

Survey Title: SB Priorities Evaluation 2011
Report Type: Conditional
Start Date: 10-May-11
End Date: 31-May-11
Invitations Sent: 8
Delivered: 8
Bounced: 0
Completed Responses: 7
Filtered Responses: 6
Response Rate: 87.50%
Incomplete Responses: 0
Incomplete responses included in this report: 0

Q1. I am:					
Responses	Count	%	Percentage of total respondents		
Superintendent	0	0%			
School Board Member	6	100.00%			
(Did not answer)	0	0%			
Total Responses	6		20%	40%	60% 80% 100%

Q2. Priority 1.1: Implement the Framework for Quality Learning, the Division's curriculum, assessment, and instruction model, in all learning communities.								
Responses	Count	Assigned Weight	%	Percentage of total respondents				
1 - Well Below Expectations	0	1	0%					
2	2	2	33.33%					
3 - Insufficient Evidence	1	3	16.67%					
4	3	4	50.00%					
5 - Above Expectations	0	5	0%					
N/A - Unsure	0	NULL	0%					
(Did not answer)	0	NULL	0%					
Weighted Score: 3.17								
Total Responses	6			20%	40%	60%	80%	100%

Q3. Rankings of 5 (Above Expectations) or 1 (Well Below Expectations) must include an explanation in the box provided.

Response(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | While every school has teachers who have fully implemented the Framework for Quality Learning, it does not meet my expectations to date. We have pockets of excellence in all schools among teachers. We have some schools that have deep implementation in grade levels or departments. Some schools that have a strong, centered focus on implementation as evidenced in student learning work that demonstrates performance well above the SOL expectations. Target 100%, Q3 92% and 65%, Q3 62% |
| 6 | We don't have clear evidence that this is happening across the division. The School Net KPI was a poor choice of what to measure. |

Q4. Priority 1.2: Assess level of student engagement in learning communities, identifying and enhancing practices connected to high levels of student engagement.

Responses	Count	Assigned Weight	%	Percentage of total respondents				
1 - Well Below Expectations	0	1	0%					
2	0	2	0%					
3 - Insufficient Evidence	1	3	16.67%					
4	4	4	66.67%					
5 - Above Expectations	1	5	16.67%					
N/A - Unsure	0	NULL	0%					
(Did not answer)	0	NULL	0%					
Weighted Score: 4.00								
Total Responses	6			20%	40%	60%	80%	100%

Q5. Rankings of 5 (Above Expectations) or 1 (Well Below Expectations) must include an explanation in the box provided.

Response(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | Both indicators in green showing attendance rates meeting standards and demonstration of engaging qualities meeting standards. |
| 3 | The priority has been accomplished and is green. |

Q6. Priority 2.1: Through common rigorous assessments and use of high-yield instructional strategies all students will meet high expectations for performance and achievement.

Responses	Count	Assigned Weight	%	Percentage of total respondents				
1 - Well Below Expectations	0	1	0%					
2	4	2	66.67%					
3 - Insufficient Evidence	1	3	16.67%					
4	1	4	16.67%					
5 - Above Expectations	0	5	0%					
N/A - Unsure	0	NULL	0%					
(Did not answer)	0	NULL	0%					
Weighted Score: 2.50								
Total Responses	6			20%	40%	60%	80%	100%

Q7. Rankings of 5 (Above Expectations) or 1 (Well Below Expectations) must include an explanation in the box provided.

Response(s)

1	While the use of common assessments meets expectations target 100%, Q3 green, the percentage of students performing at a proficient level on common assessments has not met the target, target 95%, Q3 at 80%.
6	We are still not reaching all students. We should be able to do better than 85%. Although we have 100% common assessment, I wonder about the level of rigor on those common assessments

Q8. Priority 3.1: Review and align human capital management systems to support workforce development and enhance diversity throughout the Division.

Responses	Count	Assigned Weight	%	Percentage of total respondents				
1 - Well Below Expectations	1	1	16.67%					
2	3	2	50.00%					
3 - Insufficient Evidence	1	3	16.67%					
4	1	4	16.67%					
5 - Above Expectations	0	5	0%					
N/A - Unsure	0	NULL	0%					
(Did not answer)	0	NULL	0%					
Weighted Score: 2.33								
Total Responses	6			20%	40%	60%	80%	100%

Q9. Rankings of 5 (Above Expectations) or 1 (Well Below Expectations) must include an explanation in the box provided.

Response(s)	
1	The targets have not been met in Q3, targets 17%, Q3 performance at 7% and 9%. Recruitment of minorities remains a critical concern. The HR staff need to further develop strategy to support increasing the numbers of minorities in the applicant pool.
3	The data reflect status that is too far below expectations. These KPI may not actually provide an accurate or effective measure of the priority intent.
6	We didn't win the grant for Human Capital management. We are doing enough on staff development. Minority recruitment is below expectations.
7	HR continues to be an area of concern.

Q10. Priority 4.1: Benchmark Division performance against Baldrige National Quality Criteria, aligning or creating structures, systems, and processes to support continuous improvement.

Responses	Count	Assigned Weight	%	Percentage of total respondents					
1 - Well Below Expectations	0	1	0%						
2	0	2	0%						
3 - Insufficient Evidence	1	3	16.67%						
4	4	4	66.67%						
5 - Above Expectations	1	5	16.67%						
N/A - Unsure	0	NULL	0%						
(Did not answer)	0	NULL	0%						
Weighted Score: 4.00									
Total Responses	6			20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	

Q11. Rankings of 5 (Above Expectations) or 1 (Well Below Expectations) must include an explanation in the box provided.

Response(s)	
1	KPI met expectations for this priority, target 100% and Q3 100%
3	While the KPI shows "green", it may not provide support for the intent of the priority.
6	The quality counsel has done excellent work.

Q12. Priority 4.2: Implement balanced scorecard model, aligning Division strategies and performance measures in dynamic and transparent ways.

Responses	Count	Assigned Weight	%	Percentage of total respondents					
1 - Well Below Expectations	0	1	0%						
2	0	2	0%						
3 - Insufficient Evidence	1	3	16.67%						
4	4	4	66.67%						
5 - Above Expectations	1	5	16.67%						
N/A - Unsure	0	NULL	0%						
(Did not answer)	0	NULL	0%						
Weighted Score: 4.00									
Total Responses	6			20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	

Q13. Rankings of 5 (Above Expectations) or 1 (Well Below Expectations) must include an explanation in the box provided.

Response(s)

1	Target 100%, met Q3 target
3	Each department is following the intent.
6	the balanced Scorecard has been improved. We are starting to use it effectively. It is critical going forward that we give a great deal of careful thought about the KPIs so that we are measuring the important metrics that will drive improved student performance.

Q14. Priority 5.1: Support Division vision, mission and goals through ongoing resource utilization review and strategic allocation of capital and operating revenues.

Responses	Count	Assigned Weight	%	Percentage of total respondents					
1 - Well Below Expectations	2	1	33.33%						
2	0	2	0%						
3 - Insufficient Evidence	1	3	16.67%						
4	3	4	50.00%						
5 - Above Expectations	0	5	0%						
N/A - Unsure	0	NULL	0%						
(Did not answer)	0	NULL	0%						
Weighted Score: 2.83									
Total Responses	6			20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	

Q15. Rankings of 5 (Above Expectations) or 1 (Well Below Expectations) must include an explanation in the box provided.

Response(s)

1	Unable to meet this- staff directed to work on other areas of high priority or community profile (webpage revisions, SIS fix, scheduling work. target 100%, Q3 10%
3	Insufficient effort has been made in this area. The metric itself may not provide insight into the process or application of the recommendations.
6	Although the KPI is in the red. I feel that given all the challenges we have face in the last year, that we have done very well with the resources we have. however, it is critically important that we get out front and take back control of our agenda. We have spent too much time putting out fires and not enough time advancing the work of the division.