

## Unapproved School Board Meeting Minutes

Dickinson Public Schools  
Special Meeting

November 1, 2016; 12:15 p.m.  
Board Room, Central Office

The Dickinson Public School Board held a special meeting on November 1, 2016, at the Central Administration Office. Board members present were: President Sarah Ricks, Vice President Brent Seaks, Mrs. Tanya Rude, Mrs. Kim Schwartz, and Mr. David Wilkie. Administrators present were: Superintendent Douglas Sullivan and Assistant Superintendent Vince Reep. Others present were Mrs. Melanie Kathrein, Ms. Fern Pokorny, and Mrs. Twila Petersen.

**Call to Order** - Board President Ricks called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

**Public Participation** – There were no requests for public participation.

**North Dakota School Board Association (NDSBA) Superintendent Evaluation System** – President Ricks explained many board members had attended a session regarding the superintendent's evaluation at last week's NDSBA annual convention. There was interest expressed by board members to use the NDSBA's superintendent's evaluation model and to expedite the process for implementation. President Ricks noted she had called Attorney Anita Thomas regarding options since the superintendent and the board members had already completed part of the process for the superintendent's evaluation due November 15. One option, if the board chose to, would be to complete the process for both evaluation models and keep them both in a file. Another option was to complete the current evaluation as is and then adopt the new NDSBA model before the spring evaluation. The third option would be to continue with the current model that has been started and finalize and not use the NDSBA model, at this time. Mrs. Rude stated that the school board was made aware of the new NDSBA superintendent's evaluation model as early as February. At that time the Board had a brief conversation and noted the questions on the NDSBA model did not match what DPS would like and therefore the NDSBA model was not chosen. The board members now realize the questions could be tailored to meet the needs of the District. Additionally, Mrs. Rude noted the NDSBA superintendent's evaluation tool could potentially be used for administrative evaluations and teacher evaluations and still use the Danielson framework. Vice president Seaks appreciated the ease of using the NDSBA model and the ability to automatically compile the information submitted. He was impressed that the NDSBA model was more comprehensive and allowed for better, detailed feedback and an opportunity for more collaboration. He felt that the evaluation model for the administrators and the teachers should be left at the discretion of those respective groups. Mrs. Schwartz said she was pleasantly surprised by the demonstration of the NDSBA model. She has struggled with the current paper model that is being used. Mr. Wilkie said he had not attended the evaluation model session at the conference and attended another presentation. He had looked at the material online for the NDSBA model and liked the option that the questions could be changed to meet the needs of the district. Mrs. Rude requested input from Superintendent Sullivan. Dr. Sullivan explained there has been lengthy discussion regarding a teacher evaluation model over many years and a committee was formed several years ago to review possible options for a teacher evaluation model. This was a two-prong approach. The first prong, which was more important, was the selection process that took close to a year of meetings. The committee studied several alternatives. He noted the work the committee members have done over the past several years to move forward with the implementation of the selected model. The NDSBA model had been reviewed by the Cabinet members several years ago and they were not interested in using that model for administrative evaluations. Dr. Sullivan referenced the NDSBA superintendent evaluation instrument. He has reviewed it and envisions discussions that would help the school board and the superintendent identify what the district needs to

**North Dakota School Board Association (NDSBA) Superintendent Evaluation System (cont.)**

do to develop a common vision. He was not sure about the board expectations, such as the “big picture items”, that he is to bring forward to the school board every month. He added that he agreed with the board that it would be a good idea to sit down and review each question. Vice president Seaks suggested the board move forward with what they currently are utilizing. Mrs. Rude moved to adopt the NDSBA Superintendent Evaluation System with a start date of November 1 when the board begins to look at the questions knowing that in the future it will not be for the November 15 superintendent's evaluation but for the March 15 superintendent's evaluation. Mr. Seaks seconded the motion. Discussion: President Ricks asked for clarification when the board envisioned using the NDSBA model. Were they anticipating December? She noted there was monthly evaluation worksheets that are completed by the board members. Mrs. Rude responded it will be implemented the beginning of the month for the board members. She suggested the board start looking at the questions immediately and inquired if it could be done during a board workshop. Dr. Sullivan responded the board can have as many workshops as it desires. He didn't know if there would be enough time between now and February for the board to do a thorough and effective selection process and for him to give a response by mid-February. He added he would be glad to help with the different approach. He felt the motion may not be necessary at this time. The motion could indicate that the board is adopting the model as presented; adopting the model is also adopting the questions. The board could, by consensus, agree to move forward with the model and then word the questions as they would like. Mrs. Rude gave an example of using possibly five questions for the February evaluation and then grow off of that. There was discussion amongst the board members of the timeline for adopting and implementation. Consensus from the board members was to move forward with the NDSBA superintendent evaluation model with some modifications with implementation in the near future. The School Board members will be reviewing the template for the NDSBA superintendent evaluation system and discussing if the Board wishes to use this model for future superintendent evaluations. Mrs. Rude requested the motion be repeated. Mrs. Petersen repeated the motion. The board members discussed a timeline for having the questions done and consensus was to attempt to have the questions completed before December. The cost of the software would be within the school board budget. President Ricks questioned if the board needed a motion today or a consensus. Mrs. Rude requested the motion be reread. Mrs. Petersen read the motion. Vice president Seaks felt the December deadline was a date that could be obtained and was realistic. President Ricks explained a possible workshop prior to December. Dr. Sullivan shared that he did not think one meeting would be sufficient, especially if the expectation is to have something in place for consideration for December. Mrs. Rude thought there could be something concrete by February 1, 2017. There was discussion regarding the February 1 deadline and not having enough time to complete the March evaluation by the deadline. Dr. Sullivan clarified that the Board is proposing to have an evaluation model chosen by December and the questions could change between December and February. Mrs. Rude responded that was correct, the questions could change. Dr. Sullivan was not sure how he would be able to respond before his deadline in February. Vice president Seaks suggested a December 1 deadline to lock in the questions. After that time any changes to the questions could be implemented for the November 2017 evaluation. Mr. Seaks asked Superintendent Sullivan if he felt that was enough time. Dr. Sullivan responded that depending on what the documents looked like in December it could be workable and continue the conversations as the board moves forward. Mrs. Rude felt that the board members could start working on it in November. President Ricks noted there was a motion on the table that needs to be voted on. She added she was concerned with the word “adopting” in the motion. Mrs. Schwartz called to question. A roll call vote was taken: ayes-Rude, Seaks, Wilkie, Schwartz, Ricks; nays-none. The motion carried unanimously.

**Discussion of Revising and Subsequent Adoption of Board Policy CAAB-Superintendent Evaluation Procedure (if necessary)**

– President Ricks distributed copies of the DPS policy CAAB-Superintendent Evaluation Procedure. Prior to the meeting, Dr. Sullivan brought to President Rick’s attention a concern with the last line under the format paragraph regarding assigning an overall performance rating. Attorney Thomas felt it was okay as written but was going to do some more research. President Ricks said the Board needed to decide how it was interpreting that sentence. Mrs. Rude shared her interpretation that it does not give an overall score and suggested omitting that sentence. Mrs. Rude moved to adopt the revised policy CAAB-Superintendent’s Evaluation Procedure by omitting the sentence “The Board shall not assign an overall performance rating to the superintendent’s evaluation.” President Ricks felt the revision should wait until there was final recommendation from the legal department. Mrs. Rude rescinded her motion.

**Adjournment** – At 1:00 p.m. President Ricks declared the meeting adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

---

Sarah Ricks, Board President

---

Vince Reep, Business Manager

---

Twila Petersen, Secretary