

Tawas Area Schools  
Special Board of Education Meeting  
August 7, 2024

A special meeting of the Tawas Area Board of Education was called to order by Vice President Ulman at 5:02 p.m. on Wednesday, August 7, 2024, in the boardroom at the administration office.

Mrs. Edmonds led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call:

Present: Ulman, Jenkins, Lentz, Edmonds

Absent: Klenow, Butzin, Bruning

Tardy: None

Administrators Present: Klinger, Danek

**PUBLIC COMMENTS – INFORMATION AND PROPOSALS**

Mrs. Ulman asked if anyone had comments on agenda or non-agenda items. There were no comments.

**NEW BUSINESS**

The board began their work session with Mr. Brian Pearson who presented on the new superintendent evaluation tool released by MASB. Mr. Pearson said that the goal of the new evaluation tool is to increase accuracy when evaluating the Superintendent.

Mr. Pearson spoke about how the process of evaluating the Superintendent has changed. A mid-year progress check is now mandatory. The Board discussed how this would look with Mrs. Danek transitioning to her new role as Superintendent. They talked about not doing a mid-term check this first cycle for Mrs. Danek or possibly adjusting the quarterly check-ins and only doing a mid-year check.

Mr. Pearson talked about the requirements of the law next. The Superintendent must be evaluated annually and through the evaluation process must be assigned a rating of effective, developing or needing support. There must also be a mid-year progress check which can be a closed session discussion but must then be acknowledged in open session with a motion. The Board may give a brief synopsis of the discussion before the motion is made. The ratings have changed and highly effective is no longer a rating option. Mr. Pearson also talked about the student growth portion of the evaluation now being worth 20%. The same assessments must be used for all staff. The rubric that has been created by administration is already meeting these requirements. Rater reliability is now required and training is required every 3 years. The follow up training after the initial training has been completed is only a 20-minute training. All board members must complete the training. If they do not complete it, they can be a part of the progress check but cannot participate in the final evaluation. If a board member who has not completed the training does offer their opinions or input, this input cannot be considered by the Board in their final evaluation.

If there are extenuating circumstances or if the Superintendent has worked less than 60 days, they are not required to be evaluated.

There must be an appeal process outline in the Superintendent's contract. If an appeal leads to their rating being vacated, you must use the rating from the previous year's evaluation.

In the event that the Superintendent is rated effective for 3 years in a row, then they can switch to being evaluated every other year if the Board decides to do this. If the Superintendent is rated as developing or needing support, then an improvement plan is required. When formulating this improvement plan, the Board must follow the Open Meetings Act and remember that FOIA applies. The Superintendent must request a closed session discussion to go over this plan. The Board cannot go into closed session with a request from the Superintendent.

A review was done of the 10 different standards contained within the MASB tool. Mr. Pearson went over the key finding that came out of the research done, which was that district-level leadership and length of Superintendent tenure has an impact on student achievement.

The performance categories were also reviewed, but have not changed. Each category lists a set of criteria that define and describe the work being evaluated, specific indicators of performance, and lists artifacts that may serve as proof of progress toward the goals. Mr. Pearson explained that a rating of effective is typically associated with someone who is being proactive, a rating of developing is associated with living in the moment, and a rating of needing support is associated with needing a lot of help. He said if the Superintendent is getting rated as effective, that is acceptable and the rubric should not be manipulated. He said if you want to build rigor, then the goals need to be increased.

Mr. Pearson spoke to the current transition of Mrs. Danek to the Superintendent role and recommended that the Board and Mrs. Danek made some short term goals for the transition, maybe 1 or 2 goals for the first cycle, and then develop new goals the following year.

Mr. Pearson encouraged the Board to look at the hard evidence that is presented to them and not depend on feedback from others. This evidence should be provided to the Board through updates, a shared drive, hard copies or any other evidence requested by the Board.

When determining a final score, a collaborative process should be used. The final score should not be an average of the individual Board members' ratings. Once the final score has been assigned, the Board will enter into open session and vote on the final total.

Mr. Pearson suggested that the Board have a planning meeting with the Superintendent in September to develop goals and determine what artifacts should be provided. There should also be a calendar created showing when the check-ins and mid-year progress evaluation will take place. The creation of this calendar can be done in a workshop and the final calendar can be shared at a regular meeting. At the planning meeting, the Board should be sure to clarify their expectations and identify what data will be used in the student growth component.

When the final evaluation is complete, the category scores should be reported publicly and then the Board should vote on the overall final score. The Board President and the Superintendent must sign the evaluation and the score must be reported in the REP.

Mr. Pearson reiterated that the Board must complete training to be involved in the evaluation process. He suggested having everyone be involved in September to start the process with Mrs. Danek, and encouraging anyone who hasn't completed the training to do so as soon as possible. Anyone who does not complete the training can vote on the evaluation but cannot be a part of the consensus. It is the Board's responsibility to ensure that only those who have completed training participate in the evaluation.

Motion by Ulman, with support by Edmonds to adjourn the meeting at 6:48 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.