

**HAWAI‘I TEACHER STANDARDS BOARD
BUDGET, PERSONNEL, AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**

Friday, February 9, 2024

**Meeting Conducted by Remote Technology via Zoom
and
Physical Location at 650 Iwilei Road, Suite 158, Honolulu, HI 96817**

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Justin Mew, *Committee Chairperson*
Dr. Jonathan Gillentine, *Committee Vice-Chairperson*
Sean Bacon for Keith Hayashi
Kahele Dukelow for Warren Haruki
Elena Farden for Keahi Makaimoku
Branden Kawazoe, *Ex-officio*
Lokelani Han, *Ex-officio*

STAFF:

Steven Harada, Licensing Specialist
Dr. Mitzie Higa, Licensing Specialist
Tracey Idica, NBCT, Licensing Specialist
Kris Murakami, Esq., Licensing Specialist
Dr. Jennifer Padua, Licensing Specialist

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. ROLL CALL TO ESTABLISH QUORUM

Committee Chairperson Justin Mew called the Budget, Personnel, and Strategic Planning Committee Meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Committee Chairperson Mew shared information regarding procedures for virtual committee meetings, then called roll call and established quorum. Committee Chairperson Mew and *Ex-officio* Committee Member Branden Kawazoe were present. Committee Vice-Chairperson Jonathan Gillentine; Committee Members Sean Bacon, Kahele Dukelow, and Elena Farden; and *Ex-officio* Committee Member Lokelani Han participated remotely.

Committee Chairperson Mew shared information regarding non-public site disclosure. None of the committee members participating remotely had anyone

present with them. Committee Chairperson Mew then shared additional information regarding meeting protocols and procedures.

B. PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS

None

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

D. APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE MINUTES

The minutes of the December 1, 2023, meeting was approved as written.

II. PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS

None

III. ACTION ITEMS

E. NBI 22-96 Revised: 2023-2024 Election of HTSB Officers and Committee Assignments

Committee Chairperson Mew reviewed NBI 22-96 Revised, which assigned newly added Hawai'i Teacher Standards Board ("HTSB") board members Dale Matsuura and Dondra Ozaki to certain HTSB committees.

Committee Chairperson Mew asked committee members if they had any questions or discussion. There were no questions or discussion from committee members.

Committee Chairperson Mew called for a roll call vote on whether or not to recommend NBI 22-96 Revised, as written, to the full board ("Board") at the General Business Meeting scheduled later at 11:15 a.m.

ACTION: The Budget, Personnel, and Strategic Planning Committee voted unanimously to recommend NBI 22-96 Revised, as written, to the Board, with all members present voting aye.

F. Discussion/Recommendations: Permitted Interaction Group Reevaluating the Annual Evaluation of the Executive Director

Committee Chairperson Mew reviewed this discussion/recommendation document, which included the Rationale/Background. He stated the Budget, Personnel, and Strategic Planning Committee was responsible for evaluating the HTSB Executive Director ("ED") annually. He then presented a timeline: The committee could discuss today and/or mull it over for the next few weeks, but by the March board meeting the members would finalize these evaluation instruments. Once finalized, the evaluation

would be conducted at the April board meeting. The results would be reported at the May board meeting.

Committee Chairperson Mew asked committee members if they had any questions or discussion.

Committee Member Farden thought this was a very good draft to start with but had some recommendations. (1) She stated while the rating system of *commendable*, *acceptable*, and *marginal* kept things simple, establishing a rubric to define what *commendable*, *acceptable*, and *marginal* looked like would help evaluators rate the ED without bias. Committee Member Farden gave an example of *commendable* for “Standard 1”: If discipline was an area within leadership, would discipline determine whether or not the ED was extremely effective in identifying the need for and applying appropriate disciplinary actions? Was the ED skilled in implementing behavior-based feedback? Was the ED following established statutes and policies? (2) Committee Member Farden also asked if these evaluation standards were aligned to any other Hawaii Revised Statutes (“HRS”) or Hawaii Administrative Rules (“HAR”) regarding the role of an ED.

Committee Chairperson Mew responded to the second part of Committee Member Farden’s recommendations, stating the ED standards were based on national standards for EDs in such positions across the country. He mentioned the standards were also aligned to the HTSB ED interview questions for all applicants. Committee Chairperson Mew stated the permitted interaction group (“P.I.G.”) would take more specifically what Committee Member Farden inquired about HRS, as well as a rubric to go along with the evaluation.

Ex-officio Committee Member Kawazoe stated Executive Director Felicia Villalobos aligned her activities with the standards she was being evaluated on in the beginning of her Executive Director’s Report. He acknowledged the rubric as suggested by Committee Member Farden and stated the P.I.G. would meet prior to the next board meeting to look at how the evaluation ratings would be defined, which would then be brought to the next board meeting. He mentioned when it becomes a New Business Item, the Board could discuss and change it as necessary.

Committee Member Bacon also thought this was a great start but suggested that “Standard 2” be changed to include “external partners” alongside “teachers, members of the board and staff,” or to condense it to only “promotes positive and effective communications.”

Committee Chairperson Mew stated the evaluation standards were the standards as written, but the P.I.G. would take the recommendation into consideration. He then announced that Committee Members Farden and Dukelow had their hands raised.

Committee Member Farden stated she would yield her time as she spoke earlier, though she did have another question.

Committee Member Dukelow stated she researched the document that the P.I.G. had used to create the evaluation questions and mentioned it seemed to be Executive Director Villalobos's job description and duties. She iterated that looking at that document with the standards and their corresponding points seemed to be the rubric itself, which made everything much clearer. She stated that, for her, looking at them all together helped her better understand, rather than how it was spread out on the document that was provided.

Committee Chairperson Mew thanked Committee Member Dukelow and confirmed if she saw it as a whole.

Committee Member Dukelow stated it was clearer to understand how each standard was being addressed through the points below.

Ex-officio Committee Member Han wanted to share some mana'ō about what she felt this provided document helped the committee to do. She iterated she liked Committee Member Dukelow's bringing up the fact that there was a document stating the "rubric" and a document stating the evaluation. She mentioned possibly blending the two together might or might not be a good idea. She also shared that on previous P.I.G.s she had sat on, the members tried to make the evaluation broader because they felt the evaluators should not use the rubric as their only source of knowledge and should be allowed some wiggle room. She stated Executive Director Villalobos's position—and any other position that was evaluated like this—encompassed more than what was in black and white. She shared she liked the idea of evaluators having a rubric to look at, but maybe not necessarily on the actual evaluation document.

Committee Member Farden thanked everyone who had provided comments, acknowledging that this evaluation was a very big undertaking and very important. She strongly recommended placing the rubric on the same evaluation document so that it could be referenced as the evaluators reflected on Executive Director Villalobos's performance throughout the year, while keeping in mind their interactions with her and understanding the full scope of the evaluation. Committee Member Farden explained the usefulness of a rubric, providing the analogy that if she were to tell her husband to clean the bathroom, his standard of clean would look different from hers. But with a rubric of what a clean bathroom would look like, it would be easy to determine whether or not the standard was met. Committee Member Farden also mentioned the timeline that Committee Chairperson Mew had presented, wondering if that timeline was unfair as the evaluation would be finalized in March and Executive Director Villalobos would be evaluated with it by May. Committee Member Farden provided another analogy: The Kansas City Chiefs and the San Francisco 49ers knew how to win the football game, but halfway through the game the rules were changed, and the teams were going to be evaluated differently on how to win the game. Committee Member Farden suggested the board members might want to start in a new year the new evaluation that they all agree upon, so that

Executive Director Villalobos could be evaluated fairly and have enough time to show her evidence and justification of her work, which they all knew to be very good.

Committee Chairperson Mew stated this evaluation was in the draft phase, but the committee would want to finalize it at the next board meeting in March, which would require board action, and the approved evaluation would be applied for the April board meeting. He also mentioned that when Executive Director Villalobos was hired, she was hired against these evaluation standards to begin with, so she already knew the standards. Committee Chairperson Mew iterated that, additionally, the reports Executive Director Villalobos wrote out were also aligned to the standards. He stated the P.I.G. was very cognizant of the evaluation standards and they did not want Executive Director Villalobos to be evaluated on something that she was not hired for. Committee Chairperson Mew then agreed with Committee Member Farden that Executive Director Villalobos would need to know what the evaluation looked like so that she could make sure she was in line.

Ex-officio Committee Member Kawazoe agreed with Committee Member Farden that changing the evaluation mid-game would be unfair, so delaying the implementation of the new evaluation was a possibility. He stated the P.I.G. wanted to introduce the new evaluation today, but they would get together to compose something for the next board meeting to be voted on. He reminded it would be for the rest of the board members to look at and develop comments for over the following month, and come March, if they all felt like more changes needed to be made, then he would be in favor of pushing the new evaluation back. He mentioned if the Board had to take a few months to get something solid in place that would last and be a timeless thing, regardless of who was in the ED position, then maybe that was what the Board would have to do. He stated that was something the Board could definitely address at the next meeting. He reiterated the P.I.G. would get together, take all the feedback, and try to modify the evaluation document for presentation at the next board meeting. He reminded that once it becomes a New Business Item, the Board could make any necessary changes and—if they have to—postpone the vote. *Ex-officio* Committee Member Kawazoe thanked everyone for the feedback and stated it was kind of a daunting process, so he appreciated everyone's support in helping the P.I.G. tighten up the evaluation.

Committee Chairperson Mew thanked *Ex-officio* Committee Member Kawazoe for putting it all back into perspective and stated the P.I.G. truly appreciated this conversation. He then asked committee members if they had any further questions or discussion.

ACTION: None. There were no further questions or discussion from committee members.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Committee Chairperson Mew adjourned the Budget, Personnel, and Strategic Planning Committee Meeting at 9:29 a.m.