

SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE
GRAND FORKS SCHOOL BOARD
GRAND FORKS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT #1
MEETING MINUTES
October 11, 2024

The Grand Forks School Board Superintendent Evaluation Committee met on Friday, October 11, 2024, at the Mark Sanford Education Center with Josh Anderson presiding.

Committee Members Present: Josh Anderson, Dave Berger, Amber Flynn via phone, Jeff Manley via phone, Michelle Sheperd via phone, and Dr. Terry Brenner.

Committee Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Laura Cobb, District Legal Counsel, and Cindy Johnson, Executive Secretary.

Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes. It was moved by Flynn and seconded by Berger to approve the September 30, 2024, minutes as written. Upon voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Discussion of 360 Evaluation. Cobb discussed her concerns after reading the minutes of this committee's previous meetings.

A concern was whether a 360 evaluation coincides with or violates the board's current policy. State law and policy reads that the board evaluates the superintendent's job performance. If a 360 evaluation will be used as a job performance tool, the policy will need to be amended.

If not a job performance tool but rather a feedback tool, which is what the North Dakota School Board Association's document indicates a 360 evaluation is, the committee has the latitude to decide how it is used.

She encouraged the committee to ensure the 360 was productive and positive. She thought it could be completed through the leadership coach, who would also receive and review all responses and disseminate information.

In summary, Cobb reiterated the committee's options. 1) go back to the policy review committee, 2) determine to use the 360 as a feedback tool, 3) if a feedback tool, determine appropriate guardrails and

how the information will be used, and 4) report to the board the committee has discussed it and determined they no longer want to do a 360 evaluation.

Regarding the discussion about using the 360 feedback as an input-gathering tool for board members to complete the superintendent's job performance evaluation, Cobb responded that this kind of use was not in line with policy and was inappropriate.

Flynn reported that a 360 evaluation was her recommendation to the board. The intention was not for it to be utilized to evaluate the superintendent on his job performance but rather as a tool to supplement leadership growth and relationship building.

Committee members were reminded the direction from the board was that this committee determine the use of a 360 evaluation. It would align with the board's directive for the committee to set parameters around that and to determine a timeline to ensure a 360 was completed methodically and correctly.

Discussion on the mechanics of a leadership coach conducting a 360 evaluation, including the leadership coach developing the questions and determining to whom they would report, continued. It was stated again that a 360 was not and is not intended as a punitive tool.

Discussion continued about who would be included in a 360 evaluation. Cobb indicated that a leadership coach meant leadership across the district and not

only Dr. Brenner, as it would allow all leaders the opportunity to reflect and evaluate themselves. Flynn responded her intention when making the recommendation was that it would be the assistant superintendents, district administrators, the executive cabinet, and principals. Still, she would appreciate the leadership coach's advice on who should be included.

Shepperd left the meeting at 12:39 p.m.

Determining who would receive information from the 360 evaluation is pending input from the leadership coach.

Following discussion, it was moved by Berger and seconded by Flynn to rescind the action taken on September 30 to move forward with the NDLEAD evaluation tool, explore edits surrounding demographic information and additional narrative provided it doesn't interfere with the tool's methodology, and curate a recipient email list down to the district's administrative team. Upon voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

It was moved by Flynn and seconded by Manley to define the 360 evaluation as a feedback tool administered by a leadership coach, and for board leadership to collect further input on its administration. Upon voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Next Meeting. The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, November 4, 2024, at 5:00 p.m.

Adjourn. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Approved _____
(Date)

Josh Anderson, Meeting Chair