

Notice of Meeting
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #43
BOARD MEETING

SRVRTC – Lou Thompson Room

March 5, 2014

6:30 P.M.

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order: L. Hennig
- II. Roll Call: L. Hennig
- III. Pledge of Allegiance: L. Hennig
- IV. Adjustments to Agenda: L. Hennig
- V. Minutes: 1-16-2014
- VI. Information:
 - A. Evaluation Presentation by DoE to be followed by Discussion
- VII. Action
 - A. Evaluation
- VIII. Non-Public under RSA 91-A:
- IX. Agenda Items for Next Meeting: May 15, 2014
- X. Adjournment

NONPUBLIC SESSION WORKSHEET

SAU #43 Board Meeting
March 5, 2014

Motion By: _____

I move that this Board go into Nonpublic Session to act upon a matter or matters referenced in the following provisions of RSA 91-A:2 I and/or RSA 91-A:3 II (check appropriate provision.)

- 91-A:2 I (a) Strategy or negotiations with respect to collective bargaining;
- 91-A:2 I (b) Consultation with legal counsel;
- 91-A:2 I (d) Circulation of draft documents which, when finalized, are intended only to formalize decisions previously made in a meeting; provided, that nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to alter or affect the application of any other section of RSA 91-A to such documents to related communications.

- 91-A:3 II (a) The dismissal, promotion, or compensation of any public employee or the disciplining of such employee, or the investigation of any charges against him or her, unless the employee affected (1) has a right to a meeting and (2) requests that the meeting be open, in which case the request shall be granted.
- 91-A:3 II (b) The hiring of any person as a public employee.
- 91-A:3 II (c) Matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a member of the public body itself, unless such person requests an open meeting;
- 91-A:3 II (d) Consideration of the acquisition, sale, or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community.
- 91-A:3 II (e) Consideration or negotiation of pending claims or litigation which has been threatened in writing or filed against the public body or any subdivision thereof, or against any member thereof because of his or her membership in such public body, until the claim or litigation has been fully adjudicated or otherwise settled.
- 91-A:3 II (i) Consideration of matters relating to the preparation for and the carrying out of emergency functions, including training to carry out such functions, developed by local or state safety officials that are directly intended to thwart a deliberate act that is intended to result in widespread or severe damage to property or widespread injury or loss of life.

Seconded by: _____

Roll Call Vote: (list Board members by name and indicate yes or no vote for each member.)

Minutes/Decisions Reached: (identify decisions by Motion, Second, and vote.)

Motion By: _____

I move that the minutes of this Nonpublic session be sealed, because divulgence of the information likely would adversely affect the reputation of any person other than a member of this board or render the proposed action ineffective, until, in the opinion of a majority of members, the aforesaid circumstances no longer apply.

Second By: _____

Roll Call Vote: (2/3 vote required; list Board members by name, indicate yes or no vote for each member)

Motion By: _____

I move that this Board return to public session.

Second By: _____

Vote: _____

V. Minutes

1-16-2014

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT #43

MEETING MINUTES

January 16, 2014

I. Call to order

Chairman Liz Hennig called to order the regular meeting of the SAU #43 Board at 6:09pm on January 16, 2014 at the Sugar River Valley Technical Center, Lou Thompson Room.

II. Roll Call

Chairman Liz Hennig conducted a roll call. The following persons were present from the Newport School Board: Linda Wadensten, Heidi North, Liz Hennig, Leo Paquin and Karen Little
Arriving at: 6:23pm Emily Owens from the Croydon School Board
Also Present: Superintendent Irwin Sussman and Theresa Wetherington

III. Pledge of Allegiance

Liz Hennig led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance

IV. Adjustments to the agenda

The amended Minutes of 5-30-2013 were added

V. Minutes: 5/30/2013 and 11/20/2013

ON A MOTION BY LINDA WADENSTEN AND A SECOND BY KAREN LITTLE, THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES AS AMMENDED OF MAY 30, 2013.

ON A MOTION BY LINDA WADENSTEN AND A SECOND BY KAREN LITTLE, THE BOARD VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 20, 2013

VI. Information:

A. Legislative Update –

Linda Wadensten- In talking with the education community within the next few years of the evaluation processes other legislative bills that will include support staff etc.. will be expected.

Restraint issues are still out there but not too much else relative at this time.

Mr. Sussman- In regards to this issue there will be a meeting January 17, 2014 at 10:00am with Barrett Christina and the Board will be supplied information and updates

B. Evaluation Committee Report-

Linda Wadensten- The history: HB 142 comes from the waiver of NCLB where now schools are now required to have evaluations that prove outcomes to receive federal Title I funding. There are 227 schools that receive that title and the house felt that evaluations need to be done regularly to improve schools that were a DINI or SINI existed because this waiver no longer exists.

Superintendent Mr. Sussman – He will send his NH Admin Association comments on the prospective along with the Legislative update issues

Mr. Sussman/ Linda Wadensten read and reviewed the follow up from Stacy Penna (Marzano) presentation

Leo Paquin- expressed the benefit of having representation of the Marzano to come and give another presentation as well as if Mr.

Sussman would like to present another model that the board would entertain the presentation.

Everyone was in agreement

Mr. Sussman would contact Kearsarge again and ask if they could present their model

It was agreed upon by the board and Mr. Sussman that we do another presentation and Mr. Sussman would be sure that invites would get out so proper representation could attend. It was suggest: 2:30 for the 7-12 and 3:30 for the K-6

Therese Wetherington had gotten some feedback that it seemed the decision to use the Marzano Model was already made As well concerns as to whether it would provide measurement and feedback as will portion of the model be built and customized Some emphasis was given to the cost savings if training was piggy backed with Lebanon who is currently in contract for this model and planning on PD in August.

Linda Wadensten- showed and explained the DOE timeline for compliance. Although passed and signed in July 2013 would need to be adopted, developed, tested and ready to make personnel decisions by end 2017 school year.

Mr. Sussman asked if a presentation could be made to the administration

Leo Paquin expressed the importance of the committee to elaborate on its process of how Marzano was selected and recommended as the premier choice

Heidi North-asked the board what then was the purpose of the committee

Linda Wadensten /Heidi North – reiterated again the criteria that the board originally set for this committee

- **Evaluations for all staff**

- Show transparency strengths and weaknesses
- Easy to use
- Ongoing support
- Can be used for merit based pay

Karen Little requested further clarification of the timeline
 Linda Wadensten presented exact timeline handout;
 2014 – 2015 Evaluation System needs to be developed
 2015-2016 Evaluation System needs to be fully implemented
 2016-2017 – the evaluations need to be used in making decisions
 *legislators are planning on adding to the teach evaluations by adding requirement for support staff and administration to this evaluation initiative

Questions/concerns for Marzano Model that Linda Wadensten agreed to follow up on:

Therese Wetherington– PD requirements, the timing of the process
 Inquired about phase II and could it be modified as long as it parallel DOE requirements?

Do they offer “train the trainer” or a casual teacher model

Is the Marzano Teacher Evaluation model aligned with the NH State evaluation guide lines?

Is there Train the trainer workshops?

Is Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model aligned with NH state standards for teacher evaluation?

Can we add other elements, ex. ones from the Danielson Framework

The Definition of the 41 elements?

Leo Paquin – how long is the contract?

Can we cancel and what would be the implications?

Karen Little- What is the level of customer service for the training software and support?

What other districts in NH are using this model?

Requested references

Liz Henning – Can we select a portion to meet requirements and then expand from there?

Details of “crosswalks” and this option

Leo Paquin– Is it a web based system

Do we have options?

What are the risks?

Can we set goals per grade?

Liz Hennig– Suggested that our first training should be as presenter suggested Phase 1 training and development CFO committee and model to our district

Linda Wadensten –Presented the phases:

Learner & learning

Content knowledge

Instruction practice

Professional responsibility

Student outcome

Leo Paquin– We don’t want a model that doesn’t have proof behind it and that hasn’t been tested. We don’t necessarily want to work alongside another district that is in their learning process

Linda Wadensten said she would get answers and that any other questions please send them to her for answers. She would also follow up on the presentation for the staff.

Emily Owens– How does Croydon fit into this?

Asked if they receive title one funding right now

Suggested it may be so insignificant it may be better for them to lose it.

Questioned if they even needed it.

Linda Wadensten -They would be lumped into the k-6 program at Richards and would have (use) their own laptops to do their evaluations. Linda Wadensten also commented she wasn't sure the requirements of being able to give up title I funding and discouraged her to do that.

There was a discussion about the cost and training offered Linda Wadensten –explained we have an opportunity to work with Lebanon who is doing 4 trainings by Marzano in August, if we did it alone would cost the district over 20K.

Leo Paquin -suggested we do our own timeline of training and not worry so much about partnering with Lebanon he felt there may be other districts when we are ready that we can collaborate with.

Over view follow up outline:

Linda Wadensten will call Stacy Penna and see if she can represent by end of February

Linda Wadensten / Heidi North will put together a brief summary of the process for administration of how Marazno was selected and recommended ASAP

Mr. Sussman will contact those who attended the presentation and get follow up questions to Linda Wadensten within 7 days

After the administration has been presented to, a committee within should then be formed

- VII. Non Public session was waived
- VIII. Agenda Items for next meeting-
Evaluation Committee Report
- IX. Adjournment-

ON A MOTION BY KAREN LITTLE AND A SECOND BY LINDA WADENSTEN, THE BOARD UNANIMOUSLY CLOSED THE MEETING
The time was 8:40pm

Respectfully Submitted;
Heidi North, Secretary

DRAFT