

**NHSAU School Board Meeting
NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOL ADVISORY UNIT 29
John W. Day Educational Center
34 West Street
Keene, New Hampshire
PHONE: (603) 357-9002 FAX: (603) 357-9012
WEBSITE: www.sau29.org**

**COMMITTEE: Advisory Committee of the N.H. School Administrative Unit 29
School Board**

DATE: June 27, 2011

**LOCATION: Cheshire Career Center Conference Room, Keene High School, 43
Arch Street**

CALLED TO ORDER: 7:02 PM

TIME ADJOURNED: 8:52 PM

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- Earl Horn, Chair – Harrisville
- Kelly French – Nelson
- Kathleen O'Donnell – Keene
- Ege Cordell – Chesterfield

OTHERS PRESENT:

- Neil Donegan – Keene
- Carl Panza – Keene
- Judy Idelkope – Chesterfield
- William Gurney – Co-Superintendent
- Wayne Woolridge – Co-Superintendent
- Paul Cooper – Human Resources Director
- Stephanie Kleine – Sullivan School Board
- Rob Mitchell – Gilsum School Board

Chair Earl Horn called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

1. Informational Presentation: Gilsum/Sullivan School Committee

Stephanie Kleine (Sullivan) and Rob Mitchell (Gilsum) reported on the work of the Gilsum/Sullivan School Committee. Ms. Kleine stated that Sullivan and Gilsum committees, both independently and collaboratively, have been meeting biweekly for 2 or 3 months. She continued that the purpose is to figure out whether Gilsum and Sullivan want to send students to Keene Middle School and Keene High School, and explore all of the options. They are meeting with selectmen every 3 or 4 weeks, surveying and talking with people in town, and getting as much information as possible about what works well, what the alternatives are, what the challenges are, and whether or not the challenges would be resolved elsewhere or not. They are discussing whether or not to withdraw

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

from their current district. Ms. Kleine reported that Sullivan currently has 79 students total in grades preK to 12, and 8 have special needs. She continued that Gilsum has 96 students, and 13 have special needs. She continued that the committee is still gathering information, and creating diagrams of options and complicated matrixes. They have a late October/Nov. 1 deadline for reporting their findings and recommendations to the boards of selectmen.

Ms. Kleine stated that she is not sure if it would even work for Gilsum and Sullivan to tuition their students to Keene elementary schools, given all the changes occurring in Keene. Mr. Woolridge replied that the Keene Board of Education (KBE) has not had a conversation about the Elementary Ad Hoc Advisory Committee's report/recommendations yet. Ms. Kleine spoke about the need to figure out what to do with special education. She stated that she knows Keene has space issues, as do 6 other local towns, so maybe expanding the preschool or adding another one would be an option to consider.

Ms. Kleine stated that everyone wants to have the ability to have a voice for their town, which certain options would allow, while others would not. She and Mr. Mitchell stated that currently, Sullivan has one board member (and they often feel overruled), whereas Gilsum has only 8/10 of one vote, and Swanzey has 6 or 7 votes. It is difficult for small towns to have an effect on a vote.

Chair Horn asked if leaving Monadnock Regional School District is an option being considered. Mr. Mitchell replied that Gilsum cannot tuition some kids but not all, so if people want to do anything other than being in the Monadnock Regional School District, Gilsum would have to withdraw. He continued that this is being driven by necessity; everyone in the state is seeing a decline in enrollment. Small towns have challenges in this regard but also opportunities. Some people in Gilsum are not happy with the education their kids are receiving. Last fall, Gilsum received a letter from Mr. Gurney suggesting they look into the possibility of tuitioning kids to Keene. Mr. Mitchell continued that it has been 50 years since Gilsum has sat down to talk about the future of the kids' education, so it is an important discussion now. He continued that it is complicated, because Gilsum's elementary school building is owned partially by the town and partially by the school district and also operates as a community center. There is a need to find out what it would cost to purchase the building back from the district. There are many issues to consider and information to gather, such as currently-unknown special education costs, possible future uses of the elementary school building and unclear operating costs, per pupil costs, etc. Mr. Mitchell stated that the fates of Gilsum's and Sullivan's schools are linked. He continued that a cost-shared system would help them both, but there is still a lot to work out.

Mr. Panza asked if the study committee will be working through the summer. Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Kleine replied yes. They agreed to Mr. Panza's request to keep the SAU29 Advisory Committee up to date, via Mr. Gurney. Mr. Mitchell added that at www.gilsum.org, there is a link to the Gilsum/Sullivan School Study Committee's meeting minutes.

Mr. Mitchell clarified the process: the committee will figure out the options, then present their findings and a recommendation to the selectmen. The selectmen will review the recommendations, then host meetings with the public, and then the selectmen decide whether or not to proceed. There will be something on ballot in March 2012. If the decision is to withdraw from the Monadnock School District, there is a process for that, and another committee forms. All of the towns in the district would have to vote to let Gilsum and Sullivan out of the district.

Mr. Donegan asked if Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Kleine have any idea if Gilsum and Sullivan would join SAU 29 if they withdraw from Monadnock, or if they are considering keeping students in grades K to 5 in town and tuitioning the older kids to Harrisville or Keene. Mr. Mitchell replied that those are all options that need to be investigated further. Ms. Kleine replied that they cannot say there is a position taken on anything right now. She continued that if she were to guess, based on the conversations so far, the focus is on how to keep Sullivan's own school open, improve the quality of education, and gain more control over the Sullivan students. She continued that if Sullivan (and Gilsum) could be its own district, potentially they could approach to join SAU29, either as a collaborative or independent. She asked how much weight their vote would have, and how it would be different than what they have now in the Monadnock school district. Chair Horn replied that there is such a difference with the SAU board, which only oversees the administrative unit. He continued that it does not oversee the schools. Those are under the control of the individual districts. In terms of having a vote, it is really up to the receiving district to provide a forum for input. For example, Harrisville board members can attend KBE meetings but they do not have a vote. Ms. French added, but they would have total control of their elementary school.

Mr. Mitchell stated that until a couple weeks ago they did not even realize that joining the SAU would even be a possibility. Ms. Kleine replied that she is cautious about the idea, because it was her impression that Winchester and Surry were not able to join, so why would Sullivan and Gilsum be able to? Mr. Woolridge replied that Winchester has not asked to join. He continued that Surry did, and their request was considered by a study committee, who found that Surry would bring in about \$30,000 in revenue. It did not seem to be a big enough advantage so SAU 29 chose not to have Surry join the SAU. He continued that if Gilsum and Sullivan withdraw from Monadnock, they will either be their own SAU or could ask to join SAU29. If the two districts were together, funds would increase, and that might work. He continued that he would advise the board to study the Gilsum/Sullivan School Study Committee's recommendation to see if the revenue would be enough to offset some of SAU29's current costs. The Gilsum/Sullivan School Study Committee would have to determine whether or not they really want to take that step, and SAU 29 would have to study the request to see if SAU29 has the capacity. This SAU29 Advisory Committee meets again in September, and then a group could study Gilsum and Sullivan's commitment including the potential revenue.

Mr. Donegan asked if they have considered joining Surry's SAU. Mr. Mitchell replied that Surry is still in the process of forming that. He continued that joining them is a

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

possibility, or another possibility is to just form their own SAU and leverage the same services because the person leading that (in Surry) is doing it part time. Mr. Woolridge agreed that that is something to explore.

Chair Horn asked Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Kleine to stay in touch with Mr. Woolridge and Mr. Gurney and keep everyone informed. He thanked them for their presentation.

2. Approval of Minutes – November 10, 2010

Ms. French made a motion to approve the minutes from November 10, 2010. Mr. Panza seconded the motion, and it passed by unanimous vote.

3. Discussion of Co-Superintendent Goals/Objectives for 2011-2012, Evaluation Cycle, New Approach to Review Forms, and Job Descriptions

Mr. Panza stated that he wanted to accomplish setting some goals and objectives, and setting up an evaluation cycle for the superintendents, and developing a new approach to the superintendents' review forms. He distributed handouts to the committee.

Mr. Panza thanked Mr. Cooper for his help. He referenced the first handout, an inverted pyramid showing the SAU's mission statement, goals and objectives, strategy, execution, and tactics. He continued that the general SAU goals are one, to increase student learning (there are 15 objectives for this); two, to improve efficiency and effectiveness (8 objectives); and three, advocacy for education students and districts (9 objectives). He continued that 15, 8, and 9 are too many objectives and there should be a maximum of 4 or 5. The intent is to have a system in place that identifies goals and objectives, has a timeline, and includes evaluations. That system is currently not in place, or is only in place very loosely.

Committee members asked Mr. Panza which document he was referring to, with the 32 objectives. Mr. Woolridge determined that Mr. Panza was referring to the central office goals that he, Mr. Gurney, Mr. Cooper, Ms. Cargill, Ms. Woods, Mr. Harper, and Mr. Ruehr developed a year ago. He continued that they are internally-used goals, not SAU board goals, which is why he thinks no one signed off on this.

Mr. Panza referenced section (g) of statute 303.01, the Substantive Duties of the school board, which states that each school board shall determine the educational goals of the district, long-range plans, and measurable and attainable short-term objectives. Chair Horn replied that that refers to duties of the school board, but the SAU29 board is not a district school board. Ms. Idelkope added – we are not a district. Mr. Panza replied that each district has to consider goals and objectives. He continued that the only SAU goals they have are the ones he just showed the committee.

Mr. Woolridge replied that new ones are rolling out for this year, and he can show them to the committee. He continued that the 3 goals Mr. Panza referenced are the overarching strategic goals. In regard to the first goal of increasing student learning, there has been a lot of research lately about districts that are high performing and have impact on student learning. It begins with a review of where the United States is relative to 30+ other

countries. The US is the most loosely-coupled of all the countries. The goal is to move towards a more tightly-coupled model. They are trying to get the 7 districts in SAU29 to move in a more similar direction, to increase efficiency with things like hiring, professional development, etc. Mr. Woolridge continued that this year the focus was on RTI (Response to Intervention), which is their fail-safe system. It is a way to make sure no student fails. In regards to the second goal of increasing efficiency and effectiveness, they have been looking at how to use staff better, given the economic challenges. Oil costs are increasing, thus they are looking at energy efficiency as well. In regard to the third goal of advocacy, he and Mr. Gurney feel that they need to do more, and make the SAU schools better known, e.g. by having the PTAs meet with legislators. He continued that this committee can give direction for goals.

Mr. Panza referenced the handout again and stated that there is the overarching goal at the top, and each district would have its own goals, under probably the same basic categories. The key is to have not too many objectives, so it is possible to be effective. When the superintendents are evaluated at the end of the year, the only way one can evaluate them is by determining whether or not they were successful with the objectives at the end of the year. He continued that he has a different method to propose than the current one, and a timeline, and he is looking for input.

Mr. Panza referenced the handout that shows the timeline of the East Longmeadow school district on the left side, which he is using as a model, and Keene's timeline on the right. He stated that in May, East Longmeadow's school board grants the superintendent performance pay, if warranted, which Keene does not do until October. Mr. Cooper replied that Keene does not use performance pay; employees are given an across the board Cost Of Living Adjustment (COLA) raise.

Mr. Panza stated that East Longmeadow develops new strategic, formative goals in July. SAU29 is, just now in this meeting, and in previous meetings he has had with the superintendents and others, developing the goals of the school districts. He continued that he wants Mr. Gurney to give updates on the objectives laid out in this document, at each monthly KBE meeting. Mr. Gurney replied, yes, he would like to do that.

Mr. Panza stated that the process in February – the board reviewing the evaluation instrument, cycles, and timelines; and the superintendents completing self-evaluations – is always unwieldy. He continued that he made changes to the evaluation sheet, and tonight he is looking for approval to move forward with the process, not approval of the details or wording or the particular questions. There are not many meetings of this committee so he wants to take advantage of this one as much as possible.

Mr. Panza distributed copies of the new/updated evaluation form he has created. He commented that it can be difficult for everyone to fill out both Mr. Gurney's and Mr. Woolridge's evaluations. Committee members replied that they do not evaluate Mr. Gurney; they only evaluate Mr. Woolridge. They stated that Mr. Woolridge is the co-Superintendent who works with the towns, and Keene is the only district that evaluates both Mr. Woolridge and Mr. Gurney. Ms. Idelkope stated that the towns pay 50% of

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

both co-superintendents' salaries because supposedly the towns are deriving the benefit of both of them, but the towns proposed years ago that they pay for Mr. Woolridge's salary and Keene pays some portion of it, like how the towns pay 30% of Mr. Harper's salary and Keene pays 70%, because he is the Keene Business Manager. She continued that the towns felt there were inequities there. They only evaluate Mr. Woolridge. Mr. Panza asked if school board members from the towns receive 2 evaluation forms. Committee members replied no. Ms. Idelkope explained that they receive an evaluation form for Mr. Gurney but the towns have taken the stand that it makes no sense for them to fill it out. She continued that there are functions that Mr. Woolridge does that serve Keene, because he serves the SAU. Ms. O'Donnell replied that due to the structure of meetings and how people are exposed to the information, generally, only the chairs of the KBE's committees are aware of what Mr. Woolridge is doing.

Mr. Panza stated that he wants to clean up the evaluation form, and the issues Ms. Idelkope is speaking about will be addressed later. He asked for committee members' opinions of his revised evaluation sheet, which has the same questions and ways of measuring. He continued that last time he did this, he asked for a self-evaluation and he does not know if that took place or not. Mr. Cooper replied that he thinks it did. Mr. Panza replied, 2 years ago, but not recently. Ms. French asked if Mr. Panza wants to make self-evaluation part of the standard process. Mr. Panza replied yes. He continued that there is a lot of paperwork going back and forth, and it would be best if board members see the superintendents' self-evaluations first, in order to make better judgments as to how to evaluate them. The right-hand column on the revised evaluation sheet is for the superintendents' self-evaluations. Once they fill it out, the sheet will go to board members to fill out. Board members then look at the superintendents' self-evaluations and decide whether they agree with their assessments or not, and fill the sheet out themselves. Comments on the sheet are optional. Ms. French asked if Mr. Panza's version has room for one to comment on a whole section instead of commenting on one item at a time. Mr. Panza replied yes. He continued that this evaluation sheet is cleaner because it is all on one page and the self-evaluation process is done simultaneously with the board members' evaluations of the superintendents.

Chair Horn asked Mr. Woolridge if he sees any difficulties in regard to this new sheet. Mr. Woolridge replied that it would take him longer to fill out, but he could make it work if this is the way everyone wants it. Chair Horn asked if Mr. Woolridge would have to fill out 6 separate forms, since he works with 6 districts. Mr. Panza replied not necessarily. Chair Horn asked if Mr. Panza's intent is that the superintendent might not give comments on every subsection of each category, and would just write comments in the areas he felt was most necessary. Mr. Panza replied yes.

Ms. Cordell stated that rather than having space in the right hand column for board members to write comments, it is now the space for the superintendents' self-evaluations. She continued that this means it is not a one-page document, and is still complex, and she thought the point was to shorten and simplify the document. Chair Horn replied that in the previous form, there were a lot of comment blocks that he just did not fill in. He continued that how he sees this condensed is that instead of having a comment space for

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

each item, there is just one comment space for each category, which makes it more efficient.

Ms. Cordell stated that she is not sure she wants to receive the self-evaluations before she does her evaluation. Mr. Panza replied that that is how they do it at East Longmeadow. Ms. French replied that she thinks it would be helpful. Ms. Cordell replied that she likes the idea of having the self-evaluations on the same sheet, but she does not necessarily want to see the superintendents' perspectives before she expresses hers. Mr. Panza replied that board members are not aware of everything the superintendents do. Seeing the superintendents' self-evaluations first will help with that.

Ms. Idelkope stated that she, like Ms. Cordell, would prefer not to see the superintendents' self-evaluations before she evaluates them. She continued that one benefit to not seeing the self-evaluations first, right there on the sheet, is that it forces board members to think about what the superintendents should be doing. One complaint of the Chesterfield board is that they do not have the goals, so they do not know what they are measuring against. She continued that she wants to see the goals when she is filling out the form. The way that most board members fill out the evaluation forms is to echo what the superintendents say unless they strongly disagree, and having the self-evaluations right there on the sheet will only increase that. People are reluctant to put negatives, because boards do not evaluate the superintendents on a continuous improvement process. It is a one-time thing, and the superintendents get their raise. There has never been a time when they did not get a raise. Especially during their first year, board members tend to just say the superintendent "exceeds criteria" or "is outstanding." She continued that she wants to see the SAU goals. She knows what her district's goals are and they go through their own evaluation process with Mr. Woolridge. Chesterfield determines their goals and Mr. Woolridge's job is to set up the objectives. Chesterfield's school board gets to see the objectives for Chesterfield, and there should be a similar process for SAU goals.

Mr. Panza replied that the SAU goals are general goals within the administrative unit itself, as Mr. Woolridge said. Mr. Woolridge replied that they welcome oversight from the SAU board. Ms. O'Donnell asked Ms. Idelkope for an example of what an SAU goal could be. Ms. Idelkope replied implementing a uniform curriculum. Ms. French replied that she does not want that. Chair Horn replied that that would be a goal that would be appropriate for the SAU board to discuss and then approve or not approve.

Ms. Idelkope stated that she would be fine with having board members see the self-evaluation section after they have already filled out the evaluation themselves; she just does not want the self-evaluation right next to the evaluations board members are writing, because it will bias. Ms. O'Donnell stated that she finds the comments section the most helpful. She continued that this is because not everyone defines the answer choices, such as "meets the standard," the same way. When she asks people what that means to them, some people think it means the superintendent was mediocre/competent in that area, and other people think it means he met the mark. She continued that she has taken pains to

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

transcribe every comment, because without those, the numbers are meaningless due to people's different ways of defining them.

Mr. Panza asked how many people know about the superintendents' review. Ms. O'Donnell replied that this year there was a problem, because people were told different things. Some board members were told to mail their forms back to someone else and others sent it to her. She only saw 3 evaluations. She continued that it is poor timing, because the evaluation forms are distributed in March, when some members are leaving the boards and others are joining, which means that the exiting members usually do not fill it out, and the new members are unable to. It should be distributed at a different time.

Ms. Idelkope stated that she thinks a narrative self-evaluation from the superintendents would be more valuable than having them rate themselves in every category, because not all of the categories are equally valuable.

Mr. Donegan asked if Mr. Woolridge and Mr. Gurney get an evaluation this year. Mr. Gurney replied no. He continued that no one met with him face to face and he did not get a summary. Ms. O'Donnell replied that the year before last, evaluations were not done at all. Mr. Gurney replied that he and Mr. Woolridge were not asked for a self-evaluation and have not seen an evaluation for 2010 to 2011.

Ms. Idelkope suggested that it is the superintendents' responsibility to start the evaluation process on a timely basis. Chair Horn stated that this committee has been saying for years that there is no clear timeline, and this begins to address it. He continued that when the board chair changes every year, and is trying to do so much at once, it is easy to lose track of the evaluations. But they are very important and the chair has to have a schedule to go with. Maybe it is the superintendents' job to make sure that gets rolling. Ms. French replied that the Organizational Structure Committee agreed that it should not be the employees' job to manage their boss. She continued that she totally applauds Mr. Panza for trying to fix this. They need to make a policy. The committee had put together recommendations a while back, including distributing evaluation forms at a time other than during school board elections, and having the superintendents receive their reviews in May. She continued that the committee's thoughts on goal-setting were similar to Mr. Panza's suggestion of having them set in May/June and ratified in August in time for the school year to start in September. That was a committee discussion, but the problem is that it was never actually turned into a policy. Every time there is a new chair, there is no clear list of the responsibilities.

Ms. Idelkope stated that there is a policy that outlines the process for evaluation. She continued that the problem is that the structure should support the vice chair learning the process while they he or she is vice chair, but it does not happen. She continued that she does not understand why Michael Briggs was not aware, because he participated in the discussions. Someone has to be in charge of making sure the timeline is followed. Board members are volunteers and they are not particularly good at it when there is a revolving door and they do not have a sense of the history of the board. It is fair to ask the Human Resources Director to get things rolling. Mr. Cooper replied sure, he can do that, if some

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

clear timelines are set up. What has always been a problem for the board chair is taking all the data they have and putting it into a coherent format. He continued that he has worked with each of the board chairs over the past 3 or 4 years, to take all that data and help them write it in a format that makes sense. That can be part of that cycle.

Ms. O'Donnell stated that the public has many misconceptions about the KBE, thinking that they have all kinds of duties and responsibilities that they do not, but one of the few responsibilities the KBE *does* have is evaluating the superintendents. She continued that this was one of her big frustrations as chair of the KBE; she tried for months to get it done and it was difficult. There is no real clear administration person who is there to help the KBE. There are policies, but last year Mr. Panza did not lead this meeting and he did not know about it. Board members are just volunteers trying to do their best and no one really assists them to tell them what to do and when to do it, and there are too many things that fall through the cracks. Having a good evaluation system is crucial.

Mr. Panza stated that he wants to do something; he wants to see something materialize. He continued that in regard to the self-evaluation, some board members want to see it simultaneous to/before doing their own evaluations of the superintendents, and others do not want to see it until afterwards. Maybe some board members could receive the document with the self-evaluation column hidden. Ms. Idelkope repeated that she would prefer a narrative self-evaluation. She continued that to her, this would show that the superintendent was writing about what he thinks is important to write about, not just trying to fit his words into the pre-determined categories on the sheet. Mr. Gurney stated that they created a matrix that they use. Ms. O'Donnell replied that last year, Mr. Gurney wrote a page and a half letter. Mr. Panza replied that it is not grading. Mr. Gurney replied that he and Mr. Woolridge do not grade themselves but they write about their accomplishment of the goals. Ms. O'Donnell replied that the board members need to have the goals specifically listed. If the evaluations are written in May or June, they are likely to only be writing in regards to the current crises that are happening, not the whole year.

Ms. O'Donnell left at 8:28 PM.

Chair Horn stated that there are 3 topics to this discussion: one, a timeline for the evaluation cycle; two, how to get that process started so it happens every year; and three, the format of the evaluations. He suggested that if the group only has time to focus on one thing right now, for starters, it should be the timeline. He continued that then they can decide who is going to trigger the process, Mr. Cooper or someone else. Then figuring out the format is the last step.

Ms. French stated that one suggestion Mr. Panza put on the sheet is to have periodic review of the goals. She continued that she agrees that that would be helpful, because she dislikes being surprised by a self-evaluation at the end of the year. Chair Horn stated that Mr. Panza has laid out a possible evaluation cycle, which the committee may need more time to look it over carefully before adopting. He suggested that over the summer, committee members can examine it more thoroughly, then submit

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

feedback and suggestions, which would be disseminated to all committee members before their September meeting. He and Mr. Panza could meet to incorporate all of the feedback and suggestions, to come to the September meeting with a proposed timeline. Ms. French added that board members from 2 towns are absent tonight, so they should be given this document to look at as well. Mr. Panza replied yes, and he will also send everyone East Longmeadow's very comprehensive policy to review.

Mr. Cooper suggested that goals be set and approved in May or June, not August or September, because by then it is too late. He continued that Mr. Gurney and Mr. Woolridge spent today with the principals to give them goals and instructions. They cannot wait for final board approval in September. Mr. Panza replied that the board now gives approval in August. Mr. Cooper replied that is too late. Mr. Panza replied that they gave Mr. Gurney his goals. Mr. Gurney replied that it is just a draft until the board approves them. The process should be further along. The goals should drive the school's improvement plans, but they heard the improvement plans yesterday. This is a re-alignment of the cycle.

Chair Horn suggested that he, Mr. Panza, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Gurney, and Mr. Woolridge meet August 15, at 7 PM. People can give feedback and suggestions, relative to the evaluation timeline and process, by August 1. After that small meeting, the information generated at it will be distributed to the SAU Advisory board members in preparation for the September meeting.

4. Choose Representative for Local Government Center

Mr. Woolridge stated that Jack Calhoun was a representative, but he left. He continued that the SAU is not mandated to have a representative, but if anyone wants to do it, they can. Mr. Panza suggested Ms. Idelkope, who declined. Ms. Cordell stated that she may be interested in being the representative, and asked for more information. Mr. Woolridge explained that a representative would get to hear, first hand, what the deliberations are, and be a part of everything, such as setting insurance rates, how parameters are set, etc. Ms. Cordell stated that she will think about it and talk with Mr. Calhoun. Ms. French stated that there are also board members absent tonight, whom they could ask to do this.

5. Discussion on Co-Superintendents' Job Descriptions

Mr. Panza stated that there is not enough time for this agenda item tonight, but in a nutshell, there is a generic superintendent job description that has nothing to do with the real goals and roles.

6. Brief Discussion on Future Organizational Structure

Mr. Panza stated that this topic is too large to discuss tonight.

Ms. Idelkope suggested forming a committee. She continued that it is a big process. Chair Horn stated that potentially they are looking at a change in the superintendents' contract time and also in the organization. He continued that he would rather they have a head start with this work, rather than being rushed or under pressure at the last minute.

Advisory Committee of SAU29 meeting minutes,
June 27, 2011

Ms. Cordell replied that that ties in with the evaluation structure - knowing how well the structure is working helps one see where to go.

Chair Horn stated that he does not have enough knowledge about how to reorganize the SAU. Mr. Panza replied that it is very complex, almost philosophical. Ms. Idelkope stated that the previous consultants said the current system is not sustainable long-term. Ms. French suggested looking at what the old consultant said, instead of hiring a new one.

Chair Horn suggested that in the fall, they can review what the previous Reorganization Committee did, and then form a new committee then. Mr. Donegan replied that before a committee is formed, he thinks that the individual boards need to get together and articulate what they expect to happen. Keene has done this, and the KBE is going to have some pretty specific ideas on what they want the structure to look like. Chair Horn replied that Harrisville's board will not have met before the next SAU board meeting in September. Mr. Gurney stated that it is possible to talk about forming a committee without getting into specifics. Chair Horn replied that maybe then the boards can start putting together some expectations.

Mr. Panza suggested sending the proposed evaluation timeline to all the board members for review. Mr. Woolridge replied that he can send it out, before August 1, but he does not know if he can answer questions about it. Chair Horn asked Mr. Panza to make sure the information gets sent out to all school board members.

Mr. Donegan asked for clarification about whether or not the superintendents did a self-evaluation this year. Ms. Idelkope replied no. She continued that the superintendents set up their own goals but the goals have not been run by any boards. They do not have goals from this committee. Mr. Woolridge replied that the damage of not having clear goals moving forward is significant. Having a high-performing central office helps student achievement, and the biggest predictor of that is having goals. He continued that they welcome getting the SAU board involved before they meet with the principals. They do not see a downside to their goals, of increasing student achievement, increasing efficiency and effectiveness, and student advocacy – these are goals most everyone would agree to. Each district will have separate, more directly-targeted goals of their own, and the central office is not getting in the way of that.

Mr. Panza asked Mr. Cooper to talk with him about the timeline before it gets sent to everyone.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted by
Britta Reida, Stenographer

APPROVED: 9/19/11