

LAMOILLE NORTH SUPERVISORY UNION BOARD  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015  
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER

Board members present: Belvidere – none; Cambridge –Jan Sander; Eden – David Whitcomb, Jeff Hunsberger; Hyde Park – Raven Walters, Dan Regan; Johnson – Katie Orost; LUSD #18 – Carl Szlachetka; Waterville – none. Others: Edith Beatty, Charleen McFarlane, Catherine Gallagher, William Sander.

**Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.**

**1. *Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Public Comment***

C. Szlachetka called the meeting to order at 5:08.

**MOTION: J. Sander moved to approve the agenda, J. Hunsberger seconded, and the motion was passed.**

**2. *Superintendent Evaluation Process***

E. Beatty distributed a proposed superintendent evaluation process. She said when she first interviewed here she asked about how she would be evaluated. A few people gave their thoughts and they had very different things to say. We want to tap all our key constituencies, get input into E. Beatty's work scope and help her improve and focus. But we are really a diverse group of people. She is trying to help the process not yield homogenized data, with good, bad, and indifferent responses all mixed together, but to look at the data in a stratified way, separating out what is most important to different groups – principals, board members, central office staff.

She is proposing a more formative evaluation for the first year. The instrument discussed previously seemed a little daunting for a first year superintendent. Last time we talked about employing a continuous growth model. She reviewed what would happen in Year 1 under her proposal. First she would receive clear marching orders from the LNSU board as to the work expected and reasonable standards for accomplishment. She would come back and review the goals she set and reflect on where she is with regard to the goals. She proposes meeting with the executive committee for this. It is hard with the big LNSU board. In both of the SU's where she worked recently a couple of people worked with the superintendent to develop and administer the evaluation. She thought it might be interesting to invite her mentor, Joe Ciccolo, to be part of the conversation. There would be brief surveys targeting the primary needs of different groups – board members, principals, central office. Then it would be time to refine goals and set a plan for Year 2.

Her handout also included details of her major goals. She said she finds she is doing more management than leadership, often because she has no choice.

C. Szlachetka said this proposal is slightly different from what we started out with, but he supports it. He thinks a formative approach is appropriate.

D. Regan said what seems most critical to him would be the board's acceptance of the continuous growth model. If the superintendent is obviously the wrong fit for an SU there are multiple opportunities for the board and superintendent to come to that realization but he sees the evaluation as an opportunity for her and us to reflect in a way that would lead to continuous improvement.

W. Sander said he is a little worried that E. Beatty will be spread too thin on a lot of these things. He thinks some of these responsibilities should be delegated to others so she can be an educational leader. He would not want her to spend a lot of time on bond votes, buildings, etc. He would like a superintendent to stay longer than recent superintendents. The board needs to restrain itself. The superintendent needs to be focused on transition points. We need to figure out how help our students do better in post secondary education. The superintendent needs to be focused on that and the board needs to support it.

D. Whitcomb brought up one thing he feels it is important for the superintendent to do. If something is going on that board members don't know about, the superintendent or someone else in central office or the principal should notify board members. Board members on a 3-member board can't let each other know about board-related matters outside of a meeting. There is something happening now in Eden that he didn't know about. For 3-member boards, there has to be more help from the superintendent's office to help them know what is going on.

C. Szlachetka said he sees that as part of a larger goal of improving communication between central office and the boards.

E. Beatty said her practice has been to inform the board chair. D. Whitcomb said the board chair can't notify other members on a 3-member board. E. Beatty said she would love to work with D. Whitcomb on this detail.

Hearing no other comments on the proposed evaluation process, C. Szlachetka said we will move forward with it.

**3. *Board Structures and Committees - Personnel***

C. Szlachetka said because this board doesn't meet as regularly as the town boards, members often don't have enough time to get information or data before being asked to vote. The most egregious example is when the board is asked to discuss the budget. This year was a little better than last year, but the board was still handed the budget shortly before the vote. He would like to see a sub-group meet more frequently. Maybe there could be different groups talking about different items. We could have budget, personnel, and policy committees. One thing he did this past year was get together with Peter Ingvaldstad and Brian Schaffer to try to compare policies between the high school board and the LNSU board. There are a lot of differences, in some instances maybe contradictions. And town board policies may not be similar. He thinks in order to function more efficiently there should be a lot more continuity between policies at different schools. Probably the appropriate place to work on that is at the SU level.

E. Beatty said there is a new responsibility for the LSNU board. In the past not many licensed people have been hired at the SU level. Now licensed special ed staff are being cen-

tralized. We are likely to have vacancies between meetings that will need to be filled. The LUSD board has a personnel committee and during summer they delegate hiring approval to them. The LNSU board could do the same thing. Either the executive committee could meet every month or a personnel committee could meet.

W. Sander said the LUSD board personnel committee was originally set up to resolve issues, not to screen candidates between breaks. He said historically when the full LNSU board has met every other month, the executive committee has met in the alternate months. That has worked out pretty well but we haven't done that the last few years.

E. Beatty said if there were a budget group they could begin working with M. Frederick and E. Beatty in September to talk about the issues that will be facing us.

C. Szlachetka said he thinks it would be a great idea to have the executive committee meeting in the off months, but for hiring we potentially need to cede authority to approve hires to a subgroup.

W. Sander said the board does need to be informed of applicants. It is good to have board members take a critical look at them. He assumes special educator hiring will largely be done by schools using them. E. Beatty said the difficulty is not finding the best candidate but getting board approval of the superintendent's recommendation.

C. Szlachetka said one thing that might help attendance is possibly looking at a carousel meeting structure. He talked to people from other districts that practice that. They have all boards go to a central area to have a unified meeting and then break out into different board meetings. It helps everyone hear the same thing at the same time. Last year the LNSU board had a great presentation from teachers about teaming between towns and afterward a board member complained that it was a waste of time because his school had just had the same presentation. Carousel meetings might do away with some duplication.

W. Sander said we have done that before. R. Walters said Hyde Park has discussed openness to anything that can improve efficiency and reduce the meeting burden on the superintendent. C. Szlachetka said all the different meetings we have currently make it hard to find a time to convene something like the BNC.

E. Beatty said one idea is to try having a carousel meeting once or a few times during the year. A number of SU's do this with success. We could visit an SU that does it and be guests at their board meeting to see how it works.

R. Walters asked how we get from discussion to action on this. E. Beatty said she thinks there is an opportunity to address it in the full board meeting.

4. *Adjourn*

**MOTION: D. Whitcomb moved to adjourn at 5:47, J. Sander seconded, and the motion was passed.**

*Minutes submitted by Donna Griffiths*