

# School Board Trustee Grading Rubric



**HIGH**  
Strong evidence of leadership characteristic because the Trustee...

**MED.**  
Limited evidence of leadership characteristic because the Trustee...

**LOW**  
No evidence of leadership characteristic because the Trustee...

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regularly referenced the effect of a proposed policy on students and/or student outcomes.</li> <li>Supported equitable, data-driven, student-centered policy decisions.</li> <li>Offered clear solutions/alternatives supported by data/research.</li> <li>Demonstrated a clear understanding of established district goals and asked about progress toward those goals.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actively and meaningfully contributed to the discussion of several policy issues and/or made meaningful policy recommendations through a subcommittee.</li> <li>Demonstrated respect and decorum by following established meeting procedures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actively and meaningfully contributed to discussion of matters dealing with budget, finances, or funding.</li> <li>Demonstrated concern and/or deep knowledge about the use of resources.</li> <li>Supported measures focused on financial accountability and effective allocation of resources (e.g. a balanced budget, minimizing resources diverted from the campus-level.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrated concern about the allocation of resources across the district.</li> <li>Acknowledged the difference of needs among students, schools, and neighborhoods.</li> <li>Supported measures that allow for equitable distribution of resources and opportunities.</li> <li>Critically evaluated existing policy and practice to ensure groups of students are not disproportionately and negatively affected or left out.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clearly and comfortably discussed the needs of both their constituents and the entire school district.</li> <li>Demonstrated respect for district administration and structure.</li> <li>Supported practices and policies that demonstrate effective governance and Board accountability.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acknowledged general effects of school board policy on students/outcomes.</li> <li>Recognized specific students or programs in their district.</li> <li>Generally supported data-driven, student-centered policy but with no evidence of a clear understanding of implications on district goals or progress.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not actively or meaningfully participate in policy discussions and/or made no meaningful policy recommendations through a subcommittee.</li> <li>Demonstrated respect and decorum by following established meeting procedures.</li> <li>Repeatedly left meeting space during presentations or discussion.</li> <li>Left the meeting early.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not actively or meaningfully participate in discussion of matters dealing with budget, finances, or funding.</li> <li>Did not acknowledge the use of resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed concerns of only students/families in their trustee district.</li> <li>Did not meaningfully speak on matters of equity in the district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was silent or hard to understand during policy discussions.</li> <li>Demonstrated a general understanding of district administration and structure but broke with protocol on specific matters.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not address any policy issue/concern.</li> <li>Did not support data-driven, student-centered policy decisions and/or opposed proposals without offering solutions/alternatives.</li> <li>Did not attend meeting or was absent for the majority of voting items.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failed to effectively communicate with fellow trustees and members of administration to the level of impeding the meeting and district progress.</li> <li>Publicly insulted/antagonized fellow trustees, other elected officials, members of the administration, or members of the general public.</li> <li>Did not attend meeting or was absent for the majority of voting items.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spent more meeting time discussing matters outside of the Board's control (e.g. state laws/mandates) than matters within the Board's control (e.g. school-based budgeting).</li> <li>Failed to support measures focused on financial accountability and effective allocation of resources, or supported ineffective or unsound financial practices.</li> <li>Did not attend meeting or was absent for the majority of voting items.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not address the concerns of students/families from traditionally underserved populations.</li> <li>Failed to support measures that allow for equitable distribution of resources and opportunities for students based on need, or supported inequitable measures.</li> <li>Did not attend meeting or was absent for the majority of voting items.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not address any district needs.</li> <li>Publicly insulted/antagonized district administration.</li> <li>Made public attempts to undermine district structure/protocol.</li> <li>Failed to support practices and policies that demonstrate effective governance and Board accountability, or supported measures and policies that demonstrate ineffective governance.</li> <li>Did not attend meeting or was absent for the majority of voting items.</li> </ul>

\* The overall rating also takes into account the percentage of time the school board spends discussing meeting student outcome goals each board meeting.