

Minutes
Board of Directors Meeting
National SAM Innovation Project

Date: July 6, 2021

Time: 9:00 AM EST

Location: San Pedro Conference Room, J. W. Marriott Starr Pass Resort, Tucson, Arizona

Present: Mark Shellinger, Executive Director
Bert Hendee, President
Paul Katnik, Vice President
Debbie Daniels, Secretary
Nathan Roberts, Treasurer
Dave Sechler, Member
Shawna Fagbuyi, Incoming Member
Erika Zigelman, Outgoing Member

I Call to order: at 9:06AM EST by President Bert Hendee

II Quorum: All board members were present. (Four required.)

III Farewell to Erica, Seating of Shawna

- A. The board said Goodbye to Erica. She shared her experience as a board member and what Shawna could expect. She discussed being a voice for principals and for SAMs. She will continue to support NSIP and is writing grants in hopes of new monies to help support SAMs. Mark shared the history and evolution of including a practitioner on the SAM board. Erica will remain a member of the SAM organization.
- B. President Hendee welcomed Shawna to the board of directors.
- C. The board introduced themselves to Shawna.
- D. Mark shared how energetic Shawna is and how enthusiastic she is about SAMs. Paul remarked that he was impressed with her vision and Bert commented that she “just lit up the screen!”
- E. Shawna shared how she became involved with SAMS and her excitement about the process. She discussed the energy she took home from the SAM conference and how much she enjoyed the SAM Talks. She expressed her gratitude and the opportunity to be a member of the NSIP Board of Directors.

IV Reading and Approval of Minutes: Motion was made by Paul Katnik and seconded by Dave Sechler to approve the minutes as written. Motion carried. 6 -0.

V Executive Director: Service, Fiscal, Legal

- A. Bert shared that Mark has put in an amazing amount of work to keep SAMs alive during the pandemic.
- B. June 30, 2020 – there was a negative balance. Mark and Carol paid NSIP expenses to keep the payroll going. They have been repaid. 2021 – balance \$580,000 including Wallace and other grants/gifts.

- C. Service changed to all remote training, implementation specialist work, and coaching.
- D. For additional support, NSIP increased the amount of professional development and coaching provided to SAM Teams.
- E. The baseline cost for SAM services was lowered from \$12,900 to \$4,500 with costs that can be added. The costs are different in some places based on the involvement and the history of the work in those areas.
- F. At the \$4,500 fee, Mark says that he can make SAMs work.
- G. Coaches will return to one or two in-person meetings on a limited basis. Online will continue and has been found to be effective. The cost and time effectiveness rate has been successful. Again, depending on the district and their involvement, in-person visits will be different.
- H. There are some big expenses coming, particularly with the tech work.
- I. Mark has found a lot of benefits from working online and traveling less. He has determined that the training works well with 8 – 10 participants, but not as effective with 30. He is still working on how to be as effective with 30. He explained how he conducts the training.
- J. Federal funds paperwork is completely done. NSIP owes a disaster loan that is to be repaid (\$146,000) and has received a Wallace award of \$190,000.
- K. Mark shared how the transition to online went and how well it worked.
- L. Financially, NSIP is fine. Mark has no real concerns. He is trying to figure out how to get more states to use the funds that state have that are approvable funds for SAMs. In some places, it is being used and in others there are still challenges.
- M. Dave talked about how helpful it was to set in on the training.
- N. Dave asked about the changes in the webpage.
 - i) There are some struggles getting the results and data wanted from the website.
 - ii) There is a private company that will be working with NSIP on this.
 - iii) Mark reviewed the new features.
- O. NSIP brought on two new states in August – Wisconsin and Nevada (contract not signed yet).
- P. Word of mouth is still the best recruiting tool that NSIP has.
- Q. Money in some states is not getting to the school level and that is frustrating. There is a hope that this changes.
- R. NSIP has found it encouraging that more superintendents and district personnel are using SAMS and TimeTrack. This really helps to bring on more schools in the districts.
- S. The question was asked as to any downsides to not shadowing SAM principals – Mark said, surprisingly, no. This could not be reinstated unless the fees were raised. The national average was 25% on instruction and is being used as a baseline.
- T. In the training now, Mark starts with management events and how to schedule it and then moves to personal and instructional time.
- U. Shawna shared an example of how to manage emails and how it works with time management.
- V. Paul suggested that so much has changed about SAMs now and we need to revisit/research the new process pieces.
- W. Mark has been keeping data on how many stick with SAMs and how many drop out. This past year, only four dropped out.

- X. Mark would like to look at teams at level 3 and 4 and do some research with the teachers and see how they are working with principals and the relationship with the teachers and increased effectiveness based on principal change and how that impacts teacher change. Missouri is doing some studies now on how principal actions move teacher practice. Shawna shared an example of how she analyzed this type of data. It helped her to see what she needed to do to improve her practice. Paul connected this practice to the Balanced Score Card and how coaching and effectiveness is measured in Missouri.
- Y. When teams mature to the point to delve into data, it demonstrates just how effective the SAM process can be.
- Z. Mark discussed how to use TimeTrack data on working with teachers and the impact on teachers.
- AA. Nathan queried whether there a way to have a referral incentive, such as a \$100 off the conference fee. Dave had some reservations of it “sounding like” a pyramid scheme. Dave discussed the challenges from referrals that appear to offer promises that are not reality. Shawna liked the idea of some type of ambassadorship in the SAM recruitment process. Bert is apprehensive about incentivizing with money or discounts to the conference – it should be about the passion and real interest.
- BB. There is a focus group report that Mark will share later. Gamify was an incentive idea.
- CC. There are marketing possibilities that we need to discuss more. Dave continued to share a “Big Brother, Big Sister” concept.
- DD. The NSIP Mentoring system is 100% in place and is working very well. NSIP is open-ended on the amount of time for mentoring.
- EE. NSIP is training four new coaches. Two are Steve and Carol Seid, Jay Roth, and an Iowa principal.
- FF. NSIP has an SBA Loan, 2 pay protection grants, a Wallace grant, and a federal tax relief which will last another two quarters. NSIP would still have about a \$200,000 balance without all of these grants and incentives.
- GG. Eric and Jim are valuable to SAMs and are both committed to remaining with SAMs. Mark is going to ask for more on the 401K for the two of them.
- HH. An NSIP legal issue – “service failure” - occurred when there was no food inside because of rain but they were charging for the food (\$190,000) and had also used attendee information that they put in the Marriott system, but it has been removed. It was worked out with Marco Island and NSIP did not pay for that dinner plus received a penalty fee for Marco Island using the attendee information.
- II. Another legal issue – implementation specialist car accident and insurance – our insurance will cover NSIP, if needed.
- JJ. Both legal issues are now settled.
- KK. Springfield Research – A superintendent did a data report comparing SAM vs non-SAM schools. The report was very positive toward SAMs. While good information, it is not a real research study. This study stopped when NSIP lost Scott during COVID. Missouri works with a federal comprehensive center to do research and study.
- LL. All the board members agreed that now may be the time to do some studies. Research can be less cost effective now by using Zoom. Proven data and results are the most effective way to recruit and provide information that motivates people to join SAMs or create interest.

MM. Bibb County is doing some research that is interesting. Lansing used data to make a case of making teachers better. It was a Tale of Two Teachers. The data was used to show what the teachers and students did and tied it to the principal's engagement.

NN. Shawna asked if SAMs goes to other conferences and the answer is yes, but have not found them to be very effective.

VI Updates on Research, Focus Groups, National Conference

A. Focus Groups

- i) A selected group was given the charge to develop a focus group to focus on the SAM work. The charge was to look at a big idea and open up to the SAMs community and anyone who wanted to participate. The sessions were facilitated, and three questions asked were:
 - (a) How have you leveraged the SAM process throughout the pandemic?
 - (b) What component of the SAM process do you find most/least helpful?
 - (c) If you had an opportunity to be a part of a National SAM Design Team to improve principal practice, what would you prioritize?
- ii) Some of the big ideas/themes that emerged were: Gamify – consider including features such as badges, synching calendars, hosting ongoing collaborative group sessions by teams or role alike groups and selecting topics for the sessions.
- iii) Gamification with badges really came to the forefront.
- iv) The new Time Track is moving forward on connecting the calendar with other calendars.
- v) Mark agreed that there were opportunities to implement all of the big ideas in the coming year. Mark plans to do more with focus groups in the coming year and with different groups and select mentors for the focus groups. He plans to offer honorariums to the focus group members.
- vi) Paul supports the honorarium; the board would provide questions and include a board member on each focus group. For example, Now that you have proven that you are an instructional leader, what metrics could you use to show impact? There are an endless number of questions that we could put to the focus group or professional learning community.
- vii) Dave discussed how deprived many are with professional development, and this could certainly support professional learning. He also discussed the result of the focus group sessions and how the NSIP board will respond to the report/results. The goal is to build the capacity of all members of the SAM Team.
- viii) The board will respond to the focus group and how they plan to move forward in honoring this work and identify the areas that will be addressed this year.
- ix) A format and variety of models will be considered and for longer charges there should have a specific topic/question. Another feature could be to have access to discussions and modules.
- x) This will help to take SAM Talks to the next level.
- xi) Bert asked how we get the topic of impact into action and get some feedback for the board. Going through the focus group is an action. Mark continued to discuss the need for examples of impact and that we need examples, like the The Tale of Two Teachers. Shawna suggested asking principals what areas of their role has been impacted by SAMs. What has helped you to move an initiative in your building?

- xii) Mark reminded the board that we have to be careful about not being evaluative.
- xiii) Bert will send a letter to the focus group on behalf of the board. Including the board's interest in learning more about impact, including looking at the rubrics and providing feedback.

B. Review of Mission/Vision of NSIP – Metrics work continued

- i) Paul provided a worksheet for the board to work through the common vision/mission of NSIP.
- ii) The board discussed the components that Paul identified.
- iii) The board suggested using this worksheet as a guide for the September meeting.
- iv) In terms of metrics, how do we identify them in the vision and mission. The discussion turned to the tools that are SAM owned and that is what this board should use as metrics. For example, SAM Team Performance Rubric, 3 Non-negotiables – Time Track, Daily Meeting, First Responders.
- v) The board found this exercise to be very insightful and help in focusing on the vision and mission and being committed to the statements and having them truly guide board agendas, conference presentations and activities, etc.
- vi) Paul requested by September 1, all board members complete the worksheet and send them to Paul.

C. Policy Review

- i) Policy 2.2: RPDC needs to be removed because this is specific to Missouri.
- ii) Policy 2.3, 2.8 and 3.1: There are no state affiliates anymore. Affiliates mentioned in the Vision refers to the original and history of the organization.
- iii) Dave will work on the language about affiliates and present at the September board meeting.
- iv) Policy 3.8: The role of the treasurer needs to be rewritten. Nathan will work with Mark on this.
- v) The issue of the executive director loaning money to the organization was discussed and the concerns of the board about similar future situations. Language will be drafted to address this situation for the next meeting. Nathan and Mark will work on this language.
- vi) Policy 3.9: The language stating that the executive director supervises all employees needs to be addressed and that the language in the evaluation instrument should be changed to address operations and not personnel. This language will also be revised by Paul Katnik, Bert and Shawna and bring it back to the next meeting.
- vii) Bylaws 2.2 Board of Directors item j should include more explicit language. Paul will draft new language.
- viii) Dave has asked that all assignments be sent to him by August 6th, so he can compile and send it to the board members prior to the September board meeting.

VII Next National Conference Information

A. January 26 – 30, 2022

- i) We have received four conference offers to host. Starr Pass has also made an offer for January. Mark plans to visit some Marriott resorts in Florida in August. Starr Pass will be the backup for 2022 and we will also look at coming back in 2023.
- ii) The board agreed with his plan.

VIII Review of new TimeTrack

- A. Eric explained the new version 6 of Time Track.
- B. This has given him an opportunity to rebuild Time Track.
- C. Eric shared information about the new version to the Board and all board members had an opportunity to try out the new version. Board members all found the new version very intuitive and user friendly.

IX New Business

- A. **Implementation and Performance Rubric** – Mark charged a committee to review and revise the performance rubric – The thinking is a continuum of three rubrics from implementation to performance. The intent was to provide a rubric, measurement for teams of all sizes / schools / districts. The committee standardized the language. Paul asked why do we have these rubrics? The original principal rubric was created to help new teams make progress and become reflective. The goal of the entire process is to do more than manage your time more effectively and to see an end result of the implementation and the continuous improvement. Implementation should begin the look at changes in practice. The board held an in-depth discussion about the rubrics and the process.
 - i) Implementation Rubric
 - (a) This document measures the basic training and the Implementation phase and require level three completed to move to coaching. The goal is to achieve 51 % or higher on instruction and that it supports student achievement.
 - ii) Performance Rubric Practitioner’s 1.0
 - (a) The purpose is to ask the questions before you move, check to see what they have accomplished.
 - (b) For this one, everyone must be at 2 and others may move to three.
 - iii) Performance Rubric Practitioner’s 2.0
 - (a) Moving to this level depends on the school and the coach for continual development.
 - (b) Shawna shared her understanding and experience as to how she would use the rubrics.
 - iv) The board supports this work and wants to see this work continue and include more detail and measurement of impact.
 - v) These rubrics are going to be implemented and placed in Time Track and get feedback on the rubrics. The rubric committee and the focus group will meet and continue this discussion.
 - vi) Mark thanked all of the committee members for their work: Carol Merritt, Dave Sechler, Deb Sykes, Kent Snurnbusch, and Carol Owen.

X Miscellaneous

A. NSIP Employee Proposal

- i) NSIP has done a 401K 6% match in the past. This was intended to be a supplement to retirement. For those who have safe harbor, 12% match and 6% from the individual.

XI Board Actions: *The following board action was taken during this meeting.*

- A. Nathan Roberts made the motion to approve a 401K 6% additional match for those employees who have safe harbor. This would make a total of an NSIP 12% match and a 6% match from the individuals. Paul Katnik seconded the motion, Dave Sechler abstained. Motion carried 5 -0.

- 3. **XIV Next Meeting Date:** *The next meeting date is September 17, 2021. The location to be determined.*
**This date was later changed to October 2, 2021, at 4750 Amelia Island Pkwy, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034.*

XV Adjournment:

- A. There being no further business, a motion was made by Nathan and seconded by Shawna to adjourn. President Hendee declared the meeting adjourned by unanimous consent (6 - 0) at 4:42 PST.

Respectfully submitted by,



Debbie Daniels
Secretary

Adopted by the Board in the meeting

of _____,
(Date of Meeting)

(Signature of Presiding Officer)