

MINUTES
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
EDWARD A. GREER EDUCATION CENTER, BOARD ROOM
2832 E. FLAMINGO ROAD, LAS VEGAS, NV 89121

Wednesday, June 6, 2012

7:57 a.m.

Roll Call:	<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Member Absent</u>
	Dr. Linda E. Young, President	John Cole, Clerk
	Deanna L. Wright, Vice President	
	Lorraine Alderman, Member	
	Erin E. Cranor, Member	
	Carolyn Edwards, Member	
	Chris Garvey, Member	

Dwight D. Jones, Superintendent of Schools

Also present were: Mary Ann Peterson, Board Counsel, District Attorney's Office; Carlos McDade, General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel; Pedro Martinez, Deputy Superintendent, Instruction Unit; Staci Vesneske, Chief Human Resources Officer, Human Resources Division; Kim Wooden, Chief Student Services Officer, Student Support Services Division; Kenneth Turner, Special Assistant to the Superintendent; Cindy Krohn, Executive Assistant to the Board, Board Office; Elizabeth Carrero, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent, Office of the Superintendent; and Stephanie Gatlin, Transcriber/Recording Secretary.

FLAG SALUTE

Trustee Alderman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADOPT AGENDA

Adopt agenda.

Motion: Alderman Second: Cranor Vote: Unanimous

Trustee Wright was not present for the vote.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION DIALOGUE

Discussion, dialogue as required by Governance Policy B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance, and possible action on the Ends and Executive Limitations that the Superintendent's performance will be judged by in the upcoming school year.

Superintendent Jones noted that the Board was previously provided with a crosswalk of the School Performance Framework (SPF) and the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF). He shared that an effort in moving toward the SPF was to be able to hold everyone in all District facilities accountable for what happens with the students with regard to academic performance, but that staff recognizes the essential items that are in the QAF, and those are cross-referenced in the SPF.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION DIALOGUE (continued)

There was discussion regarding the number of initiatives and the positive changes that are occurring in the District.

Trustee Cranor suggested that it would be helpful to keep track of what procedures or processes the District has discontinued as it moves forward.

Superintendent Jones spoke about efforts moving forward toward less disruption at the school level while making adjustments to staffing by not making those changes in the middle of a school year; efforts toward more transparency in terms of budget information, including the development of a budgeting document that will be available for viewing by the public; and a transparent review of each position in the District by a Superintendent's committee which will include members of the public. He talked about the efforts in transparency in terms of academic performance through the Growth Model. He said there has been a focus on employees and the training and support that is needed and providing most of that training through Title I and Title II funding. He said in an effort to continue to build our systems, an operational dashboard is currently under development and will also be available for public viewing.

BOARD MEMBER ARRIVES

Trustee Wright arrived at the Board meeting at 8:18 a.m.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION DIALOGUE (continued)

Trustee Young expressed that it is important to continue to include the special needs students and alternative students as the District moves forward with the many changes and implementations of new programs.

Trustee Edwards said that this is an important discussion and wondered whether the Board and Superintendent ought to have this type of "pulse-taking" conversation more regularly and have it included in policy to do so. She suggested that this discussion should include whether or not there are implications for policy changes so that some of the topics discussed or concerns expressed could be captured in relationship to what the Superintendent could be evaluated on. For example, she expressed concern for teacher morale and said she believed that was partly covered in policy. She said it may be helpful for the Superintendent to hear what the Board feels is necessary in the QAF as a monitoring tool for E-2: Academic Achievement.

Superintendent Jones responded that his objective is to bring forth items that are in alignment with the Trustees' expectations to assist the Board in making an accurate assessment of his performance. He stated that with regard to teacher morale, there have been actions that contribute to moral that he had no control over, such as the recent arbitration, the implementation of the Common Core Standards, which is a state requirement, and evaluations now being attached to student achievement as passed by legislation.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION DIALOGUE (continued)

Trustee Edwards clarified that if the Board wants to be able to evaluate the Superintendent on matters other than what is currently in policy, then a policy discussion needs to take place on how the Board would like to make changes so those expectations are met. She suggested that type the dialogue they are having here could take place occasionally during the Board and Superintendent Communication item on the Board meeting agenda.

Trustee Young asked the Superintendent if the discussion was helpful or whether the thoughts expressed need to be more structured or quantified in order to be clear and measureable.

Superintendent Jones stated that he does need to be clearly aware of those items that the Board will hold him accountable for and the expression of concerns and thoughts shared during this discussion are also important for him and for the public.

Trustee Alderman asked about addressing the components of E-2: Academic Achievement that are not represented in the SPF.

Superintendent Jones responded that in reviewing the QAF in preparation for his interview for the position of superintendent, he could not get a clear indication of what was most important to the Board. He said as he learned more and gathered more input, he tried to capture those things that are most important in the SPF. He said there are components in the QAF, though, that are important and that still should be reported to the Board.

Trustee Alderman asked how the SPF would be presented to the Board in the future.

Trustee Cranor commented that she believes that the SPF should be the primary instrument or evaluative tool, but that she likes that there are those nuance pieces of E-2: Academic Achievement that will still be monitored.

Superintendent Jones stated that staff is working on innovative tools by which to present, track, and view specialized information, and the Board would be receiving a demonstration in the next few weeks.

Dr. Turner responded that the QAF touches on items that must be reported on through Policy Governance® in E-2: Academic Achievement. He said that the SPF is a focusing document that is intended to summarize a great deal of information that is understandable to the public but also to provide enough detail to show how the District is performing. He offered that if possible, the QAF and the SPF would each be reported on separately.

Mr. Martinez added that he, Superintendent Jones, and Dr. Turner, have purposefully approached the SPF in a way that it is a working document and not just a compliance document.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION DIALOGUE (continued)

Trustee Edwards stated that in her opinion the SPF measures language arts and mathematics and some elements with regard to climate and achievement gaps, but there are parts of E-2: Academic Achievement that the Board has said are important and essential, and those elements are addressed in the QAF. She said that in terms of the Superintendent's evaluation, she wondered if the Board weighted some items more heavily than others and if so, whether that has implications for a policy change. She said a question for the Board is whether or not the policies capture the Board's intent and whether or not the Superintendent is meeting those expectations. She suggested that the prioritization should not indicate that any one thing is less important than something else but should be based on what the Superintendent is evaluated on.

Trustee Cranor suggested that as this type of dialogue takes place, the Board and staff should refer specifically to the Executive Limitations, E-1: Vision Statement, and E-2: Academic Achievement and be more conversant around those policies for clarity for the Superintendent.

Trustee Alderman commented on the challenges of measuring aspects of E-2: Academic Achievement such as citizenship, courtesy, and respect. She stated that subjects other than reading and math are important because those subjects, such as art, foreign language, social studies, and financial literacy help to make the whole person and address socioeconomic gaps. She said she would like to see a monitoring report that addresses this area.

Trustee Garvey said she believes there could be some prioritizing, which could change between schools or between communities, and the Board needs to be fluid in their discussions of what is most important as things change and as more funding becomes available.

Trustee Young commented that there needs to be some flexibility and latitude for the Superintendent to do his job, but that the appropriate level monitoring needs to be applied. She cautioned that through all of the reports and documents she did not want the Board to lose sight of the students.

Trustee Wright suggested that in the future the District should be looking at courses that teach life skills such as financial literacy, postsecondary choices, and computer literacy. She said she looks forward to seeing the SPF evolve, and she would like to see some clear highlights of the high priority issues, such as growth and the graduation rate, for example.

Trustee Cranor proposed envisioning the evaluation cycle as a three-phase cycle as an alternative to a predetermined cut score with the Board and Superintendent being currently in the pre-report dialogue phase of the cycle. She said this would be the first phase where the Board gives the Superintendent the information he needs to know whether he is moving in the right direction and meeting the Board's expectations and where the Superintendent gives feedback and tells the Board whether that information is sufficient. She said in the next phase, the Board receives reports, and the Superintendent presents his case, and in the final phase, policy review and any necessary policy revisions take place.

BOARD AND SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION DIALOGUE (continued)

Trustee Alderman suggested that staff present the data in the QAF in the same manner in which the SPF will be presented, answering the questions, "Where are we at? How did we get there?"

Trustee Edwards noted that there is a monitoring report schedule in the Board's Appendix that gives a timeline of how changes are made to policies, and that there is a deadline by which policy changes must be made in order to hold the Superintendent accountable for the following year.

Trustee Cranor clarified that she was not proposing a timeline change but a clear distinction of the different phases of the evaluation process; that the Board provide the Superintendent with the information that he needs, as opposed to a cut score, to effectively make his case to the Board; and that the Superintendent make the determination of what he needs to do to demonstrate that he is accomplishing what is set forth in policy.

AGENDA PLANNING: ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Trustee Edwards requested that Trustee Young review B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance in the schedule and confirm that it is reflective of the timeline that the Board wants.

Trustee Young agreed to do that.

DISCUSSION AND REQUEST FOR SPECIAL MEETINGS

None.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

None.

ADJOURN: 10:27 a.m.

Motion: Wright Second: Cranor Vote: Unanimous