

**Mississippi Board of Education
Board of Education Training
State Superintendent of Education Evaluation Process
Friday, October 16, 2015
Mississippi Public Broadcasting – Jackson, MS – Board Conference Room
8:30 a.m.**

Meeting Minutes

The members of the Mississippi Board of Education met at 8:30 a.m. on Friday, October 16, 2015, in the Board Conference Room at Mississippi Public Broadcasting, 3825 Ridgewood Road, Jackson, Mississippi.

Board members present: Ms. Rosemary G. Aultman, Ms. Kami Bumgarner, Dr. Karen J. Elam, Mr. Johnny Franklin, and Dr. John R. Kelly (Board Chair)

Board members absent: Dr. Jason S. Dean, Mr. William H. Jones, Mr. Charles McClelland, and Mr. Richard Morrison

Former Board member present: Dr. O. Wayne Gann

MDE staff present: Ms. Sonya M. Amis, Dr. Kim S. Benton, Mr. Washington Cole, Ms. Jean Cook, Ms. Patrice Guilfoyle, Mr. Todd Ivey, Ms. Heather Mitchell, Dr. John Q. Porter, Mr. Quentin Ransburg, Mr. Pete Smith, Mr. Pat Ross, and Dr. Carey M. Wright

Attorney General staff present: Ms. Raina Lee

National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) representative present: Mr. Robert Hull

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) representative present: Dr. Rick Melmer

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Dr. John R. Kelly, Chair. Dr. Kelly introduced Dr. Rick Melmer (CCSSO) and Mr. Robert Hull (NASBE) and thanked them for coming and welcomed them to Mississippi. The members of the Board and staff introduced themselves.

Dr. Kelly discussed the timeline of the process for the state superintendent of education evaluation. Dr. Kelly referenced the Board Retreat held in April 2015, where the Board discussed the roles and responsibilities of the Board, and how the evaluation of the superintendent came out of that discussion. Dr. Kelly recognized Ms. Sonya Amis and Mr. Quentin Ransburg on beginning the process by contacting subject matter experts at CCSSO and NASBE. Dr. Kelly credited Mr. Hull and Dr. Melmer for bringing the process to where we are today.

Like Mississippi, many states do not currently have a superintendent of education evaluation process. There needs to be some way to get evaluation feedback to the superintendent. The evaluation process needs to be transparent, and all parties involved need to be kept in the loop.

Dr. Kelly referenced the agenda and the evaluation tool feedback provided by the Board members. During the training Mr. Hull and Dr. Melmer will weed through the feedback and try to answer questions from the Board members. Dr. Kelly stated the goal of the training was to have an evaluation instrument that is fair, transparent, and thorough.

Dr. Rick Melmer introduced himself and provided a brief background on his work history and accomplishments in education and on CCSSO and their role as a membership organization for state departments of education. This is CCSSO's first effort to work with a state department of education on a superintendent evaluation process, and they would like to develop an instrument that they can replicate for use around the country.

Mr. Robert Hull introduced himself and provided a brief background on his work history and accomplishments in education and on NASBE and their role as a membership organization for state boards of education. Mr. Hull stated that NASBE has had requests from other states requesting a chief evaluation tool.

Dr. Melmer went through the training objectives and four goals to accomplish during the training:

1. Where we have been
2. Goals and outcomes
3. Specific tools, processes and components (will be tailored to Mississippi)
4. Once a plan is developed how to integrate that plan into a policy format

Mr. Hull stated that the evaluation process is about long-term capacity building. Mr. Hull received Board participation on what they think the purpose of an evaluation is:

- Feedback
- Monitoring of the Strategic Plan
- Accountability
- Measurement of success/failure
- Improvement of performance
- Guidance – State educational agency staff

Mr. Hull stated that the purpose of an evaluation is accountability and trust, and the two levels of benefit are personal and institutional. The personal level helps the superintendent as an individual recognize his/her achievements and opportunities for growth. The institutional level helps align the board and the department. Achievements and growth are made through the superintendent and also provide opportunities for growth for the board. A board shows growth personally and institutionally like the superintendent. Another benefit for the board is transparency by allowing institutional accountability.

Dr. Melmer went through the review of the appraisal tools. Each state is different when it comes to the evaluation process (e.g., elections, appointments).

The superintendent must lead the agency in five key ways:

1. Technical Leadership
2. Human Leadership
3. Educational Leadership
4. Cultural Leadership
5. Symbolic Leadership

Dr. Melmer said they have taken these five areas and applied them to the evaluation of a state educational agency. This is the very first opportunity to work through an evaluation process like this with the superintendent present, and they are hoping to receive feedback and determine what areas should be reconsidered to improve the evaluation tool moving forward. There are three purposes of the appraisal tools:

1. Self-Evaluation
2. 360 Degree Assessment
3. Evaluation Tool

The same set of competencies would apply to all three tools to ensure consistency.

Comments and issues brought about through table discussion:

- Some Board members are new and do not have a benchmark to go by
- The 360 Degree Assessment needs to be more condensed
- Sending the 360 Degree Assessment to all superintendents is too much; need to send to a sample of districts
- Superintendent should have some role in deciding who the 360 Degree Assessment is sent to
- For an organization that has not been involved in formal evaluations of its superintendent, it is much too early to think about a 360 tool
- The evaluation process needs to be kept positive
- The evaluation process is a great process to see where we are and how we can improve

Mr. Hull stated that the purpose of the 360 Degree Assessment is to provide information for the board, not to evaluate the superintendent.

Mr. Robert Hull presented the Decision Points. Two key questions to keep in mind are:

1. What are the desired outcomes of the evaluation process?
2. What standards will be used as a basis for the evaluation process?

A board must agree on the core areas of competency before devising the evaluation system.

- Are the core areas of competency discussed the right ones for Mississippi?
- What additional areas of responsibility do you wish to include in the evaluation process beyond the core leadership competencies?

Comments and issues brought about through table discussion:

- Order of the evaluation rubric; should be aligned to the Strategic Plan
- Hit the hard targets first (facts, test scores, data) and then the soft targets (personal attributes)
- Do not see any stretch goals (targets that are set at a very high bar)
- Compensation for meeting the stretch goals
- Concern with the large number of competencies, but it is hard to eliminate some of those

Mr. Hull went through the Decision Points (defining the process and establishing the parameters).

Dr. Melmer suggested coming up with a general 360 Degree Assessment tool. It was agreed that the 360 tool should also include the leadership team.

Members of the Board agreed upon a tentative timeline for the evaluation process.

Short Term (process vetting)

- State Superintendent gives report to the Board (December 2015)
- Board members complete the evaluation rubric independently and electronically submit it to NASBE (December 2015 – January 2016)
- NASBE tabulates results and forwards them to Dr. Kelly and Dr. Wright (January 2016)
- Board convenes to discuss the results in Executive Session (January 2016)

Mid Term (process refining)

- Review process: May – June
- Alter instruments: May – June
- Develop policy: June – September


Long Term (process implementation)

- Launch formal process

Dr. Kelly thanked Mr. Hull and Dr. Melmer on the very informative process they presented and also thanked Ms. Amis and Mr. Ransburg for their hard work.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m.

Approved:



John R. Kelly, Chair
Mississippi Board of Education



Carey M. Wright
Executive Secretary
Mississippi Board of Education