

LAMOILLE NORTH SUPERVISORY UNION BOARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015
GMTCC ROOM T-30

Board members present: Belvidere – Angie Evans; Cambridge – Jan Sander; Eden – Jeff Hunsberger; Hyde Park – Raven Walters, Dan Regan; Johnson – Katie Orost; LUSD #18 – David Whitcomb, Sue Hamlyn-Prescott, Beth Bailey; Waterville – Becky Penberthy. Others: Edith Beatty, Charleen McFarlane, Marilyn Frederick, Joe Ciccolo, Harry Frank

Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.

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

D. Whitcomb called the meeting to order at 6:01.

D. Whitcomb said the order of items on the agenda needs to be changed to accommodate Harry Frank. He needs to be as late on the agenda as possible.

MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to approve the agenda, D. Regan seconded, and the motion was passed.

2. *Sharing Success*

E. Beatty said she thought it would be great to open the meeting by giving people a chance to share a success story from their school or community.

B. Penberthy said the Lancers won a basketball title.

R. Walters said she attended the Fine Print celebration and saw kids from all across the district celebrate their passion for writing and literature. Fine Print is the only SU-wide literary magazine in the state. It is competitive. Art is included also.

B. Bailey said her granddaughter, a freshman in college, qualified for the NCAA steeplechase and came in 7th in the nation.

D. Whitcomb said he went to awards night at the auditorium. The pre-tech and GMTCC kids did a good job. He went to JSC for the tech center graduation. He went to the teacher celebration and practiced graduation with B. Schaffer. A board member had two grandchildren graduating and D. Whitcomb asked B. Schaffer to do something to recognize that, but he didn't. Graduation was very good, but he was a little disappointed that the students seemed less enthusiastic than they have in the past. B. Penberthy said she thinks it is a very well-behaved class. She thinks he saw kids trying to behave well. E. Beatty said she saw a class that seemed very close-knit and appreciative of each other. B. Penberthy said they didn't even pull a senior prank.

D. Regan said Outright Vermont selected Lamoille Union as the site for its state summit. It is quite something that this school was the host site. B. Schaffer gave a beautiful warm welcome, which was impressive. Towards the end of the year the middle school and high

school musical groups gave a much appreciated concert in the auditorium. He heard that the jazz band performed to an appreciative audience at the Unitarian church on Church St. (*J. Sander and A. Evans arrived 6:12.*)

R. Walters said two HPES kids played taps at the Memorial Day celebration and they were invited to perform again for the VFW.

D. Regan said the middle school and high school bands were in Memorial Day parades. One parade went to a cemetery in Johnson where the band played taps.

D. Whitcomb said he would have gone to the tech center forestry competition but he found out about it the day after it was held. There will be better communication about dates in the future.

J. Hunsberger said he recently had his first opportunity to hand out diplomas at ECS's 6th grade graduation. It was a nice celebration. On a celebratory but sad note, ECS said goodbye to Kathy Tobin, who is retiring. J. Lindgren did a nice presentation for her that evening.

K. Orost said her favorite event at JES is the talent show on the last day of school, where kids sign up to get up on stage.

3. ***Approve Food Service Contracts***

M. Frederick said two schools in our SU contract out for food service – Johnson and Cambridge. Both have already approved bids from The Abbey Group, but the state reminded us that the only entity that can approve food service contracts now is the SU board.

MOTION: K. Orost moved to accept the decisions of the Johnson and Cambridge school boards to award food service contracts for 2015-2016 to The Abbey Group and to appoint the business manager as their representative in executing both contracts on their behalf, seconded by R. Walters.

K. Orost asked why the price for the Cambridge Food Service Director is different from the price for the Johnson Food Service Manager. M. Frederick said it is based on the existing people in those positions. One might have a different health plan or more experience. The Abbey says they will change the price if the person in the position changes. **The motion was passed.**

4. ***Preliminary Discussion on Act 46 (aka H.361)***

E. Beatty said the high school board made a motion to ask the SU board to study consolidation. The SU board had already expressed a desire to study it. This board might discuss that and then move the discussion to the full board. We are beginning to have a lot of resources to help us. To qualify for the accelerated tax cuts the electorate would have to vote and we would have to be ready to consolidate by July 1, 2016. Then we would get a tax cut of 10 cents in the first year, 8 cents the next, and so on. Or we could be ready a year later, which may be more realistic for us, and get tax cuts of 8 cents, 6 cents, and so on. If we wanted to do the accelerated process we would almost have to get on the ballot for town meeting day. That seems a little fast to her. We could set a study group to work from August to December and then that group could determine feasibility of doing the

accelerated process vs. waiting another year. There are grants available in addition to the tax breaks. At a minimum, we would want to get a grant of \$5-20K to get a consultant to work with us. Orleans SW has been having community forums.

J. Hunsberger asked what the difference is between us and Orleans SW that they are putting this on a faster track and doing community forums. Edie said some SU's have already been studying this. We could have community forums but it would be good to have that planned by a committee so we would have a plan and similar information formats for all our communities.

D. Whitcomb said the discussion has to go to local school boards from here. He thinks we have to get moving on it.

D. Regan said he thinks we should pay close attention to structuring the committee. It sounds like a different sort of committee from the Act156 committee. That committee read the legislation, discussed it with central office administrators, talked among themselves, and came up with recommendations, but no part of that group's work entailed getting voices from the community. This seems different and more complicated.

D. Whitcomb said the state is going to hire a consultant. We probably need a consultant.

J. Ciccolo asked if all the boards are on board. E. Beatty said she hasn't heard that anyone isn't on board with a study group. Whether they are on board with consolidation is another question. She thought tonight it would be good to talk about forming a study group and also come up with questions we have about the legislation. We would not try to answer the questions tonight, just see what they are.

D. Whitcomb asked, why couldn't Eden, Belvidere and Waterville work together on this and have one big public meeting? J. Hunsberger said he isn't opposed to that idea. E. Beatty said she thinks that would be a question for the study group. E. Beatty said we are one of the rare SU's in the state where all towns send our kids to one high school, so we are a poster child for consolidation. There is a question of whether we want to consolidate in groups or as a whole SU. D. Whitcomb clarified that he is just asking about a community forum with the 3 towns together, not consolidating the 3 towns as a group. B.

Penberthy said she is open to the idea but thinks it's a little early.

B. Penberthy said one of her biggest concerns is the competitive nature between the towns and schools in the SU. To be successful with consolidation, that competition has to go away. We can have an impact on that with community forums. Parents can go to a forum in any town that is convenient, not just their own town.

D. Regan said one issue that dilutes competitiveness is how members of the SU-wide school board will be selected. If they are selected to represent their individual town, the voters are telling them, "Go fight for our town!"

J. Ciccolo said we have a great example in the LU board, where all towns are represented. We can show our constituents what we do for grades 7-12. That would put to rest some things people worry about.

B. Bailey said we have to get together as boards or we won't be able to sell this to our taxpayers.

D. Whitcomb asked how many students we have in LNSU. E. Beatty said close to 2000, not counting all GMTCC students. D. Whitcomb said people do not understand what is going on. E. Beatty said part of our work is listening to the communities and part is educating them.

J. Hunsberger said if a study committee can make a commitment to meet over the next couple of months we could be in the study phase and still have a message with enough information to go out to our communities and tell them what we are preliminarily thinking and start holding forums. Maybe we could have one in the fall in each community and one before town meeting or before the vote, the first with preliminary information and the second to tell people where we stand. If we extend the process until the second year, that is okay. At least we will have some momentum.

R. Walters said the voters are counting on us for leadership. People think consolidation might mean some schools are going away.

D. Whitcomb said there is an article in this week's Stowe Reporter. LSSU is working on it, but they have fewer board members in their SU.

D. Regan said he thinks it would be helpful to have a clear sense, not only of what would change, but of what would remain the same. His own hunch is that a lot around teaching and learning will just continue if there is consolidation. A lot would be a change in governance and behavior of school boards.

D. Whitcomb said we need to know what the North Country is doing. E. Beatty said that superintendent is totally opposed to consolidation. R. Walters said Woodbury just had a meeting this week.

J. Hunsberger said he thinks if we get out in front of this early, the community can't say we didn't do enough work to get the information out. He would err on the side of getting initial information out and then taking it back to a study group. E. Beatty asked if he is suggesting an initial study group with one member from each community. J. Hunsberger said he is suggesting an equitable group of people who are interested in moving forward and can be getting a consultant.

R. Walters suggested that, given the time pressure for the study group to start the work, since our boards already expect us to serve as leaders and we are probably the better informed members of our boards, it might make sense for the executive committee to be the study group.

E. Beatty asked if this group should meet in August. D. Whitcomb said he thinks before that. We have to get going. We need help from the Superintendents Association, Principals' Association, Secretary of State, etc. E. Beatty said the state is surprised and overwhelmed by how many people are going for the accelerated process. She handed out a PowerPoint with information for people to read at home.

E. Beatty said she is quite sure we can at least get the low level grant that is available. D. Whitcomb asked if this group wants to go for the grant. E. Beatty said there are several layers of grants. We can start with the smaller one and work up. She can gather information on those.

D. Whitcomb suggested members of the executive committee could study the information at home and then plan to meet in August, because it is hard to meet in July. The rest of the committee agreed. C. McFarlane said she would poll people on meeting dates using the Doodle online scheduler.

J. Ciccolo said there should be conversations with principals. We don't want principals working in opposition to what the study group is working towards. E. Beatty said we will be talking to principals. That is an important point. J. Ciccolo said the board chairs as well as the superintendent will need to be working with principals.

E. Beatty said we haven't even begun to get into all the issues. This board has been talking about taxes and boards and what the public will support. We don't collaborate a lot now. Each school has been its own district and made its own decisions. There are bigger decisions to consider. Are we just going to put a net over the SU with the appearance of being consolidated? What does it mean if we are one district with one budget making decisions about what is best for all kids? We haven't even uncovered all the work this entails.

D. Regan said he would love to hear E. Beatty flesh out that statement that we have barely begun to touch the dimensions of collaboration. As board members we hear a lot about PLC's and horizontal and vertical collaboration. From our point of view there seems to have been some progression toward collaboration. He would find it helpful for her to flesh out the potential for more collaboration.

E. Beatty said she thinks there has been movement. The work of the curriculum committee and the common assessments point in the direction of more ties than had been the case in the past.

B. Penberthy said we share staff across schools to create full time positions. J. Hunsberger said he is willing to sit with any town in the district and discuss anything anyone wants to do. He has no baggage to bring into that conversation. He is excited about figuring out how to make this work well for all, not just for Eden.

B. Bailey asked how we are coming with a common curriculum for all elementary schools so all students are on the same page when they come to middle school.

E. Beatty said she comes from 2 other SU's and she has a sense of where we are compared to those SU's. There has been a lot of effort. How we define curriculum is very different. We used to have a state grade expectation framework and a lot were just getting on board with that and then the Common Core came in and now we are looking at proficiency based learning. Every couple of years the game changes on us. There have been 5 years with a formal curriculum director. We are moving toward articulating a common curriculum and common outcomes and benchmarks. She thinks many of our schools have different ways of getting there, which can be fine or not. Most of our schools purchase different math programs, which may have different language and sets of strategies. W. Savery does not feel there is a seamless transition when kids come to middle school. W. Savery is a big crusader for having a common curriculum. Common assessments are better established in math, emerging in literacy and just beginning in science. There is not much in social studies. We are on the road.

5. *Negotiations Updates*

MOTION: R. Walters moved to enter executive session because the district would be placed at a substantial disadvantage by premature general public knowledge to discuss support staff negotiations, inviting M. Frederick, E. Beatty, and C. McFarlane to remain, seconded by J. Hunsberger, the motion was passed, and the committee entered executive session at 7:01. The committee consented out of executive session at 7:16.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to enter executive session because the district would be placed at a substantial disadvantage by premature general public knowledge to discuss teacher contract negotiations, inviting M. Frederick, E. Beatty, and C. McFarlane to remain, the motion was passed, and the committee entered executive session at 7:17. The committee consented out of executive session at 7:29. (*S. Hamlyn-Prescott joined the meeting during executive session.*)

6. *Superintendent's Report*

E. Beatty recommended hiring Jade Hazard as Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction. A search committee interviewed 3 out of 19 or 20 applicants and reached full consensus on J. Hazard, who is currently a gifted and talented teacher at CES.

MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to offer the Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction position to Jade Hazard, seconded by J. Sander. D. Regan, who was one of the members of the search committee, said he believes in big pools and was dismayed by the small size of this one. But he was really swayed, as he thinks others were, by J. Hazard's performance during the interview. Some may say she lacks secondary experience, but not a single candidate will have the full range of PreK-12 experience. He and others were really impressed by her. E. Beatty said her salary would be \$76K, lower than that of the person who has been in the position. **The motion was passed.**

C. McFarlane said most schools, when we haven't ratified a contract, do an addendum to the administrator's contract saying the salary will stay the same and the contract can be

retroactively amended after the master agreement is ratified. There are letters for central office administrators for the board to sign. In November the board approved a budget with the recommended increase for the Director of Student Support Services salary, to bring that more in line with others in the state. C. Gallagher's addendum has that salary increase. C. McFarlane's contract also needs to be signed.

K. Orost said JES was asked to do an addendum to the principal's contract but decided not to because his contract already stated that his increase would be retroactive after the teacher contract was ratified. E. Beatty said for JES doing nothing keeps the same contract. C. McFarlane said maybe she can look at David Manning's contract and incorporate its language into other administrator contracts, but right now they are not the same.

E. Beatty said a committee has interviewed 4 applicants for the position of executive assistant to the superintendent and sent 2 finalists to her. She interviewed them and has selected the one she thinks is the better match and made an initial offer to that person. C. McFarlane said there were 14 applicants. This hiring decision doesn't have to come to the board because it is not a licensed position.

D. Regan asked if the person will be in place early enough for training before the school year. E. Beatty said we hope to have the person in place by the second or third week of July. C. McFarlane will be nearby to provide learning.

E. Beatty distributed a sheet showing allowable budget growth by district under the new legislative restrictions. M. Frederick said this is to give an idea what the 2% limit would mean in each town. Especially in small towns the budget can't move much. A budget can go over the limit but that will result in higher taxes on the amount over the limit. Budget increases are supposed to average 2% across the district. E. Beatty said this is where we get rewarded for being frugal. Some other SU's can go up less than 1%. MF said we are all in a good financial situation now. Each district has at least one reserve.

7. ***Superintendent Evaluation Process for 2015-16***

E. Beatty said she invited J. Ciccolo here for conversation about the superintendent evaluation. She distributed a summary of what she envisions success would look like for next year. She said we have struggled with the superintendent evaluation. The executive committee was going to meet in April but C. McFarlane looked at collective schedules and found there was one evening in April that was available and that was used for negotiations.

One thing that seems clear is that we really value our local districts and schools. LNSU central office is held almost in disdain. She can't imagine working with more capable and nice people at central office. Morale in the office is good. Everyone is working hard and getting work done. Some of the attitude is based on old folklore. When she came to LNSU there were a couple of areas where central office fell short. She would like to say that those have been resolved. We have turned over some staff and lost some we didn't want to lose. We have a lot of evidence and data showing that our HR requests are really moving along. We get a lot of feedback on how we have improved our HR responses.

Sometimes people see central office as the “no” because it may be central office’s responsibility to implement statute, the master agreement, etc.

The national average superintendent tenure is 3 years. In Vermont, the job is harder because nowhere else has as many school boards. At a recent conference E. Beatty attended with other superintendents, people laughed when they heard we have 8 boards for 2000 kids because they come from places with one board for half a million kids. LNSU has a history of a revolving door for superintendents. There are few nights Monday through Thursday when E. Beatty is not in a meeting. Those are 14 hour days for her. She hears more from people about what she is not doing than what she is doing. She talked to some parents as Waterville who said they had thought they would see her at the holiday concert. She would like to talk about changes. She would like to get to things like holiday concerts. We have to make the superintendent job manageable. She was hired as an educational leader, but much of her time in board meetings is spent doing the same thing 8 times and there is not time to push much forward. (Harry Frank arrived at 7:59.) She finds she has been stifled sometimes by not having the authority that the superintendent should have according to statute and policy. Some board members want that authority for the board. To have all the responsibility for some decisions that aren’t hers (but ought to hers) is challenging. This is what is exciting about the possibility of consolidation. There are ways of looking at structures and schedules to make all our work more doable. We could practice for consolidation this year. We could see how Shelburne does their carousel meetings and try them ourselves. We could try on this year what it would be like to be consolidated. Another issue is that sometimes in meetings we do not model the behavior we should model for our students. We have exhibited some bystander or enabling behaviors.

J. Ciccolo said her words could have been his words. By the time 3 years as superintendent have come around you will have given so much of your life you will head either to divorce court or a psychiatrist. Sometimes the time frame of who has to approve what slows things down drastically. In neighboring SU’s more authority is given to the SU. If people are not confident in the superintendent to run things then they should hire someone different. He would invite any board member to shadow E. Beatty for a whole day. Not having direct experience of being the last person in the food chain makes it different for E. Beatty. She has risen to that. She has been involved in all the things a new superintendent should be. But she has to juggle priorities. We can talk about how to make things more efficient and move agendas along. One thing D. Whitcomb did as chair was make meetings move quickly.

D. Regan thanked E. Beatty for her reflections on what success would look like. Her statements are general. He suggested she could think about concrete indicators of success that would demonstrate these goals had been advanced. E. Beatty said she would love to do that with the board. It is tough that we have so little time.

E. Beatty and D. Whitcomb welcomed Harry Frank of VSBA. H. Frank said he came to work for VSBA because he believed that when citizens know how to use their voice effectively that is one of the most positive things for our school systems. One way to do

that is through annual evaluation of the superintendent. The board needs to determine what it is trying to accomplish. The board's job is to distill what is more important to the community and describe it in a mission statement, goals statement, etc. Then the organization knows where it is trying to go. He is curious about what the board would like to get out of the superintendent evaluation. What do board members want the superintendent to get out of it and what do they want the board to get out of it? He asked each person to answer those questions. J. Ciccolo suggested people could also talk about what they don't want.

S. Hamlyn-Prescott said she would like first to see us determine the outcomes we want. It is hard to assess how someone is doing if we don't have the specifics of what we are looking for. She has always wanted to see the same curriculum and benchmarks across all schools but we have never gotten there. In terms of the evaluation tool, sometimes it will refer to something like the superintendent's responsibility to oversee HR but it is too broad and not clear what we are looking for in each area. She would like to go back to outcomes and identify specific things we would like to see in each area – finance, HR, curriculum, etc.

J. Sander said she thinks of the evaluation as checking a road map. We decide where we want to go and what is the best route to get there and then we check every now and then how close we are and if we are following the right path.

B. Bailey said she would like leadership from the superintendent. She would like to know their vision and where they want to take us. In the evaluation we see how close she is coming to her vision.

J. Ciccolo said when the superintendent position was advertised we described what the boards were seeking in categories such as educational leadership, community interaction, etc. Those are the areas we go back to in concert with the superintendent. He has been in places where the board comes up with an evaluation the superintendent never sees. The superintendent just gets a number at the end. He would go back to the expectations when E. Beatty was hired and put together measurable benchmarks from there.

B. Penberthy said she would want for any superintendent what she would want for herself – specific feedback on how she is doing and what people are looking for her to do more of or do differently. We need to decide whether we are looking for something different now than we were looking for when E. Beatty was first hired.

R. Walters said she wants to see a process – not something that is once a year but an ongoing conversation that informs the work of the superintendent and board. We should hold desired outcomes front and center and assess how we are doing at moving toward those. And we should ensure that the board is informed enough to support the work of the district.

C. McFarlane said she thinks an evaluation should not be set up to be punitive. It should be informative and constructive for the board and superintendent and should set the path.

E. Beatty said she thinks the best evaluation is ongoing and formative. We talked earlier about a growth mindset – what we want more of and less of.

D. Whitcomb said he thinks the superintendent evaluation should be the same as the evaluation of any person you hire. Are they doing the job you hired them for satisfactorily so principals, staff, and school board members know what is going on? We need to make them stick to the contract and what you hired them for. He stated to the Eden board recently that if we cannot talk to each other and we are restricted in who we can talk to, we can keep a lousy superintendent and a lousy principal forever. We are paying a person to do a job and we have to know if the person is doing the job right. We have to talk to people in the superintendent's office to know what is happening. Board members have to talk to each other. The superintendent should be the most well known person in the school. He saw a teacher walk up and introduce himself to the superintendent, now knowing who she was. He was disgusted. H. Frank asked if that is in the job description. D. Whitcomb said he doesn't know. H. Frank said the board has to describe what it expects as a body and hold the superintendent to that.

J. Hunsberger said he is a fan of the appreciative inquiry process, which he has studied and used, and of 360 evaluations. A 360 evaluation would give an opportunity for feedback from people under the superintendent's supervision and youth, who deserve a voice if they are informed enough. He thinks the evaluation needs to be a celebration of that person's accomplishments and strengths, identifying issues that need to be addressed and forming plans for how the person can capitalize on their strengths and on the strengths of staff.

D. Regan said he is not much interested in a thumbs up or thumbs down evaluation. This SU has had a lot of turnover in leadership. He wants the superintendent to succeed. If there is an egregious mismatch it shouldn't take an annual evaluation to ferret it out. He is interested in a continuous improvement model. He would identify and focus on concrete areas and steps leading to continuous improvement, and also improvement steps for boards.

K. Orost said what she wants to get from an evaluation is feedback. She wants to hear what E. Beatty thinks she is doing. She wants a report card on her board from E. Beatty. She would like to set goals for next year and have a mid-year check in. She would like to set expectations so all are on the same page. She would like to discuss with the superintendent development opportunities and hear if there is not time for her to go to all board meetings and community events.

H. Frank said it sounds to him like there are lots of common themes. The number one clearest message was that we should be clear about the outcomes we expect. What are those? How do we describe them clearly? There are places to work from. There were also a couple of comments that priorities may now be different from when the job description was developed and the superintendent needs a conversation with board members about that. Someone also mentioned the question of what the superintendent's goals are.

A methodology the board could use is a 360 degree process where the board asks for feedback from members of the school system and the community. Those people don't evaluate; they provide the board with information or feedback. We need to be clear about that distinction. A 360 degree process also has its limitations, as does any tool. There are some cautions with doing evaluations. He would suggest the task is continuous improvement. If there is a completely unworkable situation, that is probably evident. We are in the mode of asking how we work together to make this successful. One board responsibility is cultivating good leadership.

H. Frank distributed an outline for a 360 degree evaluation of a superintendent and a work plan for an evaluation. He said the board needs to let community, board members, staff, and students know what the board is doing and why and what the board is learning in the process.

H. Frank asked if the board wants to have someone like himself orchestrate an evaluation process. What it would look like in the end would be a function of the board's planning team. He would suggest putting together a planning team to develop details of an evaluation plan.

D. Whitcomb asked if this service would be paid for from the dues we already pay if VSBA would want more money. H. Frank said our dues would not pay for it. It would cost \$1000.

MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to hire VSBA and pay the fee of \$1000 to help the board do the superintendent evaluation, seconded by J. Sander. R. Walters said she doesn't think we have ever been able to pull off a superintendent evaluation since she has been on the board. She thinks we could get the money back in increased efficiency and job satisfaction in less than a month of E. Beatty's time. K. Orost asked about the time frame. H. Frank said it has been done in less than 6 weeks. D. Whitcomb asked if we can see what has been done elsewhere so we can see what we will get for our \$1000. H. Frank said he thinks there is a way he could show an example of a final report without violating confidentiality. A lot of what the board is paying for is the conversations. **The motion was passed.**

H. Frank said he will follow up with D. Whitcomb and administration. He suggests moving forward with the evaluation quickly. We can discuss whether to work on it during the summer or wait until fall.

D. Whitcomb said one thing he doesn't want to see is questions for the board about things like how E. Beatty works with AOE.

8. ***Adjourn***

MOTION: D. Regan moved to adjourn at 8:40, R. Walters seconded, and the motion was passed.

Submitted by Donna Griffiths

Actions taken at the LNSU Executive Committee meeting 6-18-15:

1. *Call to Order, Approval of Agenda and Public Comment*
MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to approve the agenda, D. Regan seconded, and the motion was passed.
3. *Approve Food Service Contracts*
MOTION: K. Orost moved to accept the decisions of the Johnson and Cambridge school boards to award food service contracts for 2015-2016 to The Abbey Group and to appoint the business manager as their representative in executing both contracts on their behalf, seconded by R. Walters. The motion was passed.
5. *Negotiations Updates*
MOTION: R. Walters moved to enter executive session because the district would be placed at a substantial disadvantage by premature general public knowledge to discuss support staff negotiations, inviting M. Frederick, E. Beatty, and C. McFarlane to remain, seconded by J. Hunsberger, the motion was passed, and the committee entered executive session at 7:01.

MOTION: It was moved and seconded to enter executive session because the district would be placed at a substantial disadvantage by premature general public knowledge to discuss teacher contract negotiations, inviting M. Frederick, E. Beatty, and C. McFarlane to remain, the motion was passed, and the committee entered executive session at 7:17.
6. *Superintendent's Report*
MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to offer the Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Instruction position to Jade Hazard, seconded by J. Sander. The motion was passed.
7. *Superintendent Evaluation Process for 2015-16*
MOTION: B. Penberthy moved to hire VSBA and pay the fee of \$1000 to help the board do the superintendent evaluation, seconded by J. Sander. The motion was passed.
8. *Adjourn*
MOTION: D. Regan moved to adjourn at 8:40, R. Walters seconded, and the motion was passed.