

NEVADA STATE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL AUTHORITY

November 10, 2015

Nevada Department of Education
700 East Fifth Street
Board Room
Carson City, Nevada

And

Nevada Department of Education
9890 South Maryland Parkway
Board Room
Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES OF THE EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Adam Johnson
Marc Abelman

In Carson City:

Melissa Mackedon

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

AUTHORITY STAFF PRESENT:

In Las Vegas:

Joan Jurgensen, Education Program Professional, State Public Charter School Authority

In Carson City:

Danny Peltier, Administrative Assistant, State Public Charter School Authority

LEGAL STAFF PRESENT:

In Carson City:

Greg Ott, Deputy Attorney General

AUDIENCE IN ATTENDANCE:

In Las Vegas:

Nick Sarssohm

In Carson City:

None

EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE

CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL; PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE; APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Abelman called the meeting to order at 12:00pm with attendance as reflected above.

Agenda Item 1 – Public Comment

There was no public comment in Las Vegas or Carson City

Agenda Item 2 - Introductions & Overview - Review meeting activities, discuss rationale for WestEd assistance, adjust work plan deadlines as needed, and ensure evaluation meets statute requirements

Paul Koehler and Shelia Arredondo, WestEd, introduced themselves and began their overview of the rationale for WestEd assistance in the SPCSA's Executive Director Evaluation process. Mr. Koehler said he had spoken with Superintendent Canavero about working with the board and said Nevada was a client of WestEd so this was not an additional contract with the SPCSA. Chair Abelman thanked Mr. Koehler and Ms. Arredondo for assisting the SPCSA through the process.

Mr. Koehler and Ms. Arredondo developed a work plan that proposed how WestEd would assist the SPCSA during this evaluation. They also provided the board a list of statutes governing the Executive Director. Mr. Koehler then gave an overview of the work he and Ms. Arredondo had done prior to the subcommittee meeting. Mr. Koehler and Ms. Arredondo spoke to each member of the subcommittee individually in order to gauge what each thought. They provided a summary of the topics discussed which served as the starting point for the discussion.

Agenda Item 3 - Subcommittee Interview Results - Share results from the three interviews and outline areas of agreement and disagreement

Ms. Arredondo explained the interview results with the subcommittee. She said there was a consensus that no process was in place to evaluate the executive director. She said the members had referenced the strategic plan and to set the metrics of measurement based on that. She said the members wanted to identify priorities and goals for the coming years in order to have something to measure the executive director's success against.

She said there was disagreement on the frequency of the evaluations and whether it should be annually or biennially. She said there was disagreement on who should have input on the final evaluation metrics. Members agreed that there were certain decisions that would need to be made quickly including frequency, stakeholder inclusion and overall process. Member Johnson recommended the evaluation be separated into two groups, process and outcome.

Agenda Item 4 - Initial Goals & Design Specifications - Deliberate, clarify, and finalize goals and design specifications for the evaluation protocol

Mr. Koehler then detailed the suggested goals WestEd had come up with based on the information they heard during the interviews. The goals were reflect upon and document the performance of the entire organization, calibrate and align expectations and goals between the board and executive director, determine the board's level of approval and support for the executive director, establish priorities, set goals and determine metrics for the coming year.

It was also recommended the SPCSA board assess the strategic plan and update accordingly along with evaluating the executive director. They said some of the goals were set three years ago and should be updated so the metrics for evaluations would be based on more relevant, up-to-date, goals. Member

EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Johnsons said he hoped there would be more defined targets to better measure the success or failure of the goals and metrics. Member Mackedon said the targets would have to be updated if they were to be based on the strategic plan. She said the goals had been set at the inception of the SPCSA and many of the indicators had become outdated. Member Johnson agreed that the targets and goals needed to be adjusted, but felt there was good baseline indicators contained within the strategic plan.

Ms. Arredondo explained the full board and executive director would complete and analyze results from the one-page assessment form each year, perhaps in the fall or one-year following the appointment of the executive director. Informal mid-year check-in conversations would also be conducted between the executive director and board chair to assess progress and redirect efforts as needed. A written description of the conversation would be necessary only if major adjustments were made to the work plan. Member Mackedon asked if there would be an assessment for schools to fill out during the process. Ms. Arredondo said there was disagreement on that topic but it had been brought up. Discussion continued between the subcommittee and WestEd regarding the level of detail a mid-year check in could require. Member Abelman and Member Johnson both agreed they would like to see one, but Member Mackedon said she didn't think it should be too forma. She said if the measurements for the full evaluation were robust and defined, there would be no need for the executive director to stop what he or she were doing to give the Authority an update that would already be evident. She said as someone who worked for a board, it can be difficult to stop work mid-year for a report, when a full evaluation would take place yearly.

The front side of the one-page assessment form would be similar in style to the first page of the SPCSA Strategic Plan. The front side would include the overarching goal, four main strategies, and recent data for each of the eleven measures, associated targets, and space to write one numerical rating per strategy. Once the front side of the form is completed, individuals would be encouraged to reflect upon the data and ratings and then use the space provided on the back to respond to the following questions: what are the implications for the board, what should be the board's top priority, what are the implications for the executive director and what should be the executive director's top priority?

Member Johnson had to leave the meeting at 1:05pm.

Agenda Item 5 - Proposed Process - Discuss suggested elements and approach, address any areas of disagreement, check alignment with goals and specifications

The meeting continued with discussion of updating the strategic plan. Member Mackedon said she wanted to ensure the strategic plan continued to be representative of the SPCSA Board's goals as opposed to something that would be the executive director's plans and goals. She said differences will come up between the Authority and the executive director and the strategic plan should remain consistent with the Authority board as opposed to changing each time there was a change at the executive director position. Both Mr. Koehler and Ms. Arredondo said they would strongly recommend assessing and updating the strategic plan. This would allow the Authority to set more defined goals for the future and assess the successes and failures of past plans. WestEd provides strategic planning session yearly for boards to assess their strategic plans and they recommended the SPCSA consider adding that onto the yearly calendar.

Agenda Item 6 - Next Steps - Revisit deadlines for version 2 delivery and feedback

Discussion centered on the timeline for developing and implementing the executive director evaluation, which is listed below:

2015 -2016 Calendar

Data Collection

EVALUATION SUBCOMMITTEE

1. The executive director and staff develop definitions to clarify each measure identified in the SPCSA Strategic Plan, compile the most recent data available for each of the measures, and add this information to the one-page assessment form template.

December

2. Assessment - Each board member and the executive director independently complete the one-page assessment form.

January 1 – 14

3. Analysis - The three-member evaluation subcommittee compiles and analyzes results from the eight independently completed assessment forms. The subcommittee calculates average performance scores for each strategy as well as an average overall rating and summarizes themes resulting from qualitative analysis of responses to the questions on the back of the form.

January 14-21

4. The three-member evaluation subcommittee prepares a brief summary report for the January Board Meeting.

January 29

5. Reporting - The three-member evaluation subcommittee shares results with the full board and executive director during the January Board Meeting.

February

6. Evaluation - The full board and executive director use the information contained in the summary report to collectively evaluate organizational progress; identify priorities for the coming year; establish goal(s), measures, and targets for the organization and the executive director; and determine next steps. Note: This step should be conducted as part of an annual strategic planning session.

March 1 - 14

7. Revision - The executive director and three-member evaluation subcommittee use board approved results from the February session to update the strategic plan. New and/or revised goals, strategies, measures, and targets are added to the assessment form template for the next annual evaluation.

March 21 - 31

8. Adoption - The full board reviews the revised strategic plan, makes adjustments as necessary, and then adopts the plan for the coming year.

April

9. Reporting - Evaluation results are reported publicly.

After the timeline was discussed Mr. Peltier said he would be able to send some of the data collection information to WestEd quickly.

Member Abelman asked for a motion to adjourn. Member Mackedon seconded. There was no further discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm