



Poudre School District Board of Education

2407 Laporte Avenue, Fort Collins, CO 80521 • 970-490-3607

Meeting Minutes

Minutes from Special Business Meeting

February 20, 2017

SPECIAL BUSINESS MEETING – 5:00 p.m.

PRESENT: President Cathy Kipp and Vice President David Trask; Directors Christophe Febvre, Susan Gutowsky, Carolyn Reed, and Rob Petterson; Superintendent Sandra Smyser; Legal and Policy Counsel Tom Crabb

ABSENT: Director Nate Donovan

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

President Kipp called the special meeting to order at 5:06 p.m.

2.0 WORK TOPICS

2.1 Superintendent Evaluation Instrument

A Board subcommittee of Directors Febvre and Petterson presented a handout and information they have gathered to help the Board create a new Superintendent evaluation tool.

The subcommittee proposes to adopt the Washington Standards-Based Superintendent Evaluation format, include Superintendent input on the new evaluation, add a summary paragraph that gives overall perspective of the Superintendent's performance, use a 360 degree feedback evaluation instrument and maintain current practice of feedback three times a year.

After introducing the topics, the subcommittee asked the Board and Superintendent for their thoughts on using the Washington Standards-Based format.

The Superintendent felt it is an improvement over what is used now. If it is used, it can be modified to fit our school district.

Is this format compatible with the current Superintendent's contract? The Board needs the ability to note things outside of the just the standards-based rubrics.

The evaluation does not need to line up perfectly with the Superintendent's contract. The district can link the two documents together. They are not exclusive. The evaluation does not

need to link directly to the Superintendent's contract renewal. If issues are not noted on an evaluation, it does not limit the Board from taking action.

Overall, the Board is okay with using this new rubric. It will help the Board look at things such as evidence in student achievement. There are questions on specific areas. The Board will continue discussions to clarify all points of the evaluation.

Specific Content Area Discussion included:

- On Standard 1 – Strand 1 – “Advancing a district-wide shared vision for learning.” Add to that “...consistent with the district ends.”
- On Standard 2 – no comments or questions on this standard.
- On Standard 3 – add to strand 1 – “...consistent with Board policies.”
- On Standard 4 – What does collaborating with community members and families look like? Discussion about how this might relate to diversity in our district.
- On Standard 5 – no questions or comments on this standard.
- On Standard 6 – no comments or questions on this standard.
- On Standard 7 – no comments or questions on this standard.

Guidelines to complete the new Superintendent Evaluation form:

- Rubric areas do not need to be circled from a legal standpoint, but can be and the Board agreed to circle rubric or check the appropriate boxes on the form.
- In addition, the Board will add comments and feedback explaining their position.
- Board members will complete the form individually and then meet as a group to decide on the finalized version.

Superintendent Smyser noted how this kind of rubric functions for teachers. It allows for bringing evidence to the table from both sides.

Is the document vigorous enough for the district to understand whether or not we are effectively fostering student learning and delivering on district ends? Yes; this document is all encompassing in terms of noting student achievement.

Regarding an overall summary paragraph at the end of the evaluation – is it necessary when there are comments and feedback under each section? Or is it good to have a paragraph at the end that gives an overall view of how all the parts came together? It seems like putting a collective statement at the end of the evaluation may be unnecessary. The Board agreed not to put an overall summary at the end of the evaluation.

Is it necessary to have a document that the Board uses throughout the year to make note, as things come up, of changes needed to the evaluation tool? No; this seems unnecessary for the first year, but can be adjusted at some point in the future.

Is there a need to add goals for focus areas? How are these communicated now? Do those specific items get slotted into the evaluation somehow? Any numeric goals added to the evaluation should be meaningful. In the past, goals had a specified end date.

The Board agreed to keep focus areas from the last evaluation – the academic ones and the long range plan. Superintendent Smyser will meet with Director of Research and Evaluation Dwayne Schmitz and come back to discuss with the Board specific academic numerical measures. For the long range plan goals, “Progress acceptable to the Board” will be used in the evaluation.

Should social emotional support and effective use of education technology be included in goals? No; these items are better as agenda discussion items.

President Kipp will draft a sentence on the specifics of the academic piece; a sentence saying when and what exactly is needed in that area. Director Petterson will draft a sentence on the specifics for the long range plan. At the March 21st Board of Education meeting, the Board will agree on these specific pieces to include in the official evaluation form.

Should 360 degree feedback be included as part of the evaluation process? It was used a couple of years ago. The feedback was not necessarily relevant to the Superintendent’s performance.

The Board noted that it would be helpful to get input from Cabinet members. The Superintendent will come back with a proposal for how this looks – broad, limited, the mechanics of it, who gets to see it, etc.

3.0 ADJOURNMENT

Board meeting ended at 7:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kyla Davis
Assistant Secretary to the Board of Education