MEETING MINUTES

VERNONIA SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD of DIRECTORS
Workshop Meeting – October 19, 2026
Vernonia Schools, 1000 Missouri Avenue, Vernonia

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** A Workshop of the Board of Directors of Vernonia School District 47J, Columbia County, Oregon was called to order at 4:01p.m. by Greg Kintz, Board Chair. — MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Board Present: Greg Kintz, Chris McManus, Tony Holmes, Alicia Mahoney, and Amy Cieloha. Joanie Jones arrived at 4:22 p.m. and Lisa Curry arrived at 5:00 p.m. — BOARD PRESENT

Board Absent: None — BOARD ABSENT

Staff Present: Darla Waite-Larkin, Superintendent; and Barb Carr, Administrative Assistant. — STAFF PRESENT

Visitors Present: Mike Scott, Righttime Coaching — VISITORS PRESENT

1. Prior Meeting ReCap:
The power of the Board and the Superintendent team was recapped. Communication that is positive between superintendent and board and vice versa in support of each other builds a strong team.

Roles and Responsibilities – there are a couple areas where board members stray and it is usually on the operation side of things. The board ventures out and tells staff members to do something. This is the job of the Superintendent. The board needs to stay out of operations and personnel.

2. Finalize Board/superintendent team Goals for 2026-27: The Superintendent goals were shared with the Board and Darla Waite-Larkin noted that she revised the goal regarding visibility. She changed this to reflect accessible leadership. The final draft of her goals will be presented at the Nov. board meeting for approval. — SUPT GOALS TO BE APPROVED AT NOV. BOARD MTG.

3. Superintendent Evaluation:
A strong superintendent evaluation process strengthens the board/superintendent team relationship, reviews performance against agreed-upon goals, communicates clear expectations, functions as ongoing feedback, reflects that real education change takes 3-5 years, and builds in grace for calculated risks. — FINAL EVALUATION TEMPLATE TO BE APPROVED AT NOV. BOARD MTG.

Commonly used criteria to inform the superintendent evaluation includes direct knowledge from the board members, evidence of progress towards professional goals and the superintendent self-reflection. Discussion was held on what is working well and where can there be improvement with the current process to evaluate the superintendent.

An area the board felt they wanted to improve was the ability to get feedback from staff through a survey. Mike Scott stated surveys can be tricky and it's important to be mindful of what information you are asking for in a survey. Some challenges in using staff surveys are

- Superintendents are often required to make difficult decisions that are unpopular
- The survey may reflect perceptions or satisfaction around a recent event instead of overall leadership effectiveness
- Respondents may have varying levels of understanding about board goals, district finances, legal requirements, and strategic priorities
- Feedback can be influenced by isolated incidents, rumors, or current controversies
- Survey data is difficult to interpret when response rates are low or participation is uneven

If a survey is used the most appropriate people to include are school board members, cabinet or executive team such as administrators, and those individuals that directly report to the superintendent. Potentially appropriate people to include would be district office staff, district advisory committees, long rang facilities committee, community stakeholders and community partners. For the potentially appropriate groups it is important to stick to information for which they have insight, such as:

- Communication
- Trustworthiness
- Accessibility

- Responsiveness
- Relationship Building
- Clarity of Direction
- Professionalism

Two evaluation options were discussed, 1) the current OSBA tool and 2) A shared goals tool. After discussion the board was in consensus to go with a shared goals tool. A final draft of this evaluation model will be presented to the Board at the Nov. meeting for approval.

4. Working Agreements:
The current working agreement was reviewed. Mike Scott suggested that the priorities would change to reflect the board /superintendent goals.

BOARD / SUPT WORKING AGREEMENT REVIEWED

5. Board Agenda Planning for 2026-27: Mike Scott reviewed some ideas when setting the annual agenda topics such as what are you most curious to learn more about? What questions do you hear most often from community members? What issues to you anticipate this year?

SUGGESTIONS FOR ANNUAL AGENDA PLANNING TOPICS

6. Wrap Up / Closing Activity: Mike Scott asked the board to provide a one-word insight from this training.
Lisa Curry – Optimistic
Joanie Jones – Confidence
Greg Kintz– Optimistic
Amy –. Appreciative that bleachers were finally fixed
Alicia – Happy that the bathroom sign is up
Tony –Optimistic and Calming
Chris – Appreciates the honest communication

CLOSING ACTIVITIE

ADJOURNED: Workshop adjourned 5:46 p.m.

ADJOURNED

Board Chair

District Clerk