

LAMOILLE NORTH SUPERVISORY UNION BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 2014
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER

Board members present: Belvidere – none; Cambridge – Jan Sander; Eden – Amy Fitzgerald; Hyde Park – Raven Walters; Johnson – Katie Orost; LUSD #18 – Carl Szlachetka, William Sander; Waterville – none. Others: Edith Beatty, Charleen McFarlane, Kelly Betzina.

Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.

1. *Call to Order*

C. Szlachetka called the meeting to order at 5:07.

2. *Superintendent Goals and Evaluation Process*

E. Beatty said she had put together a list of proposed goals and taken it around to every board except the high school board, which had to cancel its last meeting for lack of a quorum. There has been a lot of agreement with the goals and each board has had a suggestion or two. She has fleshed out the list to include recommendations she got.

She reviewed her most recent draft. The first goal is Implement New Superintendent Entry Plan and Initial Inquiry – understand the changing landscape of public education in general, LNSU specifically, and identify where our SU is strong and where we have opportunities for growth. The second is Improve LNSU Central Office Effectiveness and Efficiency. She said every SU around the state has some tension between districts and the SU and she thinks things are more challenging here than in other places she has worked. There is a greater disconnect between districts and central office and a sense of negativity she would like to understand and address. The third goal is Identify LNSU Common Student Outcomes. There is a lot of work to be done there. This is something she will facilitate, not do herself. She sees it starting after budget season is over. The fourth goal is Support PLC Implementation and Impact on Student Results. This one is important to principals. The fifth is Show Up! – be present in communities, schools, classrooms, board meetings, general meetings and visits; impact ability to understand, influence, lead, and respond to academic, social and cultural contexts across the SU. These aren't written as SMART goals with clear evidence that would show if they are achieved or not. She thought she would wait to see if they were approved, then beef them up.

W. Sander said he thinks there has to be a real emphasis on the superintendent's role as educational leader. That is primary. The superintendent is not supposed to be up on facilities or even budgets. Being able to facilitate cooperation and understanding among staff and faculty and having them get along with boards should probably be emphasized a little more. We have made a lot of progress on a common curriculum. Kids coming in to middle school from different elementary schools may score similarly on standardized tests but have different strengths and weaknesses.

R. Walters said the Hyde Park board was pleased with the list. These goals would meet their needs. A. Fitzgerald said Eden thought they were good goals. C. Szlachetka agreed. J. Sander she thinks the goals cover what her board wanted most.

R. Walters asked if E. Beatty proposes turning these into SMART goals. E. Beatty said not necessarily SMART goals, but it is important to know how we will know if the goals have been achieved.

R. Walters said she wonders if the fifth goal could be measured in the competency part of the evaluation. It was agreed that would be the best place for the fifth goal.

A. Fitzgerald talked about two sample evaluation tools she had brought, ones she has used in the past at work. She said she prefers to have the rating scale be something like unsatisfactory to outstanding, rather than 1 to 5. She thinks people understand that better.

R. Walters said she if she were being evaluated she would prefer the first of the two example tools, which breaks each category down into more detailed competencies. It is possible to have both strengths and areas that need improvement within a single category, so this one gives more feedback. K. Orst agreed.

A. Fitzgerald said she was thinking of having 5 categories of competencies matching the 5 categories in the superintendent search document – the same categories E. Beatty used for her goals.

E. Beatty said one way to do the evaluation is to evaluate the person against every item in the 5 areas and another is to give her certain things to focus on. A. Fitzgerald said she thinks we can do both. During the evaluation, if there is something E. Beatty hasn't gotten to yet, we can just indicate that.

It was agreed that A. Fitzgerald would update the evaluation form chosen (the first one) with competencies and send it around for feedback. She will look at the job description for job responsibilities.

E. Beatty said the responsibility to carry out policies, for example, is a big one. There are 6 sets of policies and they are all different. That is huge enough that might be a goal – determining whether boards want a single set of policies and working toward that. That would be a big goal. Amy said she's not saying one competency should be to redo all policies. She thinks it would be more about whether she can successfully help a principal navigate through policies.

E. Beatty will put more meat into the goals, then send them to A. Fitzgerald, who will put them into the evaluation instrument.

K. Betzina asked if the committee has thought about how to collect data. C. Szlachetka said we talked about the possibility of using Survey Monkey. Another thing discussed was sending something to each board and principal and asking them to send it back to a

central address where the executive committee would look at it, tabulate the data and come to an overall decision. K. Betzina said Orleans just did an evaluation. We could ask them to send their questions. E. Beatty said another thing is document analysis. The committee can check to see if the documents that should be in place are in place.

It was agreed that C. McFarlane would try to find a date for the committee to meet in January, after A. Fitzgerald has sent out an updated version of the evaluation tool.

3. ***Adjourn***

The meeting was adjourned by consent at 5:41

Minutes submitted by Donna Griffiths

UNAPPROVED