

**GREENFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS
SCHOOL COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES: Thursday, September 22, 2016
141 Davis Street, Greenfield MA
Approved 10.12.2016**

Present: Don Alexander (DA); Timothy Farrell (TF) (arrived 5:46); Jordana Harper, Superintendent (JH); Susan Hollins (SH); William Martin (WM); Adrienne Nunez (AN); Nathaniel Tripp (NT); Cameron Ward (CW) (arrived 5:53). **Absent:** none
Also present: Beth Pratt, Assistant Supt., and other school staff.

I. Call to Order

With a quorum present (DA; SH, WM, AN, NT), Vice-Chair Nunez opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

II. Public Comment

none

III. Personnel Subcommittee Recommendation and Superintendent Evaluation

NT summarized process and current status of superintendent evaluation for 2015-16 school year. NT moved to adopt the Superintendent's Proposed Summative Evaluation Report Self Evaluation as the Committee's evaluation for 2015-16. Motion failed for lack of 2nd.

WM moved to provide Superintendent Harper a summative evaluation reading of Proficient for the 2015-16 school year, and authorize the contracted salary advancement of \$141,000 for 2016-17. SH 2nd.

Discussion:

Current School Cte members haven't had benefit of training on evaluation process.

Review of contract language re: evaluation, salary

Deadlines from DESE and contract: Deadline to set next year's goals by Sept. 30; however, PARCC student data necessary to goal-setting not released until December last year, late September this year. JH is flexible re: contract's goal-setting deadline.

Options in process to complete 2015-16. Priority to move on to 2016-17 evaluation.

Evaluation Step 1: Assess Progress Toward Goals

By consensus, the Committee agreed on an evaluation of "met" for Supt's 4 performance goals:

Goal 1 = MET

Curriculum Alignment: By the end of the 2015-2016 school year, the district will have taken measurable steps to create an aligned curriculum, including use of common assessment, in keeping with district's Strategic Plan.

Goal 2 = MET

Leadership Team Development and Communication: Build on positive relationships developed in year 1 to further develop capacity of leadership team and cabinet, strengthen school and community partnerships, and increase opportunities for family engagement and welcoming new families to the district.

Goal 3 = MET

New Superintendent Induction Program: Refine skills in strategy development, data analysis, and instructional leadership by completing the second year of the New Superintendent Induction Program, including a focus on Action Planning and Implementation of the District's Strategic Plan.

Discussion: JH worked with mentor Kevin Courtney first two years. Third year is meeting with area superintendents for shared problem-solving. Praise for JH's monthly reports as detailed, connected to goals.

Goal 4 = MET

Fair, Effective Classroom Teacher Evaluation: The 2015-16 school year reflects only the second full year of the new Educator Evaluation system in Greenfield Public Schools. DESE has indicated that while most districts phased the Ed Eval system in over two years, Greenfield lags behind and therefore must complete Ed Eval on an accelerated pace. All principals, teachers, and Central Office staff will participate in the Educator Evaluation System including self-assessment, goal setting, formative and summative evaluations, and progress towards goals. Pursuing this goal will help a district implement the new educator evaluation system at the same time as the district leadership team is strengthened in ways that will lead to improvements in teaching and learning districtwide.

Discussion:

Amend second-last bullet point: Evaluated all principals according to MA DESE Ed Eval System using PARCC, pending release of data.

GPS delayed in starting Ed Eval due to lack of union agreement to proceed.

Evaluation Step 2: Assess Performance on Standards

Standard I: Instructional Leadership

Curriculum; Instruction; Assessment; Evaluation; Data-Informed Decision Making

Discussion:

Self-evaluation included "abundance of documentation."

Going forward, desire to include feedback from schools in evaluation process.

WM requests % of GPS teachers rated exemplary, proficient, etc. JH to provide.

TF moved, for the superintendent performance ratings for Instructional Leadership, to accept the self-evaluation as written in all five categories, with an overall evaluation for Standard I of Proficient. CW 2nd.

[That is: 1-A Curriculum = Exemplary; 1-B Instruction = Exemplary; 1-C Assessment = Exemplary; Evaluation = Proficient; Data-Informed Decision Making = Exemplary]

Motion passed 6-1 (SH no).

Standard II: Management and Operations

Environment; Human Resources Management and Development; Scheduling and Management Information Systems; Law, Ethics, and Policies; Fiscal Systems.

TF moved, for the superintendent performance ratings for Management and Operations, to accept the self-evaluation as written in all five categories, with an overall evaluation for Standard II of Proficient. NT 2nd.

[That is: II-A Environment = Exemplary; II-B Human Resources Management and Development = Proficient; II-C Scheduling and Management Information Systems = Proficient; II-D Law, Ethics, and Policies = Exemplary; Fiscal Systems = Proficient]

Motion passed 6-0-1 (SH abstain).

Standard III. Family and Community Engagement

Engagement; Sharing Responsibility; Communication; Family Concerns

TF moved, for the superintendent performance ratings for Family and Community Engagement, to accept the self-evaluation as written in all four categories, with an overall evaluation for Standard III of Proficient. CW 2nd.

[That is, III-A Engagement = Proficient; III-B Sharing Responsibility = Exemplary; III-C Communication = Proficient; III-D Family Concerns = Exemplary]

Motion passed 6-0-1 (SH abstain).

Standard IV. Professional Culture

Commitment to High Standards; Cultural Proficiency; Communication; Continuous Learning; Shared Vision; Managing Conflict.

TF moved, for the superintendent performance ratings for Professional Culture, to accept the self-evaluation as written in all six categories, with an overall evaluation for Standard IV of Proficient. WM 2nd.

[That is: IV-A Commitment to High Standards = Exemplary; IV-B Cultural Proficiency = Proficient; IV-C Communication = Exemplary; IV-D Continuous Learning = Proficient; IV-E Shared Vision = Exemplary; IV-F Managing Conflict = Proficient]

Discussion: Supt is gifted in communication (written and verbal), marketing. Consider area for improvement: responding to disagreements.

Motion passed 6-0-1 (SH abstains).

Evaluation Step 4: Impact on Student Learning

Consensus: Moderate

Evaluation Step 5: Evaluator Comments

Consensus to include this statement as Comments, in place of the self-evaluation Comments.

The newly seated Greenfield School Committee took office January 1, 2016 with the newest member being appointed in September 2016. As a body we have not had the benefit of specific training on the Superintendent evaluation process. On September 22, 2016, we reached consensus to offer Superintendent Harper an overall summative evaluation rating of Proficient for the 2015-16 school year.

Consideration of original motion:

WM moved to provide Superintendent Harper a summative evaluation reading of “proficient” for the 2015-16 school year, and authorize the contracted salary advancement of \$141,000 for 2016-17. SH 2nd. Motion passed unanimously.

Next steps:

Personnel Subcte to create clean, final document.

WM recommends MOU to extend contract's Sept. 30 deadline for setting goals. Supt and TF will meet.

IV. Other Business

WM move that Chair instruct the Superintendent to release the executive session minutes of December 30, 2015, as requested by Attorney General. SH 2nd.

Discussion:

Is motion necessary? JH already complying with Attorney General's request to release minutes, subject to redaction as allowed.

AN to clarify process for members to access executive session minutes. Executive session minutes automatically released after 6 months if issue is resolved.

Motion passed unanimously.

V. Executive Session

VII. Executive Session - MGL c 30A, §21, (3): To discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining or litigation if an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining or litigating position of the public body and the chair so declares

TF announced purpose of executive session, to discuss pending litigation. NT made a motion to go into executive session for purposes stated. AN 2nd. Roll call vote – Yes: DA, TF, SH, WM, AN, NT, CW. Moved into executive session at 7:45 p.m.

WM moved to return to public session. NT 2nd. Roll call vote – Yes: DA, TF, SH, WM, AN, NT, CW. Motion passed unanimously. Public session resumed at 7:58 p.m.

VI. Adjournment

AN moved to adjourn. WM 2nd. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Farber
Recording Secretary