

**WINOOSKI BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
SPECIAL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2011**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: J. Lambert, President
B. Corrigan, Secretary
J. Ticehurst, Member
J. Corrigan, Member
R. Millar, Member

OTHERS PRESENT: M. Martineau, Superintendent M. O'Rourke, JFK/WMS Principal
S. Hamble, Dr. of Tchng./Learning J. Helm, Dir. of Student Learning
R. Hood, Dir. of Spec. Ed. J. Brown, WHS Principal
G. Mears, Dir. of Facilities R. Provost, Finance Manager
S. Metivier, Board Secretary L. Basille, Teacher

1. Call to Order/ Pledge of Allegiance: J. Lambert called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
2. Discussion:
 - Administrative Evaluation – The Current Tool
 - Overview of this year's process
 - Should we use the Danielson Model or wait to see what the region adopts?
 - We need to create a policy on administrator evaluation and a cycle similar to teachers

M. Martineau said that at the administrative retreat held this summer we discussed using a tool for an administrative evaluation. We looked at board goals to incorporate into an evaluation tool. VSBA had an evaluation rubric from Doug Reeves, which the administrators decided to use. For the Director of Facilities, a tool was found on the web, and for the Finance Manager an e-mail was sent to others in the state asking for their evaluation tool. As there was no response, a tool was found on the web, which is used in NY schools. All administrators were asked to set an annual plan, which are posted on our web site. Another part of the process is to look at the tool in our professional practice, align with board goals and collect evidence to show progress on the rubric. Administrators completed a self-evaluation, we met and discussed the evaluation and a summary will be provided to the board by the superintendent.

Input from administrators regarding the evaluation process was heard. It was largely felt that even though the administrative model had some good parts to it (documentation of progress), that we should be using the same model that we use for teachers. This model is beneficial in that it sets areas of where a person can grow. J. Lambert asked if it is correct that we are not using student outcomes in evaluation. Martineau said that Dr. Paula Bevan's would like to meet with us at the end of February to discuss with the board the evaluation process. We hope to do this before the informational meeting.

R. Provost felt that her evaluation was a good tool. There was no self-evaluation done, but there was a lot of dialogue. G. Mears felt his evaluation was professionally done and it covered a lot of areas.

Martineau said that using annual plans and discussing progress on them was very helpful in the evaluation process. Jen Corrigan asked if the superintendent went to the teachers for their input. This was not done, as we need training and time to come up with a tool.

Martineau said that the CVSA group has had many discussions about administrative evaluation tools at their monthly meetings. It doesn't make sense for us to use a different tool that what would be used as a region. Next month will be looking at another model – the Vanderbilt model. We should see what CVSA decides so we won't be out there on our own.

3. EXECUTIVE SESSION: MOTIONED by B. Corrigan, second by J. Ticehurst to move into executive session at 7:00 p.m. to discuss administrative structure and superintendent's evaluation. Motion passed 5-0.
4. Adjourn: MOTIONED by J. Ticehurst, second by J. Lambert to adjourn at 9:25 p.m. Motion passed 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Metivier
Secretary to the Board