

**MEETING MINUTES
COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD MEETING
January 5, 2012**

PRESENT:

Board: Jean O'Connell, Elona Street-Stewart, John Brodrick, Louise Seeba, Keith Hardy, Mary Doran, Anne Carroll

Staff: Kate Wilcox-Harris, Sharon Freeman, Julie Schultz-Brown, Suzanne Kelly, Matt Mohs, Andrew Collins, Christine Osorio, Efe Agbamu, Darlene Fry, Stacey Akyea, Willie Jett, Steven Flucas, Marsha Baisch, Steve Unowsky, Joe Munnich, Michelle Walker

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m.

II. AGENDA

A. SSSC Monitoring - Leadership VisionCard

Staff indicated they were now reviewing the Monitoring Goal #2: Leadership. They provided a quick review of the background for the VisionCards and noted the VisionCard levels had been set at Interview (<30%), Concern (30-50%), Baseline (51-70%), Progress (71-90%) and Vision >90%. They then went on to review the Leadership area noting these were measure of processes that look at adult behaviors that will in turn affect student achievement.

It was stated that according to research, after the classroom teacher, principals have the most direct effect on student achievement. The principal of Dayton's Bluff provided one principal's story about leadership development describing the leadership pipeline, the learning catalyst cohort and the value of coaching and mentoring. He stressed the importance of the utilization of data in an organized manner. He stated one of the major things to look at for success in moving achievement was improvements or actions that need to be taken that will lead to changing students' tomorrow forever.

Staff went on to state the SSSC Strategic Plan calls for moving from principal "as building administrator" to principal "as instructional leader" by 2014. An evaluation tool and process to support and monitor this area was developed to assess performance and enhance professional growth. The evaluation was based on the foundation that principals and assistant principals play a critical role in student success and therefore should be held accountable for student achievement and equity outcomes. The tool focuses on the principal and assistant principal's roles as an instructional leader.

The evaluation process flows throughout the school year.

- June – principals/assistant principals develop a goal plan and submit it to their supervisor for review and approval.

- November (within three weeks of receiving student data) -- a fall check-in occurs with principals meeting with their supervisors to evaluate progress toward performance expectations and review their personal goals and school data.
- January/February – a survey is sent to staff by the supervisor and the results are reviewed at the winter check-in.
- February (within three weeks of receiving student data) -- principals again meet with their supervisor to evaluate progress toward performance expectations and review personal goals and school data.
- May -- Principals/assistant principals complete a self-evaluation of their performance and submit this to their supervisor.
- June – Spring check-in and final evaluation with the supervisors completing a final evaluation and meeting with their principals to review the individual evaluations.

The process involves a continuous cycle of goal setting, informal observations to evaluate progress, check-ins to provide feedback toward progress, self-evaluation and a formal evaluation. Check-in documentation is used three times yearly corresponding with achievement testing. These involve a meeting between a supervisor and principal/assistant principal to review progress.

The original leadership measures used in the evaluation were as follows:

- The percent of administrators with current evaluations complete (>95%)
- The percent of administrators satisfactory or better on each of the six core competencies (>90%)
- The percent of departmental plans updated in the last quarter based on data review (>90%)
- The percent of schools who revisited their school plan in the last quarter based on data review (>90%).

These were revised/expanded/re-focused to emphasize instructional leadership.

- The percent of principal fall check-ins completed (>95%)
- The percent of schools with a clear vision and mission (>90%)
- The percent of principals effectively using student data to align their school structures and interventions (>90%)
- The percent of principals completing documented classroom observations/evaluations with feedback given to staff (>90%)
- The percent of principals that are leading and attending PLC work in their schools (>90%)
- The percent of schools that have a clear structure for coaching and support of instructional improvement (>90%)
- The percent of principals participating in equity training (>90%).

Staff indicated that since this evaluation process is new reporting for this cycle includes “meets” and partially meets” expectations. Meets is the percent of all principals meeting all expectations; partial is the percent of principals making progress toward meeting all expectations and NM (not meeting) is the percent of Principals not meeting expectations.

The evaluation cycle is in year one of implementation. Supervisors have completed the check-in process with all principals. This check-in process with principals occurred in November and principals begin their check-in process with assistant principals in December. The results show:

1. **Vision & Mission** – the vision of the school is clear and posted and staff members can articulate the vision of the school. It was noted there have been

many new principals and co-locations this year. The expectation is that the percentage of meeting and partially meeting will increase by the end of the year. Expectations for meets include the vision and mission being mutually developed with stakeholders (staff, families, etc.); posted in classrooms, hallways and publications; staff being able to articulate and incorporate these into their everyday practice and these driving the decision-making process. 34% of schools meet expectations, 50% partially meet expectations and 16% are not meeting expectations. Overall, this area is at 84% or Progress Level.

2. **Effective Use of Student Data** – this requires knowing student data and being able to share specific plans for student improvement. Meets expectations requires use of appropriate district data tools to gain understanding of student data; utilization of Response to Intervention (RTI) to support all non-proficient students; meetings with staff to analyze data; knowing data by subgroups and having a School-wide Continuous Improvement Plan that reflects student needs and is updated according to data reviews. 50% of principals are meeting these expectations; 46% are partially meeting and 4% are not meeting expectations. Overall, this area is at 96% or Vision Level.
3. **Documented Observations/Evaluations** – to meet this expectation Principals must have documented classroom observations/evaluations. To meet expectations staff evaluations must be on target to meet deadlines; observations/evaluations have effective and written feedback given in a timely manner; teachers understand the rubric if rating is applied and site or district professional development is focused on instructional feedback. 67% of principals have documented observations/evaluations; 27% have partially met this goal and 6% are not meeting. Overall, this area is at 94% or Vision Level.
4. **Total observations of teachers done by principals** in 2010-11 was 7,152; as of 12/1/11, 3,704 had been done to date in 2011-12 so the District is on track to surpass observations from 10-11.
5. **Senior Administrative Instructionally Based Visits** in 2010-11 were 1,768 as of 12/1/11. 1,368 had been completed and are on track to surpass visits from 10-11.
6. **Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)** – 100% of district schools have PLC teams meeting on a regular basis. With the principal check-in, the expectation changed to align with the six-step data team process. 38 schools are trained in the six-step data team process. To meet expectations principals must provide a structure for PLCs to meet at least four hours per month; support the use of common formative assessments to identify instructional strategies; consistently use the six-step data team process; provide consistent leadership for PLC implementation and monitor for change in instructional practice according to student learning needs. 31% are meeting expectations; 65% are partially meeting and 4% are not meeting. Overall, this area is at 96% or Vision Level.
7. **Coaching and Support of Instructional Improvement** – must show clear structures for coaching and support of instructional improvement. To meet expectations principals must provide coaching support for implementation of district initiatives; provide a structure of support for instruction, modeling and feedback and define clear plans to support all probationary staff. 53% are meeting expectations; 41% are partially meeting and 5% are not meeting. Overall, this is at 95% or Vision Level.
8. **Equity Training** is in year one of implementation. Eight Beacon Schools began work in 2011-12; 26 sites began work with equity teams in December of 2011 and training will be implemented at all remaining schools in 2012-13. 100% of principals are participating in equity training.

The Director and Principal on Special Assignment to the Office of Leadership Development and Academic Support then provided an overview on improving instructional leadership in the district. They have implemented Learning Catalyst

Cohorts at 12 schools including the five turnaround schools that have provided professional development for principals and assistant principals along with assisting in development/implementation of the evaluation process. They are developing a "leadership pipeline" and are administering the Turnaround St. Paul and Traveler's grants while providing direction, coordination and resources to improve instructional learning.

In the area of leadership development, they provide job-embedded coaching, mentoring of new principals with additional mentoring and support as needed, small group professional development and executive mentoring. Several groups established to support principals and assistant principals were described during the presentation.

Teacher development includes student teacher preparation, Peer Assistance Review (PAR) and teacher evaluation mentoring.

District staff have successfully launched the new evaluation cycles for principals and administrators; completed check-ins with 100% of school principals; made over 5,000 instructionally-based visits to schools so far this year; totally redesigned the Office of Leadership Development and Academic Support with a renewed focus on preparing future leaders and at-the-elbow coaching for principals along with the alignment of expectations for all leaders.

Challenges faced have included sustaining progress across leadership/staff transitions; having a limited capacity to support principals in the implementation of district initiatives; changing the culture to incorporate an equity lens into all aspects of leadership and the timeline for selection of new principals.

Next steps for the department include completion of the full evaluation cycle this year; increasing their capacity for implementing district initiatives; providing on-going review of leadership development activities along with refining that work; identifying and measuring VisionCard levels for central office administrators and continuation of the equity work with schools/principals.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- It has been stated support had been provided in coming up through the SPPS systems, SPPS has an issue in having too few administrators of color; what is in place to strengthen the foundation, opportunities and retention of administrators of color in its buildings? Response: The goal and expectation, coming in the door, was to be successful. The first year questions need to be asked and responded to in order to be guided through the process. The philosophy is very clear from administration. The formal and informal process of mentoring was extremely valuable in guiding a person through processing ideas and methods/means and in problem solving. Additionally SPPS and the U of MN are establishing an administrative licensure cohort that is very diverse, providing opportunities for future administrators in SPPS. The Minnesota Principals Academy for current assistant principals and interns has a very diverse groups as well.
- When you say diverse, how diverse? Response: In as many ways as can be legally identified.
- Another important component learned through experience is that it often takes administrators of color to mentor and work with other administrators of color as mentor/coach/sounding board. SPPS has asked administrators in the district to play that role so there is the formal structure built into system plus informal support groups within the district.

- Can there be discussion about the extent of perceived coaching and support was specifically coming to you as an adult male principal and an African American? Both the gender and racial piece, how does that affect your leadership and how you work with the kids in front of you? Response: There was never a question I felt I could not ask and people worked hard to get the answers for me. This is a parallel process and is/can be addressed in that way. It is not about race but to help students be successful.
- On the importance of data, how should it be organized? How does that apply to teachers' use of data? Response: One of the best ways is through stories used to define situations and about the work being done. Expectations need to be kept high for both students and for staff all the way up.
- How is data used by teachers? Response: One primary focus is on attendance, kids need to be in school to learn. MAP scores need to be used to see where students are and where they need to be in respect to upcoming tests. MAP results are a guide to where teachers need to go. Interventions are directed at the needs of the students in order for them to grow, not just pass tests, the data is a building block.
- Feedback – how can SPPS take on professional/technical experiences and turn them around to be a social experience that enriches the community? What stories need to be shared to influence our community? Response: Students are clients; parents are voters both physical and verbal. The ability to connect with families every time they are seen, to know their names, know their children so parents have a good view of the school.
- Staff surveys – how will results and other methods of staff feedback be incorporated to improve leadership and school climate and when will SPPS move to include families and students in the leadership improvement process? Response: It is a developmental process overall. One of the main things that has occurred in the process with assistant principals is a more in-depth discussion on what is happening and how that will link to an evaluation. One thing that is known about evaluation is that what is measured gets done. The items measured this year are a beginning, as the need for additional measures are identified they will be added into the process for following years.
- In the area of timeline for selection of new principals, the lead-time from when it is known a principal is leaving and when that is announced to, the community might be a first step metric.
- The vision of the school being posted, how do schools arrive at their vision? Are they similar to one another or individual to schools? Response: There is a process schools go through to make their vision part of the fabric of their being. Having a very clear and well-defined vision defines an effective school. All stakeholders need to be involved (students, parents, staff) in the development of the mission. Each school tailors its vision to the individual unique needs of the school. A vision takes time because of the involvement of all the stakeholders, there needs to be a legitimate, in-depth process to evolve a vision for a school. Support is provided to the schools in the visioning process.

It was noted Board members can send further questions they might have on this VisionCard for staff to address at the upcoming Board meeting.

Thanks were extended to staff for the in-depth report on the process and for allowing the Board of hear stories which can in turn be used by them to enrich their interaction with the community..

B. Standing Item: Policy Update

1. Policy 716.00: Advertising in the Schools

Staff provided a quick overview of the process used to arrive at the proposed policy provided for review to Board members. The Board was reminded the work group looked at past practice, proposed and/or set aside, other districts' policies, language used within various policies and instances of where advertising and/or corporate involvement has occurred. The group used the lenses of places, the nature of messages and specific examples and things which have been encouraged, allowed and/or disallowed.

From the original policy, the group added a purpose, a definition of advertising and organized it into areas in order to facilitate reference.

QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION:

- A question was asked about School Space Media. The digital signboards are currently being used at Central and Highland for athletic events. Ad content is preapproved by schools. The signs provide an opportunity to students at the school to operate them and earn a small stipend. Students are paid and trained by School Space Media on how to use the boards. Response has been favorable from the public and a few inquiries have been received about running ads on boards. The amount of revenue generated will not be available until the end of this school year when athletic events wrap up for the year.
- What kinds of ads have been purchased? Staff will report back to the Board on this.
- Approval of School Space Media was contingent upon the revenues going to district-wide athletic funds, correct? Yes
- In the definition, should additional messages be mentioned such as post secondary institutions and differentiate between those messages and commercial message. If the message is commercial and generates revenue for the entity that would be addressed in policy (non-profits, community coalition, secondary educational, etc.).
- A decision was made to take out specific examples as something might be missed by default. The group pulled it back to an entity other than the district.
- Advertising is promotion and marketing. Should it be limited to just commercial messages? It needs to address things that are not specifically capitalistic.
- The addition of "without permission of the Superintendent" was added to indicate the Board can define the approval process by designation.
- It was stated the Board liked the format, definitions, general requirements, the opportunities provided without Board approval. The language should be address "with the permission of the Superintendent and approval of the Board" and the requirements for board approved advertising. Where, in language as it current stands, would people be referred to find an interpretation for such things as student uniforms, clothing or articles they would wear? What about the matter of military advertising? Where would people be referred to address the issue of asking for personal information from students by providing services or including it in programs? Need to ensure a statement about no financial gain to staff, students, parents or others through this. And, assuming that there would be automatic renewal/extension under the contracts – where is that referred to?
- How will contracts/agreements come back to the Board for review/renewal?
- On SPPS website, there are links to the Pioneer Press, etc. How would this impact current process/compliance?
- Has General Counsel reviewed this? Yes.

- It was noted the work group specifically delegated approval to the Superintendent after establishing the various parameters that would require Board approval.
- It was also noted that by keeping the process a “contractual process” it would then be governed by the contract process that is currently established.
- What about school uniforms with corporate logo?
- What about locker areas?
- What about rewarding schools for recruiting advertising since it states revenues will go into general funds?
- Web and Internet – differentiates between an advertising/commercial link and a link to resources or references that might also have advertising within it.
- Regarding logos, it is intended that gifts or materials given can acknowledge the company it came from.

The consensus was that the policy should be moved back to the work group to allow for further clarification acknowledging that some specific areas will more than likely need to be discussed at a COB meeting.

C. Work Session

1. **Outside Committee Assignments** - The COB Chair provided a list of outside committee assignments in effect for 2011 and asked Board members to contact her with their interest for the next year. Current representatives to the various organizations provided a brief review of the organization and the time commitment required in working with them.

III. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Mr. Brodrick moved the meeting adjourn. Ms Carroll seconded the motion. Motion passed.
--

The meeting adjourned at 6:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Polsfuss,
Assistant Clerk