

**MINUTES OF THE
Special Meeting of the
DOUGLAS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES SUBCOMMITTEE
Administrative Services Building
January 5, 2012
3:00 p.m.**

**Minutes Approved
February 14, 2012**

Present:

Trustees:

Sharla Hales
Teri Jamin

President
Board Member

Personnel:

Lisa Noonan, Superintendent

1. Call to Order

Mrs. Hales called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m. and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment

Public comments on items other than topics on the agenda were called for. There were no comments offered.

**2. Revision of Superintendent Evaluation Forms
(Information and Discussion)**

A section of the draft Minutes from the December 13, 2011 Regular Meeting pertaining to suggestions made by Trustees for revisions to the superintendent evaluation forms was available. In order to improve the superintendent evaluation scoring system, committee members discussed all of these suggestions through the course of this committee meeting, in order to make a recommendation to the Board at the Regular January Board Meeting. Alignment of the scoring terms with the upcoming, legislated, teacher evaluation system was desired. Therefore, the rating terminology would include highly effective, effective, minimally effective, and ineffective, in the same manner as future staff evaluations. Statewide, evaluations would use student achievement data as 50% of future evaluations.

Mrs. Trigg was not present, but provided ideas to both Dr. Noonan and Mrs. Hales that were considered throughout this discussion.

Dr. Noonan stated Brian Frazier could prepare an online survey for evaluation responses that would automatically compile ratings and comments in a format determined by the Board. A concern was raised regarding the unknown amount of time to set up the survey format. Mr. Frazier was commended for working many extra hours to prepare the evaluation surveys. The time and effort necessary still needed to be addressed.

The following points were discussed:

- 1) The number of bubbles to use for rating. For example, a bubble representing the four rating terms (listed above) vs. incorporating levels in between those main ratings in order to reflect the best evaluation. It was determined that the 4 main categories, with one bubble in between (7 total bubbles on the scale) would convey a desirable rating range.
- 2) The number of points assigned to each bubble. Using a range of 7 bubbles, points would be equivalent to 0,0,1,2,3,4,5.
- 3) The percentage each part of the evaluation would weigh in was considered.
- 4) Whether or not a need existed to create a list of definitions (a key) that might contain examples, to assist Board Members in determining how to categorize their ideas around a question in order to provide a rating.
- 5) A suggestion was made that the evaluation summary might be used as a guiding document. An addition of an explanation regarding interpretation of the range of rating might assist new Board Members in evaluating their superintendent. Also, new Board Members might meet either with the superintendent or Board President to learn about the evaluation process and forms.
- 6) Although not part of the evaluation system, a suggestion was made that a document could be written to outline support for an incoming superintendent to assist with transition.

Mrs. Hales called for comments from the public. There were none.

- 7) Written comments would be included, anonymously, and a box available per section (not per question) for Trustees to elaborate.
- 8) A suggestion was made to provide a cover sheet with explanations for use when completing the three part evaluation. Information might include: A) Comments will be anonymous, but grammar unchanged; B) The document will be public; C) Due date; D) Instructions; E) Survey answers on perception section from non-Board Members would inform decisions, but not be tallied into the ratings.
- 9) Part 1 and Part 3 were noted as subjective. Part 2 was quantifiable creating a balance in the system.
- 10) Information gathered from other groups was desirable, although this information would be carefully considered by the Board in the future, not averaged into the evaluation score. The 360° outlook, perception of various personnel was valued to gain information on areas the Board did not typically encounter in their realm of involvement. Value would be placed on this information received via public awareness and transparency, overall.

Various sections of the three part evaluation were discussed.

Comments for Part 2 – Data Dashboard:

- 1) The superintendent explanation column would remain as valuable information.
- 2) The Board Member notes column would remain.
- 3) Rating options included: a) placing one rate at the end of Part 2; b) rate page by page; c) Instead of individual ratings per page, each Strategic Plan goal could receive a rating.
- 4) The dashboard format would continue to change and improve, including the information contained therein as determined by order of importance.
- 5) The line item for student enrollment should not be rated.

- 6) If one rating box per goal is maintained, a Trustee could use their own system with regard to producing an overall numeric rating for Part 2.
- 7) Goals would be equally weighted, with one box for written comments per goal.
- 8) This system would create 5 total sections. An average rating number would result from the 5 sections for Part 2.
- 9) "For Information Only" should be placed on the last page of the dashboard.

Comments for Part 1 – Progress of Efforts (MBOs)

- 1) Part 1 currently does not provide an opportunity to rate the superintendent on questions in Part 3.
- 2) The rating section would be changed to reflect the new terms of effectiveness.
- 3) Each MBO (Strategic Plan Goal) would have one rating. The evaluation heading would change in this section to Strategic Plan Goals, instead of MBO's.
- 4) The end rating result would be an average of the 6 goals for Part 1.

Comments for Part 3 – Perception

- 1) Section 1 pertains more to Part 1 than Part 3.
- 2) Averaging Board ratings with others who took the survey was unusual when the Board is performing the evaluation.
- 3) Part 3 would have a single numeric rating and the terms for rating would be changed in this section, as well.

Mrs. Hales called for comments from the public.

Scott McCullough commented on the thoroughness of the evaluation process, and stated keeping it simple, was best.

Through discussion it was noted a recommendation to the Board would be to have the Board ratings calculated on the survey/evaluation. Feedback from staff and employee groups would provide information to the Board for consideration.

Following a discussion of the weight to be given to each section of the evaluation, Mrs. Hales stated a recommendation would be made to the Board to have Part 1, Progress on Efforts (MBOs) equal 25%; Part 2, Data dashboard – 50%; and Part 3, Perception - 25%.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Submitted by,

Carolyn Moore
Secretary to the Board of Trustees

Approved:

Clerk of the Board

Note: Upon approval by the Board of Trustees in a public meeting, these minutes become the official minutes of the meeting held on the above date. Board minutes are kept on a permanent basis and are available for public review in the office of the Superintendent.