Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.1 *The governing body, representing the diversity of stakeholders, functions according to its approved constitution and bylaws.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 5.1 addresses two aspects of governance: namely, membership diversity and adherence to constitution and bylaws or other governing documents. First, this benchmark challenges administrators to recruit and select board members keeping in mind gender, cultural and ethnic diversity, and needed skillsets. Second, the benchmark raises the importance of the board's governing document (usually called a constitution and bylaws) that specifies how the board is structured, the rights of members, and the procedures by which rights can be exercised.

Outstanding boards are populated by diverse membership, focused on their appropriate role, engaged in their assigned committee work, and committed to respond to the needs of the school. A productive board establishes committees according to the bylaws and is made up of members with the needed skills who can set goals and expectations in their committee area to significantly benefit the school the board serves.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

The following are guiding questions for school leaders and the governing body to ask to ascertain if this benchmark is being implemented:

- Is there a roster listing membership on the governing body that includes areas of expertise, gender, race/ethnic background, geographical location, community connections, service on board committees, and number of years on the board (Terms of Office)?

- Is there a matrix used by the Nominating Committee to determine whom to recruit for board membership based on the needed diversity?

- Does the Nominating Form ask for information to ensure the needed diversity keeping in mind gender, cultural and ethnic diversity, and required skillsets?

Benchmark 5.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.1 *The governing body, representing the diversity of stakeholders, functions according to its approved constitution and bylaws.*

- Does each member's packet or binder include a current copy of the constitution/bylaws including the date of implementation and references to updates?

- Is there a board meeting agenda showing the annual review of the constitution/bylaws?

- Does the agenda for the orientation meeting with new members include time to present the constitution/bylaws?

- Is there a copy of the annual board self-assessment which is conducted at the conclusion of the school year with attention to bylaws compliance?

- Is the constitution/bylaws in a highly visible and easily accessible place on the school's website that is organized with other school board material?

- Are minutes of meetings and records of decisions in keeping with constitution/ bylaws filed in a safe and convenient place?

- Are non-confidential versions of the minutes (or a summary) available to the public or school stakeholders?

- Are parent newsletters available that show board members' attendance at parent meetings, board updates at meetings, etc. in order for stakeholders to get an understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the board?

> **III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?**

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark,**

the governing body membership represents the gender, cultural and ethnic diversity of the school community and the needed skillsets to carry on the work of the board for the good of the school. This diversity, coupled with the board's adherence to its governing document, results in a board that contributes greatly to the success of the school and its vitality, as evidenced by their impact on the quality of the school's performance and operational viability.

Benchmark 5.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.1 *The governing body, representing the diversity of stakeholders, functions according to its approved constitution and bylaws.*

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

> the administrators, in collaboration with the Nominating Committee/ Governance Committee, work year-round to identify and recruit prospective members that ensure the targeted representation of gender, cultural and ethnic diversity, and skillsets needed to carry on board work in order to sustain a vibrant school into the future. This is evidenced by the Nomination Committee/Governance Committee's reports to the full board. Furthermore, the committee is charged with creating succession plans for each board position to ensure continued diversity. This is evidenced by the documented succession plan and board's faithful adherence to it.

> At level 4, the administrators and board ensure that the governing document is kept updated and relevant as needed. More importantly, the administrator(s) and board chair continually monitor the board's execution of the framework for effective governance. The governing body has a state of the art constitution and bylaws, and both are posted and shared with the full community. The governing body intentionally monitors itself to ensure consistency of practice as approved by the bylaws.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

> the administrators, in collaboration with the board, attempt to recruit prospective members representing the targeted gender, cultural and ethnic diversity, and needed skillsets with some success but not consistently, as evidenced by the reports from the Nominating/Governance Committee and the current roster. From observable evidence of both attendance at a meeting and board minutes, the governing body appears to function according to its approved constitution and bylaws, but is not held accountable for carrying out its responsibilities as listed in the governing document. In particular, committees are not held accountable to the administrators and board chair for completing their assigned goals or tasks.

> At this level, the administrators and board members have limited knowledge about the content of the governing documents. This is evidenced through conversations with both the administrators and board members.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark,**

> the administrators and governing body have not systematically recruited and selected board members to represent the appropriate gender, cultural and ethnic diversity, and needed skillsets. This is evidenced by board roster and

Benchmark 5.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.1 *The governing body, representing the diversity of stakeholders, functions according to its approved constitution and bylaws.*

attendance at a board meeting. The board does not have a constitution or bylaws, or the current constitution and bylaws are outdated or ignored.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Determine the kind of diversity and skillsets that represent the school community and can address the needs of the school.
- Assess the gender, cultural and ethnic diversity, and skillsets of the current board membership. A matrix is a useful tool to do this.
- Appoint a nominating committee/governance committee of the board to be tasked with this effort. This committee would be responsible for updating the matrix and report to the full board the area/s of diversity that the recruitment process should focus on.
- Form a task force to create a constitution or bylaws if one does not exist. The archdiocese or diocese is a great resource that can provide policies and guidelines for the development of a governing document.
- Establish and act on a plan to provide an in-service training for the entire board and the school's administrator on the implementation of the newly developed constitution and by-laws. A similar in-service for boards with an existing constitution and by-laws will be an opportunity to identify outdated articles or sections. Once revised or updated the administrator and chair move the document for final approval to the appropriate approving agent.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Recruit new members to maximize the gender, cultural, ethnic, and skillset diversity to advance the goals of the board, aligned to the mission and needs of the school
- Understand and commit to the role and responsibilities defined in constitution and bylaws. The board conducts regularly scheduled meetings and organizes its committees to optimize its productivity for the benefit of the school's performance and operational viability.
- Schedule a board planning retreat and short mini in-service trainings to provide the board time to better understand its purpose as well as to identify goals/activities for the coming year.

Benchmark 5.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.1 *The governing body, representing the diversity of stakeholders, functions according to its approved constitution and bylaws.*

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Identify and recruit prospective members that ensure the representation of gender, cultural and ethnic diversity, and needed skillsets on regular schedule to replace termed out board members.
- Create succession plans for each of the board positions to ensure continual diversity.
- Ensure that the governing document is kept updated and relevant as needed.
- Continually monitor and assess the board's implementation of the framework for effective governance.
- Post and share with the school and broader community the board's state of the art constitution and bylaws on an annual schedule.

V. What are some key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the terms listed below.)

Governance
Governing body
Catholic education stakeholders
State of the Art Constitution and bylaws
Framework for effective governance

Benchmark 5.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.2 *The governing body systematizes the policies of the school's operations to ensure fidelity to mission, and continuity and sustainability through leadership successions.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 5.2 is about systematizing and sharing the policies of the school's operations in order to bring all stakeholders to a position of faithfulness to the school's mission. The importance of this task is to ensure that the school's mission, acted upon through policies, is sustainable despite leadership change. Therefore, it is critical to educate and train all stakeholders in the intention and implementation of school policy. This education and training is to be a dynamic process that assists new and existing stakeholders in understanding policy formation and implementation in alignment with the school's mission. Equally critical is the establishment and implementation of accountability measures to ensure ongoing evidence of policy alignment with the program and operations. Accountability is a direct function of the school's leadership in collaboration with the school's governance. Included in the process of systematizing policy is the need for developing leadership succession plans for the governing board, leadership team, and all other leadership positions associated with school operations, such as advisory boards, parent groups, volunteer groups, affiliated clubs, and others. In doing so, the school seeks to ensure the continuity and sustainability of policies and programs aligned with the mission through carefully planned and executed leadership successions.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions for school leaders and the governing body to ask in order to be able to determine the extent to which the systematizing of school policies described above is taking place at the school:

- Is there evidence in meeting minutes that the governing body addresses an ongoing process of policy review as it pertains to connection to mission?

- Is there an orientation program and on-going training of governing body members focusing on the alignment of the school's mission with policy, operations, and programs?

Benchmark 5.2 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.2 *The governing body systematizes the policies of the school's operations to ensure fidelity to mission, and continuity and sustainability through leadership successions.*

- How does communication occur to all stakeholder groups regarding policy formation, implementation, and accountability?

- How are positions posted for professional and non-certified staff?

- Is there a listing of board members specifying terms and history of change in membership according to term limits?

- How does communication occur within the school community regarding leadership change, the leadership succession process, and identification of new leadership?

- Do the school's governing body and leadership work together to oversee the alignment of mission with policy, operations, and programs?

- Does the school have an updated policy manual that includes instructions and processes for implementation?

- Do the school's governing body and leadership have stated measures of accountability for policy implementation?

- Are there reports documenting assessment of policy implementation for the school's operations and programs?

- Are there leadership succession plans for the governing board, leadership team, and all other leadership associated with school operations, such as advisory boards, parent groups, volunteer groups, or affiliated clubs?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

> the governing body and school leadership develop and communicate policies, structures, and procedures to direct the school's operations with fidelity to the mission. *These systems are present, functional, and provided to all stakeholders* to ensure the ability of the school to operate as a vibrant entity. There is evidence of leadership succession planning on all levels of the school's governance, leadership, operations, and program.

Benchmark 5.2 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.2 *The governing body systematizes the policies of the school's operations to ensure fidelity to mission, and continuity and sustainability through leadership successions.*

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark,**

> the governing body and school leadership have put systems in place that ensure the ability of the school to operationalize the school's mission through its policies. *These systems are present, functional, provided to all stakeholders and furnish ongoing training and accountability measures for successful implementation of policies and mission alignment.* Continuity and sustainability of policies and programs is present through successful execution of leadership succession plans for the governing body, school leadership team, all other leadership associated with school operations, other advisory boards, parent groups, volunteer groups, affiliated clubs, and others. The governing body and the leader/leadership team hold themselves and the school accountable for adhering to policies and engage in regular policy review.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

> the governing body and school leadership have put some systems in place that attempt to ensure the ability of the school to operationalize the school's mission through its policies. *Only some of the needed systems are present, functional, and provided to all stakeholders.* There is clear evidence that some policies are not implemented in the school's operations and program. The school's governing body and leadership have started the process for measuring policy implementation and alignment to mission but are still in the formative stages. Leadership succession planning is not a priority.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> the governing body and school leadership have not systematized the policies of the school's operations. As yet, there is no commitment through observable evidence that consistent fidelity to the mission is a priority. There exists a misunderstanding as to the role of the governing body and leadership in relationship to policy and operations. The governing body and leadership appear to be working independently from one another.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.2 *The governing body systematizes the policies of the school's operations to ensure fidelity to mission, and continuity and sustainability through leadership successions.*

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Begin a process of recognizing that fidelity to the school's mission is fundamental to the design and implementation of an instructional program that embraces continuous improvement.
- Begin a review process for existing policies to determine alignment with the school's mission after reaching a point of understanding of fidelity to mission; engaging the stakeholders in this review process is a critical element in achieving mission awareness in the implementation of all policies.
- Begin working on updating and revising existing policies and determining creation of new policies.
- Communicate the process of revision and new policy formation to all stakeholders. This action is critical in taking the steps to ensure fidelity to mission through systematized policies.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Operationalize and systematize all policies in alignment with the school's mission.
- Establish a process for accountability of stakeholders in meeting the implementation goals of policies. Gather and analyze evidence that improvements have been made.
- Establish a process for leadership succession planning for the replacement of the school's leader in order to sustain continuity in implementation of policies.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Establish a process of accountability for successful implementation of policies to be executed with evidence gathered and analyzed by stakeholders, and adjustments made to operations and program.
- Conduct this accountability process on a regular basis.
- Maintain leadership succession over time, following the guidelines of a well-crafted plan, to ensure continuity and sustainability of policies throughout leadership transitions.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.2 *The governing body systematizes the policies of the school's operations to ensure fidelity to mission, and continuity and sustainability through leadership successions.*

> **V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the terms listed below.)**

Governing body
School leadership
Leadership team
Policy
Procedure
Operations policies
Leadership succession
Authority
Accountability
Sustainability
Systematization

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.3 *The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the bishop marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, continuing dialogue, and respect for the bishop's legitimate authority.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 5.3 is about the governing body/the board and the leader/leadership team understanding the clearly articulated norms of governance and administration that the bishop has set under his administration and respecting this authority of the bishop as he or those who report directly to him supervises and administers Catholic education in his diocese or territory. This benchmark underscores to the governing body the bishop's right to establish structures of governance and norms that guide his involvement with schools. Also under the bishop's discretion is when and why he will intervene and direct the affairs of the school when he sees it necessary.

This benchmark is positioned on the belief that a smooth and successful operation of Catholic schools will best result from an explicit understanding of which kinds of governance and administration roles the bishop will have in Catholic schools. Arriving at such an understanding depends on the quality of the relationship between a diocesan bishop and other church officials, school administrators and board members. Benchmark 5.3 reminds the governing body of its responsibility to be knowledgeable of and adhere to diocesan policies and procedures through which the bishop communicates his interventions and involvement. This benchmark calls the administration to keep the board informed of reports, policies, and procedures that the bishop has communicated to them at meetings or through various forms of communications.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

These are some questions which will help to frame this item:

- Can the governing board and the leader or leadership team clearly articulate norms of governance and administration that the bishop has set under his administration?

Benchmark 5.3 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.3 *The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the bishop marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, continuing dialogue, and respect for the bishop's legitimate authority.*

- Can the governing board and the leader or leadership team recount times when they demonstrated their respect for the bishop's authority as he or those who report directly to him, supervised and administered Catholic education in his diocese?

- Can the governing board and the leader or leadership team verbalize the structures of governance and norms that guide the bishop's involvement with regard to schools? Also can they give examples when and why the bishop will intervene and direct the affairs of the school when he sees it necessary?

- Does the governing board and the leader or leadership team know where to find these norms stating the bishop's level of involvement in the schools and under what circumstances will he intervene?

- Can the governing board and the leader or leadership team describe an occurrence when the board worked with or through the actions of the leadership/leadership team to maintain a relationship with the bishop?

- Are there samples of regular communication between the local school board and leader/leadership team and bishop to develop and maintain mutual trust?

- Can the governing board and the leader or leadership team describe the lines of communication between the local school board and leader/leadership team and bishop that are in place in order to be in close cooperation?

- Do the governing board and the leader or leadership team have in their possession documents that spell out the expectations, guidelines, and processes determined by the bishop to maintain a relationship with their local school?

- Can the governing board and the leader or leadership team articulate what the Code of Canon Law says about the bishop's legitimate authority?

Benchmark 5.3 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.3 The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the bishop marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, continuing dialogue, and respect for the bishop's legitimate authority.

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, recognizes, understands and respects the reserved powers of the bishop or those who report directly to him, and can demonstrate how each – in their appropriate roles (board, leadership, bishop) – works to build and maintain a relationship with the bishop marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, continuing dialogue, and respect for the bishop's legitimate authority.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

the school board, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leadership team, on regular and appropriate occasions publically articulates appreciation for the bishop's support of and involvement in the Catholic schools to ensure their academic excellence and commitment to their mission. The governing body and leadership team not only maintain a strong, positive and visible relationship with the bishop in the boardroom, but communicate their relationship to all stakeholders. They invite the bishop to not only celebrate mass but also to be present at significant school events; similarly, they fully support and attend events sponsored by the bishop and offices representing the bishop.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

the governing body is knowledgeable of and adheres to required diocesan policies and procedures through which the bishop communicates his role to execute interventions and his level of involvement in Catholic schools. The relationship is a limited relationship with the bishop and the offices representing the bishop marked by intermittent cooperation, occasional dialogue, and social distancing from the bishop's legitimate authority.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark,**

The governing body is not knowledgeable of and/or does not intentionally adhere to diocesan policies and procedures through which the bishop communicates his role to execute interventions and his level of involvement

Benchmark 5.3 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.3 The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the bishop marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, continuing dialogue, and respect for the bishop's legitimate authority.

in the Catholic schools. They maintain a very weak relationship with the bishop or offices representing the bishop, if any. Relationships are awkward with little cooperation or dialogue, and the bishop's authority is ignored, overlooked or continually challenged.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Become knowledgeable of and commit to adhering to diocesan policies and procedures through which the bishop communicates his role to execute interventions and his level of involvement in Catholic school(s).
- Appreciate the bishop's legitimate authority by demonstrating a commitment to board in-service and subsequent conversations that promote greater understanding of diocesan initiatives and requirements.
- Initiate a relationship with the bishop and the offices representing the bishop marked by cooperation and occasional dialogue around the topic of the bishop's legitimate authority and how it relates to, supports, and enhances the board's role in the governance of the school(s).
- Attend annual diocesan wide board in-services or meetings that provide an opportunity to interact with the bishop or his designate, seeking to develop a relationship that leads to understanding and mutual respect.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Ensure compliance with the diocesan constitution/bylaws. This is an opportunity for the board to contrast its responsibilities with the reserved powers of bishop and/or those who report directly to him.
- Provide reports to the appropriate diocesan office that demonstrate the board's commitment, through its operations and actions, to fulfilling their appropriate roles and responsibilities.
- Demonstrate how the board seeks and maintains a relationship with the bishop that is marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, continuing dialogue, and respect for the bishop's legitimate authority.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.3 *The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the bishop marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, continuing dialogue, and respect for the bishop's legitimate authority.*

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Accept and demonstrate in action that an explicit understanding of the governance model established by the bishop contributes positively to a smooth and successful operation of the school.
- Recognize and appreciate that the bishop's legitimate authority evolves through the quality of the relationship between a diocesan bishop and other church officials, school administrators and board members.
- Maintain a strong, positive and visible relationship with the bishop, communicating this relationship to all stakeholders of the school.
- Invite the bishop to not only celebrate mass but also to be present at significant school occasions.
- Support and attend the events sponsored by the bishop and offices representing the bishop.

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the terms listed below.)

Governing body
Appropriate and legitimate authority
Authoritative
Consultative
Advisory
Leadership team

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.4 *The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a constructive and beneficial relationship with the (arch) diocesan Education Office consistent with (arch)diocesan policy pertaining to the recognition of Catholic schools by the Bishop.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 5.4 is about the relationship of the local school site governing body in collaboration with the school's leader/leadership team with the (arch)diocesan office of education. In keeping with the elements of Catholic Social Teaching that promote both subsidiarity and solidarity, schools support a collaborative relationship with the (arch)diocesan educational leadership. It is in this relationship that individual schools are strengthened by the community of Catholic schools brought together through the common effort to serve the educational mission of the Church. A strong relationship with the diocesan Education Office can provide opportunities for shared resources when available.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- Do the governing body and school leader have copies of the (arch) diocesan school policies?

- To what extent has the governing body and school leader provided professional development to the members of the board regarding (arch)diocesan school policies?

- To what extent has the governing body and school leader provided professional development to the members of the faculty regarding (arch)diocesan school policies?

- To what extent has the governing body and school leader provided professional development to the school's parents regarding (arch)diocesan school policies?

- Are the school's policies in alignment with the (arch)diocesan school policies?

Benchmark 5.4 Developed by CHECSC Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.4 *The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a constructive and beneficial relationship with the (arch) diocesan Education Office consistent with (arch)diocesan policy pertaining to the recognition of Catholic schools by the Bishop.*

- What assessment tools are used to indicate alignment and implementation of (arch)diocesan policies in the local school?

- What accountability measures and reports indicate a highly functional relationship between the school's governing body, leader, and (arch)diocesan office leadership?

- What is the frequency of two-way communication between the school and the office of education regarding budgets, finances, human resources, educational support programs, and initiatives?

- Do school print and electronic publications include information about the (arch)diocesan office of education? Are there links on the school's website connecting to the (arch)diocesan office of education?

- To what extent is the school in relationship with other schools of the (arch)diocese through the community building activities of the office of education?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the governing body and school leader put policies in place that are aligned with policies of the (arch)diocese. Further, the school policies are implemented in accordance with the guidelines of the (arch)diocesan policies and are regularly monitored for alignment.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

the governing body and school leader put policies in place that are fully aligned with policies of the (arch) diocese, implemented in accordance with the guidelines of the (arch) diocesan policies, and regularly monitored for alignment. The actions of the school leader and governing body continuously foster a mutual and productive working relationship with the (arch)diocesan office of education by integrating initiatives and programs. In addition, the

Benchmark 5.4 Developed by CHECSC Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.4 *The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a constructive and beneficial relationship with the (arch) diocesan Education Office consistent with (arch)diocesan policy pertaining to the recognition of Catholic schools by the Bishop.*

governing body and school leader regularly work in collaboration with other schools of the (arch)diocese, fostered through the work of the office of education.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

the governing body and school leader put policies in place that are somewhat aligned with policies of the (arch) diocese. The school policies are inconsistently implemented in accordance with the guidelines of the (arch diocesan policies and irregularly monitored for alignment. Relationships with other schools of the (arch)diocese are limited and/or pro forma.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

the governing body and school leader put policies in place at the school level but largely ignore the policies of the (arch)diocese. The governing body and school leader appear to be working independently from the (arch)diocese and other schools of the (arch)diocese.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Begin a process to align the school's policies with the policies of the (arch)diocese.
- Establish an assessment process to gauge progress in aligning the policies in an expeditious and yet effective manner.
- Review the aligned policies of the school and (arch)diocese for congruence.
- Begin to share information and best practices through the office of education as an outreach to other schools of the (arch)diocese.
- Implement a plan and process to begin the movement away from isolation to a community of schools concept using the office of education as the conduit.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Complete the alignment of policies and fully implement them in accordance with the guidelines of the (arch)diocesan policies.

Benchmark 5.4 Developed by CHECSC Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.4 *The governing body, in collaboration with or through the actions of the leader/leadership team, maintains a constructive and beneficial relationship with the (arch) diocesan Education Office consistent with (arch)diocesan policy pertaining to the recognition of Catholic schools by the Bishop.*

- Establish a regular monitoring system to make sure that the policies remain aligned.
- Inform all governing body members and leadership team of school and (arch)diocesan policies and their alignment.
- Develop a plan to present the policies to all school stakeholders for their knowledge, use, and implementation.
- Provide outreach, support, and exchange of information with other schools of the (arch)diocese engaging in a community of schools.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Align all the policies of the school and the (arch)diocese and regularly monitor implementation.
- Continuously foster productive relationships between other schools of the (arch) diocese, the office of education, and themselves for the purpose of promoting solidarity.
- Host regular gatherings of the schools of the (arch)diocese for the cultivation of initiatives, programs, and professional development.

> **V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to Glossary for the terms listed below.)**

Governing body
Office of education or Education office

Benchmark 5.4 Developed by CHECSC Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.5 *In the case of a parish school, the governing body, in collaboration with the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the canonical administrator (pastor or designee of Bishop) marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 5.5 states the expectation of the type of relationship that should exist between the parish school's governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator. The qualities of mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue that mark this relationship are critical to the good health of the school, thus ensuring ongoing fidelity to the school's mission, academic excellence, and operational vitality.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- Do school calendars and schedules for meetings reflect the presence of the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator in regular attendance?

- Do public announcements and publications reflect the solidarity of the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator in the response to issues and the communication of program information?

- Do the records of public events identify the regular presence of the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator?

- Will the stakeholders of the school identify the qualities of mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue as characteristic of the relationship between the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator?

- What type of leadership assessment is conducted annually? Is the process designed to be formative, summative, and/or evaluative? How is the assessment used to benefit the relationship between the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator?

Benchmark 5.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.5 *In the case of a parish school, the governing body, in collaboration with the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the canonical administrator (pastor or designee of Bishop) marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue.*

- Is there an annual budget formation process that includes the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator in regular discussion until the strategic plan is complete?

- Are there clearly designed and explained roles and responsibilities that the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator can call upon to guide their work together?

- Is there a strategic plan for the vision of the school that was developed through collaborative effort of the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator? Does the strategic plan contain the collaborative responsibility of assessing progress by the mutual effort of the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3- Fully Meets this Benchmark,**

the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator exhibit through the evidence above that the qualities of mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue mark their relationship in a regular and consistent way.

At level **4- Exceeds Benchmark,**

the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator develop and foster a continuous working relationship marked by regular, positive interactions, shared goals, mutual trust, close cooperation and continuing dialogue that is productive, sustained and future focused. This positive relationship is totally integrated into "the way we do things."

At level **2- Partially Meets Benchmark,**

the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator exhibit an inconsistent and unpredictable relationship that is sometimes collaborative. Timely and effective decision-making is often impaired by this relationship.

Benchmark 5.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.5 *In the case of a parish school, the governing body, in collaboration with the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the canonical administrator (pastor or designee of Bishop) marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue.*

At level **1- Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator are not collaborating. There is an evident disconnect between the governing body, the school leader, and the canonical administrator. The stakeholders recognize this disconnect and respond to planning, policy and regulations designed by the governing body and school leader with confusion and/or disregard. The parish canonical administrator and school leader do not share the same vision for the school's future.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Begin a dialogue with the parish canonical leader to develop a relationship of mutual trust. This can be very difficult to accomplish if issues existing in the relationship are contentious. Seek third party facilitation if needed.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Increase a dialogue with the parish canonical administrator on a much more intentional and planned level.
- Promote a shared vision approach to planning and decision-making with the parish canonical administrator.
- Conduct regular meetings and share information between the governing body, school leader, and parish canonical administrator for the purpose of planning and decision-making.
- Establish a climate of mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue that marks a positive relationship recognized by the stakeholders.

To move from level 3 to 4,

- Expand dialogue between the parish canonical leader, governing body, and school leader that is marked by a sense of mutual trust and close cooperation.

Benchmark 5.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.5 *In the case of a parish school, the governing body, in collaboration with the leader/leadership team, maintains a relationship with the canonical administrator (pastor or designee of Bishop) marked by mutual trust, close cooperation, and continuing dialogue.*

- Collaborate at a level that all stakeholders become witnesses to a relationship that provides future focused decision-making that is a result of this collaboration.
- Establish an environment that all other stakeholder groups and committees of the school use as a model of collaboration marked by mutual trust and cooperation that guides their work together in support of the school's mission and vision.

> **V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the terms listed below.)**

Parish canonical administrator

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.6 *The governing body engages in formation and on-going training and self-evaluation for itself and the leadership team to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

The members of the governing body are formed in the mission and prepared to assume their roles and responsibilities if they are to be competent stewards of the school's mission and resources (both personnel and material). In fact, it is a priority. This requires members to be continually engaged in formational and educational activities from the moment that they begin to consider joining the board to the day their term of service ends. Therefore, formational and educational activities are presented during the three stages of membership:

- Prospective member (Getting acquainted with the mission and the role and operations of the board)
- Newcomer (Orientation)
- Veteran (Ongoing- this includes items for all board members on their areas of responsibilities)

This requires a well-planned program with materials, resources, and presenters, as well as a group who will oversee the activities for each of the three stages of membership. A Nominating Committee/Governance Committee of the board would be the suggested group to not only oversee the activities, but to plan and execute the blueprint.

The diocese is a resource to assist with this comprehensive and on-going formation and education. It is suggested that a designated person at the diocesan level be responsible for ongoing and systematic training and evaluation of the governing group.

Finally and most importantly, an annual evaluation is necessary to determine if the formation and education is making a difference in the performance of the governing body. Based on the evaluation, the board needs to develop and implement an annual board development plan. It is suggested that in order to plan effectively, time for a planning retreat should be allocated.

Benchmark 5.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.6 *The governing body engages in formation and on-going training and self-evaluation for itself and the leadership team to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities.*

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- What information can be distributed at the Prospective and Newcomer stages? Who determines the topics for these two stages? Who presents the topics?

- How is the veteran or ongoing formation determined? How is it designed and who determines the needs? Who oversees it?

- Is there a designated person at the diocesan level who is responsible for ongoing and systematic training and evaluation? How is the training delivered? How are connections made between the diocesan staff and the governing body?

- How are new members as well as veteran members prepared to direct their discussions, strategies, and decisions around the school's' mission and vision?

- How is the board engaged in an annual review of its performance as a governing body? How is the review used to develop the board's plan for improvement?

- Is a leadership manual for Catholic school boards/governing bodies available from the (arch) diocesan office or the religious community that offers school boards a common frame of reference, vocabulary and best practices to ensure success?

- Has a board Nomination/Board Development Committee been established to design, execute and assess board formation and education? What are the stated responsibilities of the Nomination/Board Development Committee?

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.6 *The governing body engages in formation and on-going training and self-evaluation for itself and the leadership team to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities.*

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the governing body engages in formation and on-going training at all three levels (prospective member, newcomer, and veteran). The governing body and the leadership team demonstrate a strong commitment to this training as part of their commitment to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities. In addition, both groups are strongly committed to an annual self-assessment that includes a retreat to plan for the governing body's improvement. The Nominating/Governance Committee is a standing board committee responsible for the oversight for all of the above. This committee is dedicated to ensuring that formation, education and self-evaluation occurs on a regular schedule.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

the governing body is very committed to and engages in continuous formation, education, and self-evaluation at all three levels (prospective member, newcomer, and veteran). The governing body visibly supports and ensures that the leadership team is engaged in continuous formative efforts. Both the governing body and the leadership team have clearly defined accountability measures for the outcomes associated with their responsibilities and the governing body's ongoing work and improvement plan. Outcomes are assessed utilizing both formative (after each meeting) and summative (annual self-evaluation and input from stakeholders) measures to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities, with clear follow up and plans for improvement. Annual assessments are designed to include all stakeholder groups to secure input that represents the diversity of stakeholders.

An important element of the governing body's assessment is that an annual retreat be held following the assessment process. At this planning retreat, the board and the leadership team discuss the results of the evaluation and design an improvement plan. The Nominating/Governance Committee, a standing board committee, oversees all of the above.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.6 *The governing body engages in formation and on-going training and self-evaluation for itself and the leadership team to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities.*

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

> the governing body and the leadership team intermittently engage in formation and on-going training and self-evaluation. The board and the leadership team have no set plan to provide activities at the three levels (prospective member, newcomer, and veteran).

> There is little if any assessment of the governing body's work nor accountability for expected outcomes. Thus, they limit their ability to ensure consistent, informed and faithful execution of their respective responsibilities as stewards of the mission. No Nominating/Governance Committee exists or, if it does exist, its role is limited.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> the governing body and the leadership team do not engage in formation and on-going training. Neither group has a plan in place to do so. Furthermore, the two groups do not support the concept of assessment and accountability. This negatively impacts the governing body's faithful execution of their respective responsibilities as informed stewards of the mission. No Nominating/Governance Committee exists.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Engage in formation and ongoing training and self-evaluation for the benefit of the board and leadership team to ensure continuous, faithful execution of their respective responsibilities.
- Focus on formation and on-going training in the orientation of new members and ongoing development of veteran members.
- Establish a standing Nominating/Governance Committee of the board.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Provide oversight for the formation, education and self-evaluation of the governing body as a responsibility of the Nominating/Governance Committee.

Benchmark 5.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.6 *The governing body engages in formation and on-going training and self-evaluation for itself and the leadership team to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities.*

- Plan focused and on-going training activities for prospective members, newcomers, and veteran school board members sponsored by the Nomination/Governance Committee.
- Provide formation and ongoing training for prospective members, newcomers, and veterans sponsored by the Nominating/Governance Committee.
- Organize and provide an annual self-assessment process that includes a retreat to engage in ongoing governing body improvement and ensure the faithful execution of their responsibilities.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Commit to and actively engage in the continuous formation and education of the governing body members at all three levels (prospective member, newcomer, and veteran levels) as well as self-evaluation.
- Visibly support and ensure that the leadership team is engaged in continuous formative efforts
- Establish clearly defined accountability measures for both the governing body and the leadership team based on the outcomes associated with their responsibilities.
- Assess outcomes utilizing both formative (after each meeting) and summative (annual self-evaluation and input from stakeholders) measures to ensure the faithful execution of the governing body and leadership team's respective responsibilities.
- Develop and implement plans that address areas of improvement.
- Include all stakeholder groups in annual assessments to secure input that represents the diversity of stakeholders.
- Conduct an annual retreat where the governing body and leadership team discuss the assessment results and design an improvement plan.
- Charge the Nominating/Governance Committee, a standing committee of the board, with ongoing oversight all of the above.

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to Glossary for the terms listed below.)

Formative Evaluation	On-going training
Summative Evaluation	Self-evaluation
Formation	Leadership team
Education	

Benchmark 5.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

5.6 *The governing body engages in formation and on-going training and self-evaluation for itself and the leadership team to ensure the faithful execution of their respective responsibilities.*

Benchmark 5.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.1 *The leader/leadership team meets national, state and/or (arch)diocesan requirements for school leadership preparation and licensing to serve as the faith and instructional leader(s) of the school.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 6.1 is about leadership preparation and qualifications for those serving as leaders in Catholic elementary and secondary schools. Each state does or does not set licensing (license, certificate or credential) requirements for private school teachers and administrators. In addition, each (arch)diocese, religious order, or independent Catholic school establishes its own preparation and qualification guidelines and requirements for school leadership. With this in mind, Benchmark 6.1 indicates that every leader or member of the leadership team is qualified to serve as a faith and instructional leader based on completion of a school leadership preparation program and/or licensing appropriate for the state of the school's residence and for faith-based school leadership in the diocese. The (arch)diocese, religious order, or independent Catholic school may include or modify the state qualifications or establish additional qualifications for school leadership based on local need. The spirit of Benchmark 6.1 is to indicate the necessity of both professional and faith-based school leadership preparation for those serving as the school's faith and instructional leaders.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- What are the national, state and/or local (arch)diocesan requirements for school administration licensing?

- What are the policies and/or directives regarding the licensing requirements of the school?

- Do the official records and transcripts of those serving in school leadership meet the national, state and/or local (arch)diocesan requirements for school administration licensing (license, certificate, credential)?

Benchmark 6.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.1 *The leader/leadership team meets national, state and/or (arch)diocesan requirements for school leadership preparation and licensing to serve as the faith and instructional leader(s) of the school.*

- Do the job descriptions of those serving in school leadership specify a baseline preparation for meeting the national, state and/or local (arch)diocesan requirements for school administration licensing?

- Are school leaders held accountable for maintaining the ongoing professional growth to adhere to the requirements for school administration licensing?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3- Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the leader/leadership team possesses the national, state and/or (arch)diocesan professional credentials that indicate school leadership preparation and licensing to serve as the faith and instructional leader(s) of the school. The leader/leadership team renews these credentials as required in a timely manner.

At level **4- Exceeds Benchmark**,

the leader/leadership team possesses national, state and/or (arch)diocesan professional credentials and participates in professional development beyond the requirements for renewal. This professional development supports their expertise in facilitating learning based on recognized best practices in the field.

At level **2- Partially Meets Benchmark,**

the leader/leadership team because shows a minimal or inconsistent response to the requirements for possessing national, state and/or (arch) diocesan professional credentials.

At level **1- Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

the leader/leadership team does not possess national, state and/or (arch) diocesan professional credentials and shows no interest in or plan for achieving them in the future.

Benchmark 6.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.1 *The leader/leadership team meets national, state and/or (arch)diocesan requirements for school leadership preparation and licensing to serve as the faith and instructional leader(s) of the school.*

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Develop a plan for achieving the appropriate national, state and/or (arch) diocesan professional credentials and show interest in receiving the credentials by active and timely implementation of the plan. Completion of the plan becomes a priority for continued employment and is achieved within the parameters established by the governing body.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Implement the requirement that the leader/leadership team achieve the appropriate national, state and/or (arch) diocesan professional credentials and actively develop a professional growth plan for timely renewal.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Maintain and regularly renew the appropriate national, state and/or (arch) diocesan professional credentials and engage in ongoing professional development to strengthen professional expertise and faith-based leadership skills beyond minimum requirements for maintaining the credentials.

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to Glossary for the terms listed below.)

Credentials
Licensing

Benchmark 6.1 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.2 *The leader/leadership team articulates a clear mission and vision for the school, and engages the school community to ensure a school culture that embodies the mission and vision.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 6.2 is about a leader/leadership team first developing a clear understanding of their vision and mission internally. Then the leader/leadership team creates a plan on how to create understanding in teachers, students, parents, parishioners and the wider community. After creating this understanding in the larger group, the leader/leadership team actively communicates how actions within the school tie back to the mission. In some situations, a written plan guides these communications until the overall community buys in to the vision and mission of the school and actively uses the vision and mission to guide their decision making process. The school leader/leadership team lives the vision and mission and easily relates these to the daily activities in their school. They regularly share how they reach their mission via written and verbal communication with all constituents. They regularly invite the school community to participate in connecting the mission with the school's lived experience and practice, and provide opportunities to do so.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- Is there evidence that conversations have taken place about the vision and mission with the leader/leadership team?

- Is there evidence that faculty and staff have discussed what the vision and mission really mean, or how they translate to concrete actions?

- Is there evidence that vision and mission statements are posted around the school, in publications, and referred to in meetings?

- Do members of the community recall references to the school's vision and mission at meetings and or public events held at the school?

Benchmark 6.2 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.2 *The leader/leadership team articulates a clear mission and vision for the school, and engages the school community to ensure a school culture that embodies the mission and vision.*

- Do students display an understanding of the school's vision and mission in their discussions and work products?

- Do articles or community recognitions of the school include references to the school's vision and mission?

- Are the school's vision and mission evident in their procedures and guidelines for co-curricular and extra-curricular activities?

- Do the board's by-laws reflect the school's vision and mission?

- Do postings on social media reflect the school's vision and mission?

- Can visitors to the school quickly understand what the vision and mission of the school are?

- Do surveys of the school community demonstrate a knowledge and adherence to the school's vision and mission?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the leader/leadership team fully understands the vision and mission and uses this knowledge to guide their efforts within the school. The leader/leadership team provides consistent communication to the community about these issues. The leader/leadership team uses their vision and mission to guide decisions, and welcomes and includes the school community in making sure the mission and vision are lived.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

the leader/leadership team fully understands the vision and mission. The vision and mission serve as a major factors in decision-making. When communicating with students, staff, parents and community members, the leader/leadership team frequently communicate the vision and relate it to the task at hand or subject of the conversation. A written plan explains how

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.2 *The leader/leadership team articulates a clear mission and vision for the school, and engages the school community to ensure a school culture that embodies the mission and vision.*

> the leader/leadership team will communicate the vision and mission to all constituencies and engage them in integrating mission and vision into school life. Members of the school community can articulate and affirm what the mission means and how it is lived.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark**,

> the leader/leadership team recognizes the value of communicating mission and vision, but communication is not clear and/or inconsistent and/or infrequent. No written plan exists for spreading the vision and mission to their constituencies and helping them integrate it into school life. The leader/leadership team uses the vision and mission as a touchstone for some decisions.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> the leader/leadership team does not have an articulate understanding of the vision and mission of the school. The leader/leadership team does not provide leadership on integrating the vision and mission into the daily actions of the school. The decisions made by the leader/leadership team do not intentionally reflect the vision and mission of the school. Virtually no communication is distributed to the school's constituents regarding the school's vision and mission.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Develop a basic understanding of the vision and mission and begin to connect the vision and mission to decision-making.
- Share with the stakeholders how the vision and mission affects major decisions in areas such as professional development, textbook selection, and other elements of the school's program.
- Engage the stakeholders of the school community such as the school board, pastor, faculty, and parents in discussions regarding the vision and mission for the purpose of common understanding.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Develop a clear and articulate understanding of the school's vision and mission by all stakeholders.

Benchmark 6.2 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.2 *The leader/leadership team articulates a clear mission and vision for the school, and engages the school community to ensure a school culture that embodies the mission and vision.*

- Relate the actions of the leader/leadership team directly to the vision and mission.
- Communicate to all stakeholders how mission and vision connects to their experiences of the school, using multiple available resources.
- Create opportunities for stakeholders such as the school board, faculty, and students to contribute to the vision and mission.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Integrate the vision and mission into every action and decision of all school programs through the work of all stakeholders. The entire school community recognizes and uses the school's vision and mission as a guidepost for planning and decision-making.

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the terms listed below.)

Vision
Mission

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.3 *The leader/leadership team takes responsibility for the development and oversight of personnel, including recruitment, professional growth, faith formation, and formal assessment of faculty and staff in compliance with (arch) diocesan policies and or religious congregation sponsorship policies.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 6.3 is about the creation and development of a school's faculty and staff. No action by a leader/leadership team is more important than recruiting quality faculty and staff and developing them to their fullest potential. The leader/leadership team are responsible for deliberating and researching the best means of attracting and developing faculty and staff over multiple years using written plans for both faith formation and academic development. Assessment practices for faculty and staff are outlined in policy and procedure handbooks and include formal and formative tools for evaluating performance. The data gathered from faculty and staff assessment tools drive meaningful conversations that lead to changes in instruction, job performance, and future professional development goals for the individual teacher or staff member and school.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions that will help frame this item:

- What means does the leader/leadership team use to recruit faculty and staff?

- Does the leader/leadership team use formal and informal means of recruiting faculty such as outreach to university teacher development programs and networking with other educational leaders?

- Does the leader/leadership team seek the placement of student teachers to help develop relationships with prospective teaching candidates?

- Does the leader/leadership team encourage high school students to consider teaching at a Catholic school as a vocation?

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.3 *The leader/leadership team takes responsibility for the development and oversight of personnel, including recruitment, professional growth, faith formation, and formal assessment of faculty and staff in compliance with (arch) diocesan policies and or religious congregation sponsorship policies.*

- Do interview procedures exist for faculty and staff positions? Do interview questions and protocols include focus on both professional qualifications and fit with mission? Are appropriate faculty/staff members asked to join the interview process?

- Are reference checks completed on all candidates?

- Can faculty and staff explain the assessment process used for annual performance review?

- Has the leader/leadership team clearly articulated and expressed what types of instruction they expect to witness in the classroom?

- Are examples of formal and informal observations present in the faculty/staff member's personnel files for multiple years?

- Are examples of growth plans present in the faculty/ staff member's personnel file?

- Do the goals on the growth plan relate to individual and school areas of need?

- Is there a written professional development plan for faculty that includes dates, subject matter, and name of presenters for topic sessions attended?

- Is there evidence that the topics for the professional development relate to concrete data on student needs?

- Does the professional development plan have a 2-3 year focus to ensure all faculty members adopt appropriate teaching strategies and practices?

- Are teachers asked to implement the professional development and share their experience with colleagues?

- Is time allotted for faith formation annually in the professional development calendar for faculty and staff?

- To what extent is a spiritual community developed among the faculty and staff?

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.3 *The leader/leadership team takes responsibility for the development and oversight of personnel, including recruitment, professional growth, faith formation, and formal assessment of faculty and staff in compliance with (arch) diocesan policies and or religious congregation sponsorship policies.*

- Are sufficient funds budgeted annually for faculty and staff gatherings and retreats that promote the development of a spiritual community?

- Are sufficient funds budgeted annually to support professional development activities that meet the targeted individual performance expectation goals for faculty and staff?

- Do formal or formative assessments of faculty and staff relate to the professional development topic of individual performance expectation goals?

- Do formative assessments for faculty and staff occur regularly and provide immediate feedback?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the leader/leadership team has a defined recruitment plan to attract quality candidates for all faculty and staff positions. The professional development plan for faculty and staff is linked to student needs and ongoing school improvement. The school defines professional development as opportunities for both spiritual and professional growth for all faculty and staff. Time allocation in the school calendar signifies a commitment to both spiritual and professional growth of faculty and staff. The annual budget signifies a financial commitment to support both spiritual and professional growth of the faculty and staff. A policy and procedure handbook for performance evaluation provides for regular, timely, and appropriate assessment of and feedback for faculty and staff. Faculty and staff are regularly assessed and provided professional development to support the fulfillment of their job responsibilities.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

in addition to the elements of level 3, the leader/leadership team has designed and effectively implemented a plan to develop future faculty and staff members. All professional growth plans for faculty and staff exhibit alignment with student learning needs and ongoing school improvement. Professional

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.3 *The leader/leadership team takes responsibility for the development and oversight of personnel, including recruitment, professional growth, faith formation, and formal assessment of faculty and staff in compliance with (arch) diocesan policies and or religious congregation sponsorship policies.*

development and spiritual formation topics and activities serve the faculty and staff individually and as a professional learning community. The school-wide spiritual plan provides regular opportunities for faculty and staff to learn ways to integrate faith and professional practice into their specific job responsibilities. The performance evaluation process for faculty and staff uses both formal and formative assessment tools to provide ongoing feedback and professional growth. The feedback to faculty regularly relates professional development topics and activities to professional practice in the classroom and inspires reflection on the faculty member's part. The performance evaluation process for faculty and staff includes the creation of an individual professional growth plan that requires performance data to be used in forming an annual summative evaluation. The annual summative evaluation includes goals for the next school year related to performance expectations and supporting professional growth. All individual performance and professional growth plans are in alignment with and support the mission and vision of the school.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

the leader/leadership team's plan for recruiting and attracting faculty and staff is limited and inconsistent. The school-wide professional growth plan is not clearly articulated. An inordinate amount of professional development time for teachers is spent working on operational and organizational tasks such as entering grades or preparing for parent teacher conferences. Teachers inconsistently relate information from professional development topics and activities to student learning and ongoing school improvement. Little, if any, reflection on professional development topics and activities takes place among the faculty within learning teams or departments for the benefit of student learning and program improvement. Faith formation topics and activities for faculty and staff may occur occasionally but are not a part of an annual spiritual growth plan. The leader/leadership team has a limited understanding of the goals and methods appropriate for an effective professional performance review process of both faculty and staff. Professional performance reviews of faculty and staff occur infrequently and tend to use only formal summative evaluation methods that do not ask faculty and staff to reflect on their professional practice.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.3 *The leader/leadership team takes responsibility for the development and oversight of personnel, including recruitment, professional growth, faith formation, and formal assessment of faculty and staff in compliance with (arch) diocesan policies and or religious congregation sponsorship policies.*

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> the leader/leadership team does not have a recruiting plan. Professional development is not related to student achievement data and seldom occurs. No faith formation events are planned for faculty and staff. Faculty and staff performance are not assessed and little, if any, data about their performance is collected.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Create a plan for recruiting well-qualified faculty and staff.
- Plan and implement professional development that includes faith formation and professional growth activities.
- Adopt an evaluation policy handbook.
- Conduct regular performance reviews of the faculty and staff.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Develop a wide range of contacts and networks to attract well-qualified candidates for position openings.
- Create professional development topics that reflect documented student needs so that teachers have resources to implement strategies to improve student learning.
- Assess and provide feedback for faculty and staff through both formal and informal tools on a regular basis.
- Demonstrate reflective professional practice.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Cultivate qualified candidates from a variety of resources to fill immediate faculty and staff position openings and future hiring needs.
- Relate professional development topics and activities directly to programs for immediate impact related to continuous improvement in student learning.
- Implement, reflect on, and assess the professional development topics and activities used to improve student learning.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.3 *The leader/leadership team takes responsibility for the development and oversight of personnel, including recruitment, professional growth, faith formation, and formal assessment of faculty and staff in compliance with (arch) diocesan policies and or religious congregation sponsorship policies.*

- Evaluate teacher performance using a process that includes individual growth plans, formal and informal observations, and an end of year summative evaluation.
- Reflect on professional practice regularly with colleagues and adjust instruction based on reflective practice that is focused on the improvement of student learning.
- Regularly assess the effectiveness of processes for faculty and staff development, formation, and performance assessment, using appropriate standards and criteria.

> **V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the terms listed below.)**

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.4 *The leader/leadership team establishes and supports networks of collaboration at all levels within the school community to advance excellence.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 6.4 is about the establishment of a collaborative professional environment at all levels of the school community. This collaborative professional environment creates networks of stakeholders dedicated to excellence in all elements of the school's program. These networks are engaged in continuous improvement of the school's program as an ongoing focus of their talent and expertise. The work and outcomes of the networks are shared with the full school community with collaboration at all levels to advance the school's excellence. The school leader/leadership team serves as the initiator, promoter, planner, and supporter of collaboration among the school's stakeholders and provides them with clearly delineated goals, objectives, assessment protocols and budgets.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions which will help frame this item:

- Is there a documented structure describing each stakeholder collaborative network that includes member lists, meeting minutes, schedules, and products?

- Does each network group have a mission, goals, and objectives that are in alignment with the school's mission, goals, and objectives?

- Does the school community celebrate the achievements of network group collaboration through public recognition events?

- Is there evidence that the school's budget supports collaboration of network groups through allocation of financial resources for space, time, and hospitality?

- Is there evidence that the school's budget supports collaboration of network groups through allocation of financial resources to promote professional development, network meetings and stipends for outside experts?

Benchmark 6.4 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.4 *The leader/leadership team establishes and supports networks of collaboration at all levels within the school community to advance excellence.*

- Is there evidence of the shared use of outside experts?

- Is there evidence that network groups come together to share ideas and products?

- Is there time built into the school schedule for faculty professional collaboration?

- Is there evidence that the academic program has improved as a result of the collaborative network's effort to engage in continuous improvement?

- Is there evidence based on assessment that improvement in achieving student learning outcomes is directly related to the professional collaborative network?

- To what extent has collaboration been made more efficient and transparent by using online network tools for communication and record keeping?

- Has the school engaged in collaboration with other schools to establish a regional network in support of the common issues, concerns, and objectives?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

> the leaders/leadership team has established and supports networks of collaboration at all levels of the school community. These collaborative networks are present, functional, and engaged in communication to support program excellence. The leader/leadership team ensures that the school's schedule, budget, goals, and objectives support a culture of community and collaboration.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

> the leaders/leadership team has established and supported networks of collaboration at all levels of the school community. These collaborative networks are present, functional, and engaged in communication to support program excellence in all areas. All networks are focused on advancing

Benchmark 6.4 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.4 *The leader/leadership team establishes and supports networks of collaboration at all levels within the school community to advance excellence.*

program excellence and communicate progress with other networks regularly. All networks share resources, talent, and ideas, and outcomes to strengthen the bond of collaboration and improve the school. The leader/leadership team ensures that the school's schedule, budget, goals, and objectives support a culture of community and collaboration. It is evident that this culture exists and that the stakeholders consider it critical to ongoing program improvement.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

the leaders/leadership team has established some structure for collaboration but structure for networks remains in a formative stage. Although the leader/leadership team supports networks of collaboration at all levels of the school community, there exists a cultural debate as to value of full collaboration. These collaborative networks are only partially present, somewhat functional, and infrequently engaged in communication. Stakeholders are in agreement to support program excellence but the direction to follow is not commonly understood or accepted. The leader/leadership team struggles to ensure that the school's schedule, budget, goals, and objectives support a culture of community and collaboration.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

autonomous individuals and groups that struggle to communicate their goals, objectives, and outcomes with each other in implementing the school's program is the norm.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Develop a culture of collaboration through regular communication and team-building strategies.
- Design and implement structures for professional collaborative networks on a gradual basis building upon the success of supportive groups within the school.
- Begin a planned and formative process for collaboration to be implemented by the various stakeholder groups across the school.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.4 *The leader/leadership team establishes and supports networks of collaboration at all levels within the school community to advance excellence.*

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Build on the planned and formative process for collaboration by developing the elements necessary for the cultural presence of a collaborative professional environment.
- Implement a process of regular meetings and communication for the various network groups that supports and links the ideas and results of their work with ideas and results of other groups.
- Utilize a system of sharing ideas and resources within the network to promote collaboration and mutual support for ongoing school improvement.
- Work to address feelings of autonomy and individual private agendas that may impede progress in focusing on the common goals that support program excellence.
- Ignite the art of consensus building as a practice for decision-making for all network groups.
- Develop and implement a method of assessing progress in implementing this collaborative model.
- Communicate to the entire school community that assessment of this collaborative model will be ongoing in order to maintain the integrity of the process.
- Develop schedules and design the school's budget to support a culture of collaboration.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Provide evidence and communicate to the entire school community that a culture of collaboration has been in place for three to five years and has accomplished several program goals.
- Provide evidence and communicate to the entire school community that the successful implementation of this collaborative model is directly linked to the successful achievement of program goals.
- Provide evidence and communicate to the entire school community that sharing of resources and ideas has become a regular and expected function of the school community networks.
- Provide evidence and communicate to the entire school community that decision making at the group and community level is the result of fact-finding, discussion, and consensus that represents transparency through open lines of communication.
- Provide evidence and communicate to the entire school community that the school's collaborative culture has resulted in a positive impact on student learning.

Benchmark 6.4 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.4 *The leader/leadership team establishes and supports networks of collaboration at all levels within the school community to advance excellence.*

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to Glossary for the terms listed below.)

Collaboration
Communication
Networks
Vertical Teaming
Transparency
Consensus
Professional Learning Community

Benchmark 6.4 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.5 *The leader/leadership team directs the development and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction, and utilizes school-wide data to plan for continued and sustained academic excellence and growth.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 6.5 points to the leader/leadership team as the instructional leader of the school's curriculum. In collaboration with the faculty, the leader/leadership team is responsible for planning, assessing, and monitoring the school's curriculum in a climate of continuous improvement. It is in this collaboration that the school's curriculum can be used to achieve and sustain academic excellence. The leader/leadership team guides and supports the faculty in understanding what is to be learned (curriculum), how it is to be assessed (formative and summative assessments), and how it is to be taught (teaching strategies). The faculty understands that developing and communicating their curriculum (through mapping or some other process) provides for the best use of their teaching time, and that teaching strategies must match the students' needs and the material being learned. The faculty collects classroom and school wide data that is analyzed to inform future instruction and improve student academic growth and achievement. The leader/leadership team regularly assesses progress being made around curriculum design, mapping, and revision that is supported by fidelity to best teaching strategies from professional development and adherence to the assessment plan. The leader/leadership team assists the faculty in setting subject and grade level academic goals based on the analysis of school-wide data. In referencing Benchmark 7.1, the leader/leadership team is responsible for making sure that *the curriculum adheres to appropriate, delineated standards, and is vertically aligned to ensure that every student successfully completes a rigorous and coherent sequence of academic courses based on standards and rooted on Catholic values.*

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions to help frame this item:

- Does the school have a curriculum map (or other form of written curriculum) for all grades and subjects that has been designed and/or lead by the school's the leader/leadership team in collaboration with the faculty?

Benchmark 6.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.5 *The leader/leadership team directs the development and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction, and utilizes school-wide data to plan for continued and sustained academic excellence and growth.*

- Is there a professional development plan, directed by the leader/leadership team, in place with a multiple year focus that emphasizes best instructional practices in alignment with the school's instructional goals?

- Is there a school-wide assessment plan of instructional strategies used by the leader/leadership team to supporting the curriculum analysis and planning?

- Is there a school-wide assessment plan of student learning that is used by the leader/leadership team to plan for continued and sustained academic excellence and growth?

- Does the leader/leadership team, in collaboration with faculty, preform an item analysis of standardized tests in order to determine student strengths and weaknesses and set learning goals?

- Does the leader/leadership team emphasize the use of a variety of formal and informal classroom assessments to judge the progress of student learning?

- Does the leader/leadership team direct a process for collecting, logging, and charting indicators of student progress in academic growth and the achievement of academic excellence over multiple years?

- Does the leader/leadership team regularly communicate assessment data on school-wide progress in achieving the school's academic goals to all stakeholders?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

> the leader/leadership team orchestrates the creation and or adoption of the curriculum. Preferred instructional strategies are well known and implemented on a regular basis by all faculty. School wide data is gathered on a regular basis, reviewed by the faculty, and influences both instruction in the classroom and future professional development offerings to ensure a high level of achievement.

Benchmark 6.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.5 *The leader/leadership team directs the development and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction, and utilizes school-wide data to plan for continued and sustained academic excellence and growth.*

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

> the leader/leadership team implements a standards-based curriculum and establishes a climate of collaborative professional interaction with faculty to benefit student learning. The leader/leadership team ensures that resources of time and finances are allotted for faculty to engage in the development of research-based instructional strategies to support and enhance the school's curriculum. The leader/leadership team directs and monitors the effective use of the curriculum map to ensure vertical alignment. Teaching strategies are implemented throughout curriculum areas in a conscientious manner that reflects students' needs and the best means of helping students achieve the designated learning. The school-wide assessment plan outlines multiple standardized, diagnostic, and classroom-based assessments to measure change, growth, and objectives. The leader/leadership team, in collaboration with the faculty, comprehend the purpose of various classroom and school-wide assessments and discuss accumulated data regularly in a climate of continuous improvement.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

> the leader/leadership team adopts a curriculum but are not yet able to link the curriculum to specific teaching philosophies and strategies. Few intentional connections are made between the curriculum and the standardized, diagnostic, or classroom-based assessments. The faculty review assessment data irregularly and few adjustments to instruction take place after reviewing assessment data.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,

> the leader/leadership team has not facilitated the development of a curriculum for the faculty to use. Faculty members randomly select teaching strategies with little or no continuity. There is no school wide assessment plan and the school lacks a focus on continuous improvement. Rather, the school implements programs in a haphazard manner that does not connect to overall, standards-based learning goals.

Benchmark 6.5 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.5 *The leader/leadership team directs the development and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction, and utilizes school-wide data to plan for continued and sustained academic excellence and growth.*

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Begin to create or adopt a school wide curriculum that flows from the joint work of the stakeholders of the school.
- Begin to make a correlation between the curriculum and specific teaching strategies to be used for delivery of the curriculum.
- Decide on the school wide assessment tools to assess student learning based on the curriculum.
- Link the connections between the curriculum and student assessments by grade level and/or department.
- Begin to assess some of the critical areas of the curriculum on a regular basis.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Link curriculum, teaching strategies, and student learning in order to provide assessment data to support or revise curriculum based on student needs.
- Design and implement a professional development plan for teachers that responds to student needs based on the assessment data.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Facilitate the transformational change to a standards-based curriculum where teachers understand that textbooks, etc. serve as resources to help students reach set learning objectives.
- Create a climate of understanding among the faculty that vertical alignment of the curriculum is a process that requires a professional learning community advocating for collaborative continuous improvement.
- Implement teaching strategies gained from professional development offerings that directly impact student instructional needs and curriculum delivery.
- Emphasize that continuous improvement is a result of reviewing the curriculum, teaching standards, and the planned assessments.
- Measure the school's goals and desired learning outcomes by a sophisticated assessment plan implemented by all faculty of the school through vertical teams and/or interdepartmental collaboration.
- Apply the data received from assessments to regular improvement of the school's program and student learning initiatives.
- Regularly communicate progress using assessment data on school-wide progress in achieving the school's academic goals to all stakeholders.

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.5 *The leader/leadership team directs the development and continuous improvement of curriculum and instruction, and utilizes school-wide data to plan for continued and sustained academic excellence and growth.*

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the key terms listed below.)

Curriculum
Continuous improvement
Vertical teams

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.6 *The leader/leadership team works in collaboration with the governing body to provide an infrastructure of programs and services that ensures the operational vitality of the school.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 6.6 is about the collaboration between the leader/leadership team and governing body to ensure operational vitality for the school's programs and services. Critical to this benchmark is the organizational model used by the leader/leadership team and governing body to create an infrastructure that works in harmony based on clearly designed, recognized and implemented roles and responsibilities. This collaborative model seeks to create and maintain programs and services that promote continuous growth of student learning in an atmosphere seeking to achieve a shared vision. The leader/leadership team has the responsibility to lead the planning and implementation of goals related to the components of operational vitality within this collaborative model. Specifically, the leader/leadership team ensures the operational vitality and effectiveness of the infrastructure components related to enrollment management, personnel decisions, budgeting, finance, human resources, facilities, technology, marketing, and advancement.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions that will help frame this item:

- Does the organizational model utilized by the leader/leadership team and governing body give evidence of collaboration throughout the school's program to ensure operational vitality?

- What documents, including minutes and reports, are present that indicate a regular collaborative meeting structure exhibited by all working groups of the school?

- Is there evidence that a strategic plan has been developed, implemented, and assessed through the collaborative efforts of the school's leader/leadership team and governing body?

- Do the stakeholders of the school, through recent survey, recognize collaboration between the school's leader/leadership team and governing

Benchmark 6.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.6 *The leader/leadership team works in collaboration with the governing body to provide an infrastructure of programs and services that ensures the operational vitality of the school.*

> body as providing a structure for open communication, planning and programming that ensures operational vitality?

- Are there policies and procedures in place to provide an infrastructure of programs and services that ensures the operational vitality of the school?

- Do the programs and services have sufficient personnel to ensure effective implementation of responsibilities related to each infrastructure component?

- Is there sufficient financial allocation through annual budgeting to ensure the operational vitality of the infrastructure that supports programs and services?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3- Fully Meets Benchmark**,

> all stakeholders recognize that the collaborative functioning of the school's basic framework produces strong and dynamic programs and services. Sufficient personnel and financial capacity are present to effectively implement policies, programs and procedures.

At level **4- Exceeds this Benchmark**,

> all stakeholders recognize that the collaborative functioning of the school's basic framework produces strong and dynamic programs and services. Sufficient personnel and financial capacity are present to effectively implement policies, programs and procedures. In addition, plans for facilities, budgeting, advancement and development are transparent and shared with stakeholders. The community of stakeholders is then empowered to ensure the operational vitality of the school.

At level **2- Partially Meets this Benchmark,**

> it is evident that the school's leadership is not fully supported by the governing body or vice versa. Although some collaboration occurs between the leader and governing body, it is cursory and lacks a bonded commitment to the schools' mission and vision. The organizational structure of the school does not promote collaboration towards programs and services that support the

Benchmark 6.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.6 *The leader/leadership team works in collaboration with the governing body to provide an infrastructure of programs and services that ensures the operational vitality of the school.*

>operational vitality of the school. Policies and procedures related to programs and services are designed, implemented, monitored, and assessed by the leader/leadership team without collaborating with the school's governing body. Sufficient personnel and finances to support an infrastructure of programs and services that would ensure operational vitality are somewhat present but are inadequate and/or unbalanced.

At level **1- Does Not Meet this Benchmark**,

>the leader/leadership team and governing body do not work in collaboration. The lack of connectedness and mutual support interferes with the design and implementation of policies and procedures that could support the operational vitality of the school. The school's leader/leadership team does not take an active role in developing policies, and procedures related to programs and services and is only involved in ongoing management of existing policies and procedures. The school's programs and services lacks an infrastructure of personnel and finances to support operational vitality.

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Recognize that the collaborative functioning of the school's basic operating framework produces strong and dynamic programs and services.
- Implement a plan and steps to follow to establish a collaborative environment between the school's leader/leadership team and governing body.
- Show collaboration, for the benefit of the school's programs and services, between the leader/leadership team and governing body in the early stages of the plan.
- Design policies and procedures that support an infrastructure of programs and services that ensure operational vitality.
- Allocate funds in the annual budget to support policies and procedures for an infrastructure of personnel, programs, and services that ensure operational vitality.

Benchmark 6.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.6 *The leader/leadership team works in collaboration with the governing body to provide an infrastructure of programs and services that ensures the operational vitality of the school.*

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Practice a collaborative model of decision making on behalf of operational vitality of the school in planning and establishing policies and procedures for the school's programs and services.
- Implement policies and procedures that support an infrastructure of programs and services that ensure operational vitality.
- Allocate and utilize sufficient funds in the annual budget to support policies and procedures for an infrastructure of personnel, programs, and services that ensure operational vitality.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Work collaboratively in an environment of transparency engaging all stakeholders in the responsibility of ensuring operational vitality.
- Empower all stakeholders to share in the school's plans and implementation for ongoing improvement of the school's programs and services that ensure operational vitality.
- Provide sufficient funds through annual budgeting to support short and long-term plans for policies and procedures for an infrastructure of personnel, programs, and services that ensures operational vitality at the highest level of performance.

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to the Glossary for the key terms listed below.)

Operational vitality

Benchmark 6.6 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.7 *The leader/leadership team assumes responsibility for communicating new initiatives and/or changes to school programs to all constituents.*

I. What does this benchmark indicate for school performance?

Benchmark 6.7 is about the leader/leadership team approaching communication to constituents in a systematic manner with either a universally understood or written communication procedure to be used for major initiatives. An understanding exists that communication is essential in creating a sense of community and moving the institution towards its vision and mission. With this realization the leader/leadership team knows communication must take place with regular frequency using a wide variety of communication tools such as paper, email, social media, videos, individual conversations, presentations to groups, etc.

II. As a review team member, what evidence do I look for?

Here are some fundamental guiding questions for school leaders to ask to help frame this item:

- Does evidence exist to demonstrate that an organized approach to communication is taking place in the school? For example, are communication patterns for what groups should be contacted, the means of communication to be used, and in what order specific constituents are contacted in writing?

- Does evidence exist that communication on major initiatives takes place prior to, during, and after implementation?

- Does the leader/leadership team state the reason(s) why the initiative is taking place and what success will look like?

- What evidence is there that communication means and methods are matched to the intended audience?

- Does communication relate back to the school's vision and mission?

Benchmark 6.7 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.7 *The leader/leadership team assumes responsibility for communicating new initiatives and/or changes to school programs to all constituents.*

- Does communication frequently relate back to the school's strategic plan and goals?

III. What are the key differences between the levels of the rubric?

At level **3-Fully Meets Benchmark**,

the leader/leadership team clearly demonstrates that communication is very important and regularly puts out communication about specific initiatives prior to, during, and after implementation. Many communication tools such as newsletters, bulletins, emails, social media, etc. are used; the communication tools are matched to targeted audiences. The communications are linked back to the school's vision and mission.

At level **4-Exceeds Benchmark**,

the leadership team has a written communication plan/procedure that includes target audiences matched to specific means of communications. Communication takes place prior to, during, and after implementation of an initiative. The leader/leadership team has defined what success looks like for the initiative and how it ties back to the school's vision and mission and includes this in communications. The leader/leadership team shares an understanding with all stakeholders that communication is key in creating a sense of community for the school.

At level **2-Partially Meets Benchmark,**

the leader/leadership team understands that communication is important and regularly communicates information to constituents; however, there is no agreed upon plan, so communication may be incomplete, convey an inconsistent message, not appropriately targeted to audiences, and not clearly linked to mission and vision.

At level **1-Does Not Meet Benchmark**,
the leader/leadership team fails to realize the critical importance of regular and systematic communication in reaching its vision and mission. The communication pattern is irregular and ineffective in reaching stakeholder audiences. There is little or no monitoring of school communication

Benchmark 6.7 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014

Guidelines for Interpreting and Scoring Benchmarks

6.7 *The leader/leadership team assumes responsibility for communicating new initiatives and/or changes to school programs to all constituents.*

IV. What are some key suggestions for improvement?

To move from level 1 to level 2,
- Acknowledge that communication to constituents is important.
- Develop a process and procedure for communicating new initiatives.
- Communicate new initiatives in the early stages of implementation to all stakeholders using a limited but strategic number of communication tools.

To move from level 2 to level 3,
- Begin to identify target audiences and use a wide range of communication tools to contact stakeholders.
- Communicate needs that support initiatives prior to, during and after implementation.
- Align communication of initiatives with the school's vision and mission.

To move from level 3 to 4,
- Identify all target audiences and match them with specific communication tools for greatest effect.
- Relate initiatives back to the school's vision and mission routinely and consistently.
- Implement a communication plan that incorporates procedures on how often to communicate, with whom to communicate, and why communication is essential.
- Emphasize and implement the process for annual monitoring, assessing, and revising of the appropriate strategies to achieve maximum effectiveness in communication with all constituents.

V. What are key terms for common understanding? (Refer to Glossary for the key terms listed below.)

Communication

Benchmark 6.7 Developed by CHESCS Guidelines Taskforce 2014