

***SUPERINTENDENT DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM***  
**MID-YEAR SESSION**

**Revised April 2006 – replaces all other versions**

**Mid-Year Presentation Team Reports on the Superintendency  
Rubric**

At the Mid-Year Session each cohort must have ‘presentation teams’ of two associates making formal presentations (and one presentation team of three associates if the cohort team has an odd number). Each presentation team must **independently select, independently prepare, and independently present a formal oral report on the superintendency** using one of the team’s issues as foci (20 minutes maximum), and respond to faculty questions on the superintendency (20 minutes). The next day the presentation team will meet with the presentation faculty for a 20 minute faculty critique of the presentation.

All presentation teams from the cohort may be presenting at the same time, in different rooms. The presentation teams focus may use the same issue or different issues. Each formal presentation must be of the quality a superintendent would give to his/her Board of Education and include a one-page annotated handout of key points and observations **on the superintendency**. The formal oral presentation (and outline) should address the following:

\* Briefly describe the issue and how you and the team went about its analysis, as well as your interaction with the component superintendent – **Maximum of 5 minutes**.

\* Describe what you learned about the role of the superintendent, and the superintendency. You should be prepared to discuss the four leadership dimensions (instructional, political, organizational and strategic), and the three environments (school, community and self) in the SDP model.

1. The focus of the report is the superintendency, not the issue.
2. The 20-minute time limit for the formal oral report must be strictly followed - the report will be stopped by the faculty after 20 minutes.
3. The last 20 minutes of the issue presentation will be for faculty questions. Visiting associates may participate in the questioning after the faculty has completed questioning.

**IMPORTANT:** One week prior to their presentation, the presentation team must provide each presentation faculty (see Presentation Schedule - available two weeks prior to the Mid-Year Session) with (1) a copy of the issue proposal, (2) a copy of the issue product (as provided to the issue’s host superintendent, and (3) the presentation team’s one-page annotated handout of key points and observations on the superintendency.

**NOTE:** See “Presentation Team Report on the Superintendency”

# MID-YEAR PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATION EVALUATION RUBRIC

The Superintendent is regularly called upon to summarize important issues and make her/his recommendations, typically at every Board meeting. The Professional Presentation Rubric is used to measure associate conformity to important superintendent-level presentation skills. One copy to be completed by each person present, including presenters. **All copies to presenters after faculty review.**

ASSOCIATE'S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

TEAM: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_

## Overall Presentation Performance

### **Outstanding**

The presentation was of experienced superintendent quality; focused and showing depth of knowledge and formal presentation skills

### **Meets SDP Standard**

The presentation was well balanced, covering all the important information within the allocated time

### **Below SDP Standard**

The presentation was off the mark; level not acceptable for a formal superintendent presentation

### **Unacceptable**

The presentation was stopped by the faculty and/or would have embarrassed the superintendent in public

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|

## INDICATORS:

### **Outstanding**

#### Presentation of Important Information

Essential key information was presented in a straight forward, understandable fashion

### **Meets SDP Standard**

Important information was presented with some minor needed clarification

### **Below SDP Standard**

Some key information was omitted and/or was presented using jargon/ and/or unclear explanation

### **Unacceptable**

Presenters did not share essential information in an understandable way

#### Presentation Teaming

Presentation team worked together effortlessly, demonstrating knowledge confidence, assisting one another

The presentation team worked well together

The presenters did not work smoothly together.; appeared like several presentations back-to-back

The presenters were unbalanced in time, practice energy, and knowledge; did not assist one another

**INDICATORS (continued):**

| <b>Outstanding</b>   | <b>Meets SDP Standard</b>                                       | <b>Below SDP Standard</b>  | <b>Unacceptable</b>   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <b><u>Professional Dress and Demeanor</u></b>  |   |  |   |
| The presenters demonstrated poise, correct grammar and sentence syntax; appropriate dress and grooming |   |  | The presenters were not poised, and misused words; grooming, dress and general appearance not as a role model |
| <b><u>Quality/Quantity of Written Presentation Materials</u></b>                                       |   |  |   |
| The written support materials were optimal for the presentation’s focus; concise and targeted          | Written support materials were summative and focused            | Extra and/or unneeded written materials were provided; off target and not understandable | Written support materials weren’t provided or were inappropriate for focus                                    |
| <b><u>Controlled Use of Allocated Time</u></b>   |   |  |   |
| The presenter made excellent use of the allocated time   | The presenter covered the information within the allocated time | The presentation was over/ under the allocated time                                      | The presentation was stopped by the faculty beyond the allocated time or too short and left questions         |
| <b><u>Use of Technology in Presentation (optional – if used)</u></b>                                   |   |  |   |
| Presenter made exceptional use of AV or technology, using the resources to sculpt key points           | Use of AV or technology was appropriate for the presentation    | Use of AV or technology did not enhance or detracted from the presentation               | AV or technology was mishandled or detracted from the presentation  |

NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING EVALUATION: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE OF PERSON COMPLETING EVALUATION: \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MAY BE INCLUDED BELOW AND ON ADDITIONAL PAGES >>>>>>>>>>**