ten year period.

Voting: Time invested by the Board in debating and voting on any item. Unless indicated elsewhere in this document, these activities are never a form of goal monitoring or guardrail monitoring.

GOAL EXAMPLES

Sample Goals:

- Many of these examples are drawn from current or proposed goals from CGCS member school systems (or adaptations of their policy that meet the goal definition).
- The percentage of kindergarten students who will enter kindergarten school-ready on a multidimensional assessment will increase from W% on X date to Y% by Z date
- The percentage of graduates who are persisting in the second year of their post-secondary program will increase from W% on X to Y% by Z
- The percentage of free and reduced lunch-eligible students in kindergarten through 2nd grade who are reading/writing on or above grade level on the school system's summative assessment will increase from W% on X to Y% by Z
- The percentage of students at underperforming schools who meet or exceed the state standard will increase from W% on X to Y% by Z
- The percentage of males of color who graduate with an associate's degree will increase from W% on X to Y% by Z

Sample Interim Goals:

- Many of these examples are drawn from CGCS' "Academic KPIs" work.
- The percentage of students successfully passing Algebra I by the end of ninth grade will increase from W% on X to Y% by Z
- The percentage of students showing growth from one formative assessment to the next will increase from W% on X to Y% by Z
- The percentage of students earning at least three IB, AP, or college credits each semester will increase from W% on X to Y% by Z

GUARDRAIL EXAMPLES

Sample Guardrails:

- Many of these examples are drawn from current or proposed guardrails from CGCS member school systems (or adaptations of their policy that meet the guardrail definition).
- The Superintendent will not allow underperforming campuses to have principals or teachers who rank in the bottom two quartiles of principal or teacher school system-wide performance
- The Superintendent will not propose major decisions to the Board without first having engaged students, parents, community, and staff
- The Superintendent will not operate without a system that uses student growth data to identify, retain, and place highly effective staff
- The Superintendent will not allow the inequitable treatment of students

Sample Interim Guardrails:

- Many of these examples are drawn from CGCS' "Managing for Results" work.
- The percentage of People Incidents per 1,000 Students at underperforming schools will decline from W% on X to Y% by Z

• The Employee Separation Rate for principals and teachers in the top quartile of school system-wide performance will decline from W% on X to Y% by Z

THEORY OF ACTION EXAMPLES

Sample Theories of Action:

• Some of these examples are drawn from current or proposed Theories of Action from CGCS member school systems (or adaptations of their policy that meet the Theories of Action definition).

• Managed Instruction:

- If instructional materials and methods are directed by the central office to ensure that students experience consistency and quality of instructional delivery across a system of campuses;
- Then central office will be responsible for accomplishing the Board's goals while operating within the Board's other guardrails.

• Earned Autonomy:

- If the central office directly operates some schools and grants varying levels of autonomy to other schools; and
- If the central office clearly defines operational thresholds that deserve higher levels of autonomy, and the specific autonomies earned, consistent with Board goals and guardrails;
- Then responsibility for accomplishing the Board's goals while operating within the Board's guardrails will vary between central office and school leaders based on school-level operational capacity and student outcomes.

• Performance Empowerment:

- o If the central office devolves autonomy to schools; and
- If the central office empowers parents to make choices among schools operated by differing partners; and
- If the central office creates performance contracts with schools, annually evaluates performance of and demand for schools, and makes strategic decisions regarding growing access to high performing schools and addressing low performers;
- Then school performance contracts will require the school to accomplish the Board's goals while operating within the Board's other guardrails.

SOURCES

Primary Sources

Effective Governance Survey, Council of the Great City Schools (2015)

Roles and Responsibilities of Local School Board Members in Relation to Student Achievement, Mary Delagardelle (2006):

https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2504&context=rtd

The Impact of School Board Governance on Academic Achievement in Diverse States, Michael Ford (2013): http://dc.uwm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1334&context=etd The Relationship Between School Board Governance Behaviors and Student Achievement, Ivan J. Lorentzen (2013): http://scholarworks.umt.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2406&context=etd The Governance Factor: A Predictive Study of School Board Influence on Student Achievement in Texas Public Schools, Marc Puig (2014): http://umhblibrary.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/p16668coll9/id/1197 School Board Governance and Student Achievement: School Board Members' Perceptions of Their Behaviors and Beliefs, Bobbie Plough (2014): https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1028871.pdf School Board Governance: The Times They are A-Changin', Paul Johnson (2011): https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1555458911413887 Factors That Influence School Board Actions to Support Student Achievement: A Multi-Case Study of High-Achieving Rural School Districts, Colleen Timm (2012): https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED549096 School Boards and Student Achievement: The Relationship between Previously Identified School Board Characteristics and Improved Student Learning, Jonathon Holmen (2016): https://digitalcommons.spu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?&article=1013&context=soe etd Do School Board Governance Best Practices Improve District Performance? Testing the Key Work of School Boards in Wisconsin, Michael Ford & Douglas Ihrke (2015): https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2014.982293 Pennsylvania Public School Board Effectiveness: Does It Influence Student Performance?, Aiko Maurer: https://knowledge.library.iup.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2365&context=etd A Comparison of Missouri School Board Best Practices Based on School District Size, Level of Success, and Geographic Region, Brian Sims (2012): https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10355/33107/research.pdf School District Leadership That Works, J. Timothy Waters & Robert Marzano (2006): https://www.mcrel.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/McREL-research-paper -Sept2006 District-Leadership-That-Works-Effect-of-Superintenden t-Leadership-on-Student-Achievement-.pdf Exploring the Association between Board and Organizational Performance in Nonprofit Organizations, William Brown (2005): https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/nml.71 Lone Star Governance, Texas Education Agency (2016): http://tea.texas.gov/lsg/

Secondary Sources

Eight Characteristics of Effective School Boards, National School Board Association (2011): http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Public-education/Eight-characteristics-of-effective-school-boards

The Lighthouse Inquiry: School Board/Superintendent Team Behaviors in School Districts with Extreme Differences in Student Achievement, Iowa Association of School Boards (2000):

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/234770383_The_Lighthouse_Inquiry_School_BoardSuperintendent_Team_Behaviors_in_School_Dist ricts_with_Extreme_Differences_in_Student_Achievement

The Role of School Boards in Improving Student Achievement, Washington State School Directors' Association: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED521566.pdf

The School Board Role in Creating the Conditions for Student Achievement, California School Boards Association: https://www.csba.org/GovernanceAndPolicyResources/~/media/CSBA/Files/GovernanceResources/Reports/201705BoardResearchReport.ashx

Policy Governance Consistency Framework, International Policy Governance Association: https://www.policygovernanceassociation.org/assets/documents/principles-and-model-consistency-framework-2014.pdf

School Board Quality Balanced Governance Report, Thomas Alsbury: https://aasb.org/wp-content/uploads/ACADEMY_HO-10-Balanced-Governance-External-Eval-Sample-2015.pdf

Building A Board That Works, U.S. Department of State: https://www.state.gov/m/a/os/41119.htm

Does School Board Leadership Matter?, Arnold F. Shober & Michael T. Hartney: https://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/Does-School-Board-Leadership-Matter-FINAL.pdf

Related Books

What School Boards Can Do, Donald R. McAdams: https://www.amazon.com/dp/0807746487/

The 4 Disciplines of Execution, Chris McChesney, Sean Covey, & Jim Huling: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B005FLODJ8/

The Future of School Board Governance, Thomas L. Alsbury: https://www.amazon.com/dp/1578867959/

Boards That Make A Difference, John Carver: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B008L01JWO/

Student Outcomes Focused Governance - Copyright © 2014-2021 Council of the Great City Schools & Airick Journey Crabill. All rights reserved.

Good To Great, Jim Collins	https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0058DRUV6/
----------------------------	---------------------------------------

The Fifth Discipline, Peter M. Senge: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B000SEIFKK/

Influencer, Joseph Grenny, Kerry Patterson, et al: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B00BPO7710/

The Three Laws of Performance, Steve Zaffron and Dave Logan: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B005QPDNTY/

Leadership and Self-Deception, The Arbinger Institute: https://www.amazon.com/dp/1523097809/

Crucial Conversations, Kerry Patterson, Joseph Grenny, Ron McMillan, & Al Switzler: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B005K0AYH4/

Leading Change, John P. Kotter: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B00A07FPEO/

Immunity To Change, Robert Kegan & Lisa Lahey: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B004OEILH2/

Who Killed Change, Pat Zigarmi & Ken Blanchard: https://www.amazon.com/dp/B002AR2Q1W/

Standardized Testing Primer, Richard P. Phelps: https://www.amazon.com/dp/082049741X/

BOARD QUARTE	BOARD QUARTERLY SELF-EVALUATION						
Current Date	1	1		Votes For/Against		1	
	_						
	January -March	April -June	July -September	October -December	January -March	Total Possible	
Vision & Goals						35	
Values & Guardrails						15	
Monitoring & Accountability						30	
Communication & Collaboration						10	
Unity & Trust						5	

	nuous ovement						5						
Total							100						
Direc		ar five pote of eveluation		ous quarters most re		tor and the next au	rtor optimato						
		er five sets of evaluation results for	-	-									
2.		If-evaluation results fo	-				ity ballaary them						
3.		e quarterly self-evalua	-		er and vote to adopt t	he results. (Continuin	g the example,						
	conduct the	quarterly self-evaluati	on for Oct-Dec.)										
4.	-	ne quarterly self-evalua				· ·							
	· · ·	the example, compare		esults for Oct-Dec wit	th the estimated Oct-I	Dec self-evaluation re	sults that were						
5		ing the Jul-Sep self-ev		nla antor the colf over	luction results for Oc	t Dee)							
5. 6.		elf-evaluation results. (e self-evaluation resul		•		,	the self-evaluation						
0.	results for Ja			leve during the next q	laanten. (oontinding tii	c champic, countaic							
		,	n results for the next	guarter. (Continuing t	he example, enter the	e estimated self-evalu	7. Enter the estimated self-evaluation results for the next quarter. (Continuing the example, enter the estimated self-evaluation results for						
7.				(
7.	Jan-Mar.)												

BOARD MONTH	LY TIME USE EVALUA	TION			
Framework	Activity	Mins Used	% of Total Mins Used	Description	Notes
Vision	Goal Setting			Reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting goals	
& Goals	Goal Monitoring			Reviewing, discussing, and/or approving/not approving goal monitoring reports in accordance with the monitoring calendar	
Values	Guardrail Setting			Reviewing, discussing, and/or selecting guardrails	
& Guardrails	Guardrail Monitoring			Reviewing, discussing, and/or approving/not approving guardrail monitoring reports in accordance with the monitoring calendar	
Monitoring & Accountability	Superintendent Evaluation			Annual evaluation of Superintendent/school system performance	
	Voting			The Board debating and/or voting on any item (voting on goal/guardrail adoption and/or scheduled monitoring reports & evals are counted elsewhere, not here; all other incidents	

Student Outcomes Focused Governance - Copyright © 2014-2021 Council of the Great City Schools & Airick Journey Crabill. All rights reserved.

			of debating/voting are never a form of goals/guardrails "monitoring")	
Communication & Collaboration	Community Engagement		Two-way communication opportunity where Board Members listen for and discuss the vision/values of their staff and community members	
	Student / Family Engagement		Two-way communication opportunity where Board Members listen for and discuss the vision/values of their students and family members	
Continuous Improvement	Board Self Evaluation		Quarterly and/or annual Board self-evaluation using the Student Outcomes Focused Governance instrument	
	Board Time Use Evaluation		Meeting evaluation using this time use instrument	
	Board Training		Training for the Board on Student Outcomes Focused Governance and related topics	
	Board-led Community Training		Board-hosted and Board Member-led or co-led training on Student Outcomes Focused Governance and related topics	
Other	Closed Session	NA	Time spent in non-public meetings, consistent with open meetings laws; this time is not calculated	
	Other		Any time spent on an activity that is not one of the above	
Total Student Ou	tcomes-focused Mins		Goal Setting & Goal Monitoring combined	
Total Public Mee	ting Minutes		All minutes in Board-authorized public meetings combined	

BOARD CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT EVALUATION

	Quarter 0			
The first time a Board uses the Board Quarterly Self-Evaluation; the Board's 'starting point' for their two year continuous improvement process.				

	Last Qua	rter Total			Current Qu	arter Total		Grov	vth From Last	to Current Qu	arter
Board's 2n	Quarter 1 d Quarterly Self	f-Evaluation	Board's 3rd	Quarter 2 I Quarterly Self	-Evaluation	Board's 4th	Quarter 3	-Evaluation	Board's 5th	Quarter 4	-Evaluation
Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter	Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter	Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter	Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter
	Total at least 30?	Growth at least 25?		Total at least 45?	Growth at least 15?		Total at least 60?	Growth at least 15?		Total at least 70?	Growth at least 15?
the Board met continuous imp	provement goal	Met Meet	the Board met continuous imp	provement goal		the Board met continuous imp	provement goal		the Board met continuous imp	provement goal	Met Meet
Board's 6th	Quarter 5 h Quarterly Self	-Evaluation	Board's 7th	Quarter 6 Quarterly Self	-Evaluation	Board's 8th	Quarter 7	-Evaluation	Board's 9th	Quarter 8 Quarterly Self	-Evaluation
Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter	Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter	Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter	Last Quarter Total	Current Quarter Total	Growth From Last to Current Quarter
	Total at least 75?	Growth at least 5?		Total at least 80?	Growth at least 5?		Total at least 85?	Growth at least 5?		Total at least 90?	Growth at least 5?
If either question the Board met continuous imp		Did Not Met Meet	If either questic the Board met continuous imp	its quarterly	Met Meet	If either question the Board met continuous imp		Met Meet	If either question the Board met continuous imp		Did No Met Meet

SUPERINTENDENT ANNUAL EVALUATION

A Goal or Guardrail's performance is **Met Standard** if:

- The Actual SY17/18 Ending Point >= Desired SY17/18 Ending Point OR
- At least two thirds of the Interim Goals'/Guardrails' Actual SY17/18 Ending Points >= their respective Desired SY17/18 Ending Points

Otherwise the Board must consider growth and performance and vote to determine whether or not a Goal or Guardrail's performance **Met Standard** or **Did Not Meet Standard**.

Overall School System/Superintendent performance is Met Standard if:

• At least two thirds of the Goals are Met Standard

AND

• At least half of the Guardrails are Met Standard

Otherwise the Board must consider growth and performance and vote to determine whether or not overall school system/Superintendent performance **Met Standard** or **Did Not Meet Standard**.

Goal 1: Percentage	Goal 1: Percentage of schools meeting passing standard on the state assessment in reading and math will increase from 60% to 68% by 2022			
Baseline Ending Point:		Desired SY17/18 Ending Poi	nt:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:
Interim Goal 1.1:			Management Comments	
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
Interim Goal 1.2:				
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
Interim Goal 1.3:				
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
SY17/18 Evaluation				
	Met Standard:		Did Not Meet Standard	

Goal 2: Percentage of schools meeting passing standard on the state assessment in reading and math will increase from 60% to 68% by 2022				
Baseline Ending Point: Desired SY17/18 Ending Poir			nt:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:
Interim Goal 2.1:			Management Comments	
Baseline Ending Point:Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:				
Interim Goal 2.2:				

Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:	
Interim Goal 2.3:			
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:	
SY17/18 Evaluation			
	Met Standard: 🛛		Did Not Meet Standard:

Goal 3: Percentage of schools meeting passing standard on the state assessment in reading and math will increase from 60% to 68% by 2022				
Baseline Ending Point: Desired SY17/18 Ending Poi		nt:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:	
Interim Goal 3.1:			Management Comments	
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
Interim Goal 3.2:				
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
Interim Goal 3.3:				
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
SY17/18 Evaluation				
	Met	Standard:	Did Not Meet Standard	

Guardrail 1: Superintendent will not allow the percentage or number of students in low performing schools to increase or remain the same				
Interim Guardrail 1.1:			Management Comments	
Baseline Ending Point:				
Interim Guardrail 1.2:				

Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:	
Interim Guardrail 1.3:			
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:	
SY17/18 Evaluation			
	Met Standard: 🛛		Did Not Meet Standard:

Guardrail 2: Superintendent will not allow the percentage or number of students in low performing schools to increase or remain the same				
Interim Guardrail 2.1:			Management Comments	
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
Interim Guardrail 2.2:				
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
Interim Guardrail 2.3:				
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:		
SY17/18 Evaluation				
	Met Standard:		Did Not Meet Standard:	

Guardrail 3: Super	Guardrail 3: Superintendent will not allow the percentage or number of students in low performing schools to increase or remain the same					
Interim Guardrail 3.1:			Management Comments			
Baseline Ending Point:						
Interim Guardrail 3.2:						

Student Outcomes Focused Governance - Copyright © 2014-2021 Council of the Great City Schools & Airick Journey Crabill. All rights reserved.

Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:	
Interim Guardrail 3.3:			
Baseline Ending Point:	Desired SY17/18 Ending Point:	Actual SY17/18 Ending Point:	
SY17/18 Evaluation			
	Met Standard:		Did Not Meet Standard:

NOTES

<u> </u>

	_
