

**GREENFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE**

MINUTES

November 17, 2009

Library, Greenfield High School

Approved December 10, 2009

Present: Chairperson Doyle; Committee Members Athey, Calderwood, Day, Lunt, McCormic, Mayor Martin. Also Present: Interim Superintendent Hollins, Attorney Peter Smith, (arrived at 6:21 p.m.), members of the public and press.

I. Call to order: With a quorum present Chairperson Doyle called the meeting to order at 6:12 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes:

Chairperson Doyle first responded to comments made by D. Athey at the last meeting & Mr. Athey responded. **J. Lunt moved to address the minutes as one block**, M. Calderwood seconded.

[Minutes of September 10, 2009; September 24, 2009; October 8, 2009; & October 22, 2009.]

Discussion: Re: September 10 minutes, Mayor not listed as present; he attended at 6:21 p.m. Re: October 8th minutes, WIKI spelled incorrectly. Passed. Unanimous.

III. Superintendent Evaluation: J. Lunt explained the Superintendent Evaluation instrument given to members previously and explained that multiple materials were reviewed to develop the instrument. The document's intention is to provide opportunity to comment/address any issues and not to prevent setting goals. **Motion by McCormic; 2nd Mayor Martin: To accept the Superintendent Evaluation Instrument as written [1st friendly amendment by JL & KM] and that for each of the six standards, the superintendent performance ratings (to select one) will be Poor, Needs Improvement, Good or Excellent.**

Discussion: J. Lunt suggests removing sentence about time. McCormic reflects on striking the sentence "The committee should take into account situations where this is not the case. **[Second friendly amendment by JL & KM] striking the 5th paragraph to the introduction. Pass. McCormic abstains.**

Calderwood had three recommendations to change instrument:

- adding a time line requirement to paragraph 5 of Introduction statement re: the appropriate selection and development of her staff (administrative and support staff)
- altering rating range to include 5th option of Poor. Suggested that if extreme rating of Outstanding were to be incorporated there needed to be a counterpoint at the other end
- adjusting spacing to allow adequate room for comments when converting to PDF.

There is a long discussion about the instrument and process.

Motion by Calderwood; 2nd Athey: [3rd friendly amendment] Change 6.1 to delete "acts resourcefully." 2 in Favor; 5 Against. Motion Fails.

K. McCormic asks unanimous consent for rendering the document gender neutral and allowing for typographical changes. Consensus given. Motion by McCormic; 2nd Calderwood: Amend 4th paragraph of preamble to insert "requested" before "has" and "hired the" before "supporting. Lunt, McCormic, & Athey for; 4 against. Motion fails.

Motion by Lunt/2nd Doyle: To strike paragraph 4. Comment: There are things beyond the Superintendent's control, e.g. budget, and that is a legitimate point to make. Doyle, McCormic, Lunt for; 4 opposed. **Motion fails.**

Mayor Martin leaves at 7:07 p.m.

Motion by McCormic; 2nd Doyle: To amend 2.6 to read: "Collaborates with the school committee to set measurable annual goals to achieve compliance with legal mandates and school committee policy as well as other goals, as appropriate. Passed. Unanimous.
Discussion of difference between performance indicators and goals.

Motion by Lunt; 2nd Doyle: Change language of preamble to "The rating applies to the superintendent's overall performance." Passed. Unanimous.

John Lunt comments that the Superintendent Evaluation will be file CBI-E1, an exhibit.

Time line: Discussion of relevance and verbiage of paragraph 5 of introduction page; Recommendation to defer paragraph 6.1(Human Resources and labor relations) as it covers the same information.

JL moved (friendly amendment) to amend document to strike paragraph 5 of the introduction. MC 2nd; motion carried; KM abstained

MC then asked for clarification about the word "resourcefully" (in section 6.1) as it pertains to the organization. Much discussion about the possible interpretations of the word as well as all other adverbs in the evaluation instrument.

JL reminded folks that a tremendous amount of time an effort that subcommittee put in on this document and requested a motion be put forth

MC moved to amend document to change 6.1 under standard 6 to read simply "to recruit and train personnel to meet human resources needs of the district..." and to remove "acts resourcefully to" from that sentence.

DA 2nd; MC, DA in favor, all others opposed; motion fails.

DD asked the question "Who is charged with the evaluation?" JL explained that it was the subcommittee's job to propose the instrument to help structure the evaluation but it is the school committee's job to do the actual review of the Superintendent. DA suggested that the school committee can elicit the opinions of others if they see fit. JL noted that as a matter of policy this is correct; KM agreed with one caveat...if SC member is relaying opinion of constituent(s) that it be noted in the comments.

DA couple of questions: Noted that the preamble model assumes that superintendent has the budget and supporting administrative staff. Also important to note that this is a fundamental responsibility of the superintendent to ask for whatever is necessary to run the district. If requests are not honored by the town then that's good justification if something doesn't happen. But if requests are not made, that goes to the competency of Superintendent.

KM offered friendly amendment to original motion that 4th paragraph of preamble to read: "This model assumes the Superintendent has requested the budget and hired the administrative staff to successfully accomplish the work of the office. It also allow for the Superintendent making priority decisions when resources are constrained." ME 2nd

Discussion: Much discussion about the merits and constraints of paragraph 4...

JL, DA, KM vote in favor; DD, MD, MC, MM opposed; motion fails

JL offered friendly amendment to remove paragraph 4 be stricken from the front page; DD 2nd.

Discussion: DA in favor of keeping paragraph, suggesting that Superintendent would want to keep this item. MD pointed out that this page is not part of the instrument itself and suggested that no more time be spent on this preamble.

JL, KM, MC vote in favor; All others opposed; motion fails

Mayor Martin left @ 7:07.

DA's other question: Within the document there are no core, critical measurables included in the evaluation document. Where does that happen? Is this document in its entirety that will be used to evaluate the Superintendent? Document does not refer to contract (where goals would be cited).

JL – specific annual goals set between School Committee and Superintendent determine the measurables (section 2.6) Purpose of document meant to express the will of the School Committee.

SH commented that the role of superintendent is to follow the laws of the land as well as policies set by SC and system...Instrument is general.

DD looking for ideas on what this would look like. DA – suggested having 3-5 key measurables in addition having a document citing expected behaviors/ outcomes appropriate for the job.

KM made amendment to motion to replace section 2.6 with sentence: “Collaborates with SC to set measurable annual goals to achieve compliance with legal mandates as well as other goals as appropriate.” Unanimous.

Continued discussion about the ratings/performance indicators and how they applied to each section.

JL - Friendly amendment....change language on each standard page to read “Superintendent’s overall performance for this standard, circle one..” DA 2nd – all in favor.

Original motion with 5 friendly amendments:

Motion: To accept superintendent’s evaluation instrument as written with the following friendly amendments:

- 1. Friendly amendment to change the superintendent performance ratings to be Poor, Needs Improvement, Good or Excellent**
- 2. Friendly amendment to strike paragraph 5 of the introduction**
- 3. Friendly amendment to address typos in general and make language gender neutral**
- 4. Friendly amendment to replace section 2.6 with sentence: “Collaborates with SC to set measurable annual goals to achieve compliance with legal mandates as well as other goals as appropriate.**
- 5. Friendly amendment to change language on each “standard” page to read “Superintendent’s overall performance for this standard, circle one.**

Unanimous vote: Policy CBI/Exhibit 1

Goal and Review Timelines (CBI/Exhibit 2)

1. Mutually agreed upon goal development– to be completed NLT 8/31
2. Feedback provided to the Superintendent throughout the year
3. Formal Review – Begin in May – summary document by mid-June
4. Interim review by October 31 (1st contract year)
5. Provision for final contract year – 6 month notice for non-renewal. (by November 30th)

Much discussion ensued about each item. SH recommended changing from an exhibit to a policy.

Changes to read:

1. Mutually agreed upon goal development for upcoming school year will be developed in the summer. Goal development to be completed NLT 8/31
 - A. Goals to be specific and may include core goals and ambitious stretch goals and will be accomplished within the year.
2. Feedback provided to the Superintendent by all committee members throughout the year
3. Formal annual evaluation of the Superintendent to begin in May using the approved evaluation instrument and the mutually agreed upon goals.
 - A. Summary review document to be released by no later than the end of July)
4. Initial year, interim review to occur after no more than 4 months from start date
5. Provision for final contract year – 6 month notice for non-renewal. (by November 30th)

5 stricken will be stricken on written to policy.

Unanimous vote

Superintendent passed out a document with goals that the school committee has voted through their decisions. Attorney Smith clarified that now goals have been proposed. When these are discussed, ti should be in executive session.

Doris Doyle left at 8:21 p.m.

IV. Ratification of Caucus Declaration

KM moved to have the Committee ratify the Joint Declaration of the Franklin County School Committee Caucus by the Franklin County School Committees developed and ratified November 7th, 2009, at the Franklin County School Committee summit. **2nd by Marcia Day. Passed. Unanimous.**

KM motioned to adjourn. All seconded. Meeting adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Audrey LaBonté