

**Redmond School District
School Board Work Session
February 20, 2013**

In Attendance: Chair Cathy Miller, Vice-Chair AJ Losoya, Directors Ric Little, Bob Perry, Patricia Reck, Superintendent Mike McIntosh, RSD Staff; Linda Seeberg, Trish Huspek

Chair Cathy Miller called the meeting to order with a quorum of five at 11:35 a.m.

WORK SESSION

Cathy Miller reported that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss the superintendent evaluation criteria and format.

She presented Board Policies CBA – Qualifications and Duties of the Superintendent, CBG – Evaluation of the Superintendent and a copy of the evaluation tool that was used last year for Shay Mikalson.

Objectives of the meeting:

1. To ensure the Board is meeting the contractual evaluation requirements
2. Review board policy CBA to determine if revisions are necessary
3. Discussion with superintendent to ensure alignment of the goals, expectations and priorities of the Board.

Qualifications and Duties of the Superintendent – Policy CBA

Board members reviewed the policy. There was discussion regarding the responsibilities and if there is a need for updating any of the items listed.

Superintendent McIntosh stated that he reviewed the policy and the current responsibilities listed are still relevant. The list is inclusive but shallow in description. Each responsibility is a major bullet and under them are many sub bullets. “I think we have done some serious work on agreeing on the focus areas of our district, the first being student achievement. The second is the climate and culture and the third major one the Board has implied has been the communication piece. These three are broad categories that the 37 listed in the policy fall under. What we need to determine is the measuring process to identify if the established goals are achieved.”

Pat Reck stated, “We need to focus and be grateful that we have a superintendent that has been in the trenches and has more experience than many of the superintendents in the state. He knows the enormity of the job and when it comes to his review we must respect his credentials and experience and the feedback from his colleagues. What we write into our policies regarding what the duties of a superintendent is more relevant than what comes out of OSBA.”

After discussion there was a consensus from board members no changes need to be made to the policy. It is still consistent with the goals and vision of the district.

CBG – Evaluation of the Superintendent

Cathy Miller confirmed the policy is consistent with current contractual language. She further stated the board and superintendent need to agree on when the annual evaluation would take place. She asked if June would be an appropriate time frame for that review.

Superintendent McIntosh stated that he believes June would be an appropriate time for the evaluation. He is working on the strategic plan – will have some milestones to report to the board shortly. The Achievement

Compact team will be given the opportunity to vet that report next month. In addition he is planning to survey, in cooperation with the associations, staff and community members. It would be his preference that the current school board delivers his first evaluation.

AJ Losoya stated that this year will be a unique year because there is still a lot of transition happening. “The work that is currently being accomplished will make next year’s review that much easier. After this year there shouldn’t be confusion about what the goals are.”

Cathy Miller stated that because this is a transition year, she asked Superintendent McIntosh who he feels should have input into his evaluation. Should it just be the board members or should it include additional input from building principals

Superintendent McIntosh stated, “What I don’t want to do is to have the evaluation process distract from our day job. I have a high functioning team who is being diligent in pursuing our priorities. On the other hand, I remember when the building administrators had a meeting with a board member to provide their input regarding the superintendent’s progress. I would recommend each board member meet with their assigned school principal to get feedback from them regarding my progress. I would also recommend including a teacher representative, classified staff member, and association representatives. That would provide the board a clear perspective of what is happening in the district.”

Linda Seeberg stated they have spent a great deal of time redoing the teacher evaluation system. One of those components is objective data. Part of the redesign has been about how to gather evidence of effectiveness by taking our personal bias of consideration. She recommends that whatever decision is made on how to gather the data, there should be consistency in the questions that are asked and that the questions are asked in the same way.

Ric Little stated that it will be important to have the same consistent questions to obtain valid feedback. He stated that the Board should develop the questions that would be used.

Bob Perry stated that he strongly believes the evaluation should be based on, Mike’s day job. “I want to see if Mike is doing the job he has been hired for.” He stated that he is not in support of the current evaluation tool because of the lack of detail listed.

AJ Losoya stated that the current tool may be a basic form and that there could be more detail. “I don’t want to evaluate Mike on his day to day job. I am interested in a forty thousand foot level. We need to identify goals and then evaluate how we did throughout the year.”

Pat Reck stated that the bulleted items need to be more job specific than what they are.

Ric Little stated that, “What Mike does on a daily basis add up to if he will succeed or fail. The hardest part is the measurement process. We must boil it down to what is most important to the board and then provide feedback on that.”

Superintendent McIntosh stated, “In the district we have long range goals, the big picture on where we are going and what we stand for. Then there are the everyday items, the things that we can’t predict, the things that blind side us because of something that happens across the nation. That is the complexity of what we do as a superintendent and staff. If you are getting the day to day stuff done, you might be neglecting another area. That is a snapshot of how my world is divided.”

Bob Perry stated that Mike should develop his objectives and metrics and then the board evaluates if he achieved those. He doesn’t necessarily believe an evaluation is an annual thing. It should happen at every board meeting to check in to see how things are going.

AJ Losoya stated that it is the board's responsibility to identify what the evaluation criteria will be.

Cathy Miller stated that what she has heard is that the board needs to agree on four or five key things the board will hold the superintendent responsible for and then the board will work on identifying how to measure progress.

Pat Reck stated that she believes the current outline is usable with some modifications.

Superintendent McIntosh stated that we do evaluations because we want to improve instruction. "The evaluation process should be about ways to improve my leadership so that I can improve the district and change the momentum of the district. We need to identify what this process yield in the end."

Cathy Miller stated the board needs to identify what the expectations/priorities are of the superintendent to lead the district. After an extended conversation the board identified the following as priorities.

1. Proficiency/Academic Achievement
2. Climate of Collaboration/Professional and Student Growth
3. Long Range Planning
4. Sustainability

Superintendent McIntosh stated that he would appreciate candid/constructive feedback because that is what will continue to shape him as a leader. I know that there are always ways to improve and I want to do that. I have confidence in the relationship that I have with the board."

Superintendent McIntosh provided the board a copy of a document that has been created as part of the strategic plan. All of the areas listed above are captured in the document. After reviewing and discussing the document with the board, the following agreements were made:

- This is a transition year
- The board will not go with a traditional evaluation this year
- Superintendent McIntosh will provide a year-end summation on outcomes related to the four priorities and the development of the strategic plan (May)
- A written evaluation (Executive Summary by the Board) will be provided in June
- Superintendent McIntosh welcomes (quarterly) feedback discussion with the board
- The current board will create/establish an evaluation tool that will be implemented next year so that the incoming board has something to begin with. The tool will be based on the goals of the strategic plan.

ADJOURN

The work session adjourned at 1:25pm.

Cathy Miller, Board Chair

Trish Huspek, Executive Assistant