

BOARD PERFORMANCE REPORT CARD - MEETING DATE: 05/04/11

DoTheRightThingForKids.org

OVERALL SCORE: 2.5 / 5

Board Member Attendance: Airick West, Derek Richey, Arthur Benson, Kyleen Carroll, Joseph Jackson, Duane Kelly, Crispin Rea, and Ray Wilson. Marilyn Simmons was absent.

I. [**Effectiveness**] How effective was the Board in addressing academic achievement of students by identifying problems and making decisions and plans to address the problems? I.e., will what they did make a significant difference?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5 (circle one number)
Not effective *Very effective*

Comments/examples _____

Score: 2.4

The Superintendent explained the challenges of increasing academic achievement in urban districts and first year implications of implementing Standards Based Learning.

Perhaps discussion of Portfolio Schools was intended to address academic achievement, but it did not do so effectively.

Information about SWECC students addressed academic achievement.

II. [**Finances**] Did the Board utilize financial data to understand the District's financial status, assure that it stays within its budget, and utilize available resources to accomplish the goals and objectives of the District vs. spending money on items not directly related to goals.

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
No goal-directed resource allocation *Resource allocation addressed goals*

Comments/examples _____

Score: 2

The Board supported the Administration's request to approve the FY12 budget in May and looked at the consent agenda items.

III. [Policy] Did the Board focus strategically on issues of policy, oversight and long term goals vs. “micromanagement”, i.e. getting involved in day-to-day operations, routine business and short term concerns?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Micromanagement/no policy *Policy/no micromanagement*
Comments/examples _____

Score: 2.8

A great deal of time was spent discussing a poorly conceived policy 2.11 - Portfolio of Schools concerning charter schools.

There was too much rambling on policy 2.11.

Eventually the policy was addressed, but the discussion started out with lack of leadership and understanding by board members.

The discussion of 2.11 was too long. A board member volunteered to rewrite it, and the board president asked board members to send their thoughts on 2.1 and Appendix C. Yet the discussion went on and on.

The 2.11 discussion on the portfolio of schools was unnecessarily confusing because the policy proposals made it onto the agenda with the participation of administration. That shouldn't happen. The Board looked bad.

IV. [Community engagement] Did the Board behave in ways that modeled and facilitated good community communication and citizen engagement?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5
Stifled communication & engagement *Encouraged communication & engagement*
Comments/examples _____

Score: 2.4

The Owner Engagement with the Kansas City, Missouri Mayor and City Council Members was postponed.

During the meeting evaluation, a Board member was condescending to the community saying that we "didn't get" the work of the Board and implied we were not competent enough to understand it. Is this good community building?

V. [**Board management**] Was the Board meeting organized and managed in such a way as to support efficiency and good use of time, i.e. arrangements, length, logistics, procedures, rules?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Poorly organized; time wasted

Well organized; time used efficiently

Comments/examples _____

Score: 2.2

The wandering discussion of the policy on charters and contract schools was embarrassing. The issue not being discussed openly was clear. Apparently the draft made it on to the agenda without the participation of the administration. An effective system would ask the Superintendent to draft the policy.

Members not speaking into their microphones is a continuing and irritating problem. The President takes great liberties with his position. The results of votes are seldom audible.

The length of the meeting was appropriate; however, it is just one component of a professional board meeting. Professional behavior is encouraged. Members of the Board are encouraged to attend board meetings of other metropolitan school districts to observe content, congeniality, and respect. Discussion of Policy 2.11 should have been done in a workshop or by an ad hoc committee. The Board President mentioned twice that gathering a quorum for meetings is difficult with this Board. Is that due to the number of meetings being required, or the quality and value of the meetings?

Here again, there was too much rambling over trivia.

In the words of a board member, the ball may have been advanced but it was painful and without leadership, efficiency and effectiveness. In addition, the board members still do not use the microphone.

There was nothing organized and managed about this meeting. Board members cannot be heard when they do not use their microphones.

VI [**Superintendent accountability**] Did the Board hold the Superintendent accountable for the performance of the District by requesting information and progress reports and enforcing deadlines?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

Accountability not required

Accountability strongly required

Comments/examples _____

Score: 2.2

There were rather covert jabs at the Superintendent.

The report by the Superintendent is merely a review of a few individual student or class accomplishments, not a progress report on such topics as plans for summer school, projected enrollment for fall, teacher training for standard based education, etc. Summer school was incidentally mentioned under Consent Items as they voted funding. It was very interesting, and should have been presented separately.

The explanation of Invent Now, Inc. and summer school was very much appreciated. Can this type of information be included in the Superintendent's remarks?

I felt that Dr. Covington answered the boards questions well.

There was still no explanation of why high school monitoring reports were withdrawn.

VII. [**Superintendent's initiatives**] Did the Board respond supportively to the Superintendent's ideas and initiatives, giving them thoughtful consideration?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

No support for initiatives

Strong support for initiatives

Comments/examples _____

Score: 3.2

The Board supported the administration's timing of approving the budget and agreed to consult with the Superintendent on the draft of Policy 2.11.

The Board was supportive of Summer Camp and Invest Now, but they were not presented as Superintendent initiatives.

Information on Superintendent's ideas and initiatives came from board member questions on consent items. It would be informative if the Superintendent could share some information such as Invent Now, Inc. and summer school in his report.

VIII [Board climate] Did the Board demonstrate a climate of cooperation -- participating responsibly at a professional level, avoiding disruptive, personalized or irrelevant comments?

1.....2.....3.....4.....5

No cooperation and professionalism

Climate of cooperation and professionalism

Comments/examples _____

Score: 2.7

The Board seems to be trying.

Th Board still lacks professionalism. It may be collegial, but there is a lack of maturity.

There is not disruptive behavior, but there is not a climate of cooperation if the board president cannot get a quorum to meet to discuss important issues. Perhaps one meeting each month could be used for business and the other for lengthy discussions such as policy 2.11.

Continued failure to address lengthy absences from board members is not professional nor in the best interest of the children in our school district.

Other Comments:

Following the Scholar Superstars presentation, a board member inappropriately asked a student an academic question, putting the student on the spot. Students present at meetings to receive awards should not be asked unrelated questions.

It was embarrassing to have the scholar superstars put on the spot with questions they were not anticipating.

It was inappropriate for a Board member to quiz students on civics at a public board meeting. The point could have been made without the quiz.

The visual presentation is poor, and it is hard to see details on the screen. There is much better technology today. Presentation is very old school.

To avoid the confusion of the policy discussion which caught some members by surprise tonight, why not go to one public meeting a month and use the other meeting date for a working session. This group needs to spend time together hammering out issues without taking public meeting board time to do so. When is the majority of the Board going to take responsibility for addressing the continued absence of a member? The member's constituents are not being represented.

Is there a policy for appointing an interim until the long absent board member can return so that students in the member's district are represented?

The Scholar Super Stars from Paseo were impressive.