

**HARTLAND CONSOLIDATED SCHOOLS
SPECIAL MEETING - BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartland Educational Support Service Center
October 13, 2025 – 6:30 p.m.**

AGENDA

This meeting is a meeting of the Board of Education in public for the purpose of conducting the business of Hartland Consolidated Schools and is not to be considered a public community meeting.

There is a time for public participation during the meeting as indicated on the agenda. Guests are expected to act with civility and not interrupt this school business meeting. This meeting may be recorded.

Anyone being disruptive will be asked to leave.

- I. Call to Order, 6:30 p.m., Boardroom, Hartland Educational Support Service Center
 - A. Pledge of Allegiance
 - B. Approval of Agenda/Items for Discussion
 - C. Approval of Minutes – September 15, 2025, Regular Meeting
 - D. Call to the Public

This portion of the agenda is for citizens to address any questions or comments to the Board. Attendees must register their intention to participate in the public participation portion of the meeting prior to the start of the meeting. Individuals may not register others to speak during public participation.

The Board will listen and take comments and questions under advisement but will not respond at this time. The presiding officer will refer questions to the superintendent for investigation and respond at a later date.

Speakers are asked to express themselves in a civil manner, with due respect for the dignity and privacy of others who may be affected by your comments. Each speaker may be limited to three (3) minutes. No participant may speak more than once.

- II. Rod Green, MASB: Superintendent Evaluation
- III. Action Item
 - A. Superintendent Evaluation Process Adoption
- IV. Closed Session – Superintendent Evaluation-3 Month Check-in
- V. Information Items
 - A. Future meeting: October 20, 2025, Regular, 6:30 p.m., Boardroom, Hartland Educational Support Service Center
 - B. Information Items
- VI. Adjournment

DETAILED AGENDA

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

President Coleman will call the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Boardroom of the Educational Support Service Center.

I.A. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

I.B. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

(Recommended action): That the agenda for the October 13, 2025 special meeting be approved.

Motion by _____, supported by _____. _____

Gogoleski: _____, Campbell: _____, Shaw: _____, Keller: _____, Scott: _____, Custodio: _____, Coleman: _____

I.C. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 15, 2025**

(Recommended action): That the minutes of the September 15, 2025 regular meeting be approved.

Motion by _____, supported by _____. _____

Gogoleski: _____, Campbell: _____, Shaw: _____, Keller: _____, Scott: _____, Custodio: _____, Coleman: _____

I.D. **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

II. **ROD GREEN, MASB: SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION**

III.A **SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION PROCESS ADOPTION**

(Recommended action): That the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Board President, adopts the MASB Superintendent Evaluation Tool, process, and growth model as presented _____.

Motion by _____, supported by _____. _____

Gogoleski: _____, Campbell: _____, Shaw: _____, Keller: _____, Scott: _____, Custodio: _____, Coleman: _____

IV. **CLOSED SESSION – SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION: 3 MONTH CHECK IN**

(Recommended action): That the Board of Education, upon the request of the Superintendent, enters into closed session under Section 8(1)(a) of the Open Meetings Act to discuss the superintendent evaluation.

Motion by _____, supported by _____. _____

Gogoleski: _____, Campbell: _____, Shaw: _____, Keller: _____, Scott: _____, Custodio: _____, Coleman: _____

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

V.A **FUTURE MEETINGS**

October 20, 2025, Regular meeting, 6:30 p.m., Boardroom, Hartland Educational Support Service Center

V.B **INFORMATION ITEMS**

VI. **ADJOURNMENT**

Members present: K. Coleman, C. Shaw, G. Keller, J. Campbell, J. Scott, D. Custodio, G. Gogoleski

Members absent: None

Admin. Present: C. Hughes, R. Bois, K. Gregory, D. Minsker

President Coleman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Boardroom of the Hartland Educational Support Service Center. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

9/15/25 AGENDA APPROVED

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the agenda for the September 15, 2025 regular meeting be approved as presented and amended.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes

Motion carried 7-0.

Amendments:

Motion by Scott, supported by Keller, to have a moment of silence in memory of Charlie Kirk.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes

Motion carried 7-0

Motion by Keller, supported by Campbell, to add a discussion item regarding district clubs administrative process.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes

Motion carried 7-0.

9/15/25 CONSENT AGENDA APPROVED

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the consent agenda for the September 15, 2025 regular meeting be approved.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes

Motion carried 7-0.

1. 8/11/25 MINUTES APPROVED

That the minutes of the August 11, 2025 regular meeting be approved.

2. PAYMENT OF INVOICES

That the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Chief Financial Officer, approves the financial report as of August 30, 2025, and the payment of invoices totaling \$3,126,834.75 and payroll obligations totaling \$5,048,641.54.

3. NEW HIRES

That the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent of Personnel, offers a probationary teaching contract for the 2025/26 school year, pending verification of credentials and Public Acts 99, 83 & 189 requirements, if applicable, to: Holly Goodheart (VES) and Bethany Strandbergh (MS).

SUPERINTENDENTS REPORT

- Introduction of New Hires
- High School Cyber Security Program

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Members of the public addressed the board.

NEW & REVISED POLICIES (discussed at the 8/25/25 Policy Committee meeting)

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, approves the revised policies as presented and amended.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 7-0.

Amendment:

Motion by Keller, supported by Scott, to remove 0171.4, 0172, and the Opt-out policy from the motion.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 7-0.

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, approves revised policy **0171.4**-Treasurer as presented.

Amendment:

Motion by Keller, supported by Campbell, to postpone policy 0171.4 until the next regular board meeting after the next policy committee meeting.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 7-0.

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, approves revised policy **0172**-Legal Counsel as presented.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 7-0.

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, approves the **Opt-Out Policy** as presented and amended.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 7-0.

Amendments:

Motion by Scott, supported by Keller, to amend the policy, by changing the following in item 1:
add "school" between "5" and "days" and add at the end of the second sentence: "and the standard opt-out form".

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: no, Shaw: no, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: no
Motion carried 4-3.

Motion by Scott, supported by Keller, to amend bullet 3 by changing "will" to "may", and replacing "48 hours" with "2 school days".

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 7-0.

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, to set aside policy to designate Thrun Law Firm as the district's attorney for general legal counsel.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: no, Scott: no, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 5-2.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOAL OBJECTIVES

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent, approves the strategic plan goal objectives as presented.

Gogoleski: no, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: no, Scott: no, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 4-3.

WELDING BOOTH PURCHASE

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent and the Chief Financial Officer, approves the welding booth purchase as presented.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes
Motion carried 7-0.

LUNCH PRICE INCREASE

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent and the Chief Financial Officer, approves the lunch price increase as presented.

Gogoleski: no, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: no, Scott: no, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes

Motion carried 4-3.

MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT PURCHASE (2020 BOND)

Motion by Shaw, supported by Campbell, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the Superintendent and the Director of Operations, approves the maintenance equipment purchase as presented.

Gogoleski: no, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: no, Scott: no, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes

Motion carried 4-3.

NEOLA POLICY TEMPLATE INFORMATION

Motion by Shaw, supported by Keller, that the Board of Education, upon the recommendation of Mr. Keller, requests that the Superintendent provide all Neola template documents regardless of their relevance to current policy change recommendations.

Gogoleski: yes, Campbell: yes, Shaw: yes, Keller: yes, Scott: yes, Custodio: yes, Coleman: yes

Motion carried 7-0.

2016 BOND REFUNDING

Rachel Bois talked about the opportunity to refinance bonds.

SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION PROCESS

The board discussed the tool that will be used for the evaluation process this year, MASB, with Mr. Gogoleski offering to look into other tools that could be used for the superintendent evaluation. Mr. Scott agreed to work with President Coleman, Mr. Hughes, and MASB to determine the superintendent evaluation details for this year. President Coleman will bring a proposal to the board at the October meeting.

STUDENT CLUBS ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

The board discussed the process for student clubs at the high school.

FUTURE MEETINGS

President Coleman noted the next meeting will be October 20, 2025, regular meeting, 6:30 p.m. in the Boardroom at the Hartland Educational Support Service Center.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeff Campbell
Board Secretary



Renee Braden
Recording Secretary

Superintendent Evaluation Process

MASB Requirements for Beginning of Cycle Appendix E of MASB Superintendent Evaluation

Beginning of Cycle Board of Education and superintendent mutually agree upon:

- System (tool) to be used (**Board Approval of MASB Tool, September 20, 2025, during discussion as there was no other viable option presented**)
- Timeline and key dates (**3 Month, Mid-Year, 9-Month, Summative, set up by President Coleman and shared with all Board members to mark calendars**)
- Goals, benchmarks and evidence (**Board Adopted Strategic Goals in July and Objectives in September**)
- How evaluation will be compiled (**Using Mid-Year Tool and Final Assessment Tool at Summative**)
- How evaluation will be shared with superintendent (**Closed Session, as requested by Superintendent**)
- How evaluation will be shared with the community (**Open Meeting Vote after closed session**)

OPEN PHASE Scheduling the evaluation, Appendix D

- Choosing and modifying the evaluation instrument (**Board adopted MASB Superintendent Evaluation Tool as discussion in September did not reveal an alternative option and this is the tool used previously**)
- Establishing performance goals or expectations (Board adopted Goals and Objectives (**Board adopted in July and September**))
- Determining process for the evaluation (**Using MASB Superintendent Evaluation Tool, see first bullet**)
- Voting to go into closed session (**for purpose of performance discussion, Set for the year by President Coleman with services of MASB via Mr. Rod Green**)

Superintendent Evaluation

Recommended 20% Based on Student Growth, Section G

This is above and beyond the Strategic Plan Data which will also be a factor in the Superintendent Evaluation Process under Academics & Programs

MCL Section 380.1249b

“20% of the annual evaluation must be based on student growth and assessment data or student learning objectives.”

Note: The law does not specify what data is used to assess growth. **MCL Section 380.1249** specifies “student growth, assessment data, and student learning objectives.” MDE MSTEP or other state assessment data including proficiency score data is not required but may be used in this section.

MASB Superintendent Evaluation Appendix J – Student growth and assessment data or student learning objectives metrics.

Growth may be based on “state assessment, alternative assessment, student learning objectives, nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards or based on individualized program goals.”

District Data to Review at End of Year:

In July of 2025 (July 9, 2025) Mr. Minsker forwarded the board district longitudinal assessment data. Within these data points, the board will find K-8 Early Benchmark/Smarter Balance Assessment **growth data**, fall pre-test to spring post-test. This data was also presented during my 2024-25 Superintendent Summative Evaluation and will again be used in June of 2026. This data is broken down for various assessments (state and local), all students. This data will be included in the end of the year Evidence of Effort report. The key variable is where the cohort students start in the fall on the pre-assessment and where they end on the post-assessment. If the students are achieving at a high level from year-to-year, the growth percentage may be less from year-to-year, again dependent on how they scored on the fall pre-assessment. The goal is always 100% of students demonstrate growth from fall to spring. If the board wishes for a specific metric/formula that demonstrates success or effectiveness, we can use a formula that includes the number of students improving their score from fall to spring (X) divided by the total number of students taking both assessments (Y) to get a percentage number for growth. Keep in mind that some students enter or exit throughout the year thus the disclaimer for Y.

It is important that the Board understands that teachers use these scores to gauge where students are at the start of the year as well as additional data in the form of DRA (reading level assessments), common district aligned summative assessments, formative assessments (check ins) and observational data to formulate intervention using our Multi-Tiered Systems of Support model for academics. All this data is used to understand where each student is starting from, so that we can help them make at least one year worth of growth during the school year.

I. State of Michigan Benchmark Assessment Data / All Students 2022-23 to 2024-25 who improved their scale score from “needing support” to on track for “college and career readiness” by 12th grade (the old “at risk” definition) as defined by the MDE.

Baseline Data:

ELA Grade Band	ELA Scale Score Growth (Fall to Spring)		
	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Kindergarten – 2 nd	+41%	+48%	+45%
3 rd – 8 th	+12%	+8%	+63%

Math Grade Band	Math Scale Score Growth (Fall to Spring)		
	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Kindergarten – 2 nd	+45%	+56%	+57%
3 rd – 8 th	+28%	+29%	+69%

Metric To Be Considered: The metric I suggest is 50% (district average) showing growth (X Divided by Y) from fall to spring in both ELA and Math. The 2024-25 average was 54% (36.2 three-year average) in ELA and 63% (47.3 three-year average) in math. If K-8 students do not demonstrate a 50% growth factor, the board must consider the evidence of effort and the fall pre-assessment baseline as factors that may override the rating consideration.

II. Staff GRASP Goal (Student objectives based) Success

All teachers and administrators establish GRASP (Goal, Rationale, Assessment/Accountability, Strategies, and Plan) Goals annually. These are set during the previous year’s summative evaluation discussion, with any adjustments made in the fall of the new school year if needed. These student focused goals regarding learning objective outcomes are aligned with appropriate data to consider for the growth component of the Summative Evaluation, thus essential to the work as

described in Section I. Evidence of effort must always be considered when rating effectiveness on the growth component of evaluation. It is always expected that 100% of professional staff earn either a Highly Effective/Effective rating in 2022-23 and 2023-24 or Effective rating in 2024-25.

Baseline Data:

Year	Total # of Professional	Meeting Expectations (above)
2022-23	325	100%
2023-24	341	99.7%
2024-25	333	98.5%

Metric To Be Considered: Realize a 95%+ EFFECTIVENESS rating for all staff. It is essential to note that not all GRASP Goals align with state assessment objectives as elective teachers may align with student certification requirements, or student performance objectives within their subject areas.

III. MDE MI School Data Growth Index Scores (2018-19 Benchmark Data)

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) sets the ELA and Math **student growth targets** for districts based on “percent of student” that are on track to reach or maintain proficiency within three years across the content areas of ELA and mathematics. The state performs the statistical calculation based on three years’ worth of performance on the state assessments 3-8 and from grade 8 to 11. The On-Target indicator for ELA is 57.05 and the target for Math is 35.80 of all students. As you will see below, HCS is ON TARGET as a district. The expectation is that the district will continue to be on target each year and increase the percentage of students meeting the target cut scores established by MDE for “college and career readiness.” The goal will always be 100% of students being on target for “college and career readiness” the old “at risk” language.

Student Growth Percentiles (SGPs) the Foundation to this Data:

Michigan determines school growth index scores by first calculating individual SGPs for students in math and ELA based on the state assessment scores (MSTEP, PSAT, and SAT). A mean SGP is then determined for the school, and these scores are incorporated into the Michigan School Index System on MI School Data. I will collect each school’s data and calculate an average growth index score.

Baseline Data: Percent of students showing growth (this is cohort data from one year to the next where state testing occurred) over three years. The data demonstrates the

percentage of students who are on TARGET due to showing growth. You will notice that during the COVID years there was no growth data gathered):

ELA	2018-19	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Creekside	65.00%	68.24%	75.00%	
Lakes	56.38%	57.55%	62.5%	
Round	63.53%	71.26%	71.29%	
Village	64.13%	55.56%	72.62%	
Farms	66.22%	70.23%	72.78%	
Middle School	68.29%	70.56%	71.39%	
High School	62.04%	69.32%	61.99%	
Average Non Alt. Ed.	63.65%	66.1%	69.65%	
LEGACY	15.38%	29.17%	30.00%	
HVA	14.29%	0.00%	60.00%	
Average All Schools	52.80%	55.7%	64.17%	

Math	2018-19	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25
Creekside	76.25%	72.92%	70.83%	
Lakes	53.19%	63.21%	56.84%	
Round	74.12%	60.92%	66.35%	
Village	60.87%	59.76%	44.05%	
Farms	57.37%	67.99%	66.53%	
Middle School	65.01%	68.82%	55.45%	
High School	58.33%	48.55%	35.71%	
Average Non Alt. Ed.	63.59%	63.16%	56.53%	
LEGACY	0.00%	12.5%	0.00%	
HVA	14.29%	50.00%	20.00%	
Average All Schools	51.04%	56.07%	49.19%	

Metric To Be Considered: While the goal is always to report that these index scores hit 100% in each building. I suggest that meeting the MDE established target growth index score in ELA and Math is significant. For the summative evaluation, the equation will consist of adding up the growth index score for each school and dividing it by the number of schools for both ELA and Math. The foundational statistical calculation formula is held by MDE for assigning these scores on the MISchoolData platform. While student and staff dynamics change (drops and additions occur among staff and students), only students who have been enrolled for the full academic year and have valid test scores are included in this SGPs based calculation. Evidence of Effort must

always be considered for an override of the effectiveness rating when goals and metrics are not met.

Summary:

The Superintendent Summative Self-Evaluation will include the above stated evidence of effort data points for the performance discussion under Section G of the Summative Evaluation tool. The Board should also consider the district data found under the Academic & Program Goal, per the Strategic Plan. Improvement and/or maintenance are always the expectation which will be the basis for the evidence of effort presentation. Not good to great, good to better!

MASB Superintendent Evaluation: What is a Student Growth Model? School districts should establish a student growth model to be used in educator and administrator evaluations. A growth model is a collection of definitions, calculations or rules that summarizes student performance over two or more time points and supports interpretations about students, their classrooms, their educators or their schools (See Benchmark Assessment and MDE Student Growth Index Data above). Michigan law requires that multiple research-based growth and assessment or student learning objective metrics be used in student growth models that are used for evaluation purposes. This may include state assessments, alternative assessments, student learning objectives (see GRASP Goal data above), nationally normed or locally adopted assessments that are aligned to state standards or based on individualized program goals.

Key: Triangulation of data or 3 data points is considered important in evaluating effort!

What Does This Look Like In HCS

Superintendent (Board input)

Presented to Board of Education on October 10, 2025 (see below). To be reviewed by the Board at a Special Meeting on October 13, 2025. It is recommended that action be taken to officially adopt the MASB Superintendent Evaluation tool, process, and growth model as presented. (See HCS Transparency page for Superintendent Evaluation)

Building Administration (Superintendent)

GRASP goal defines what will be used at the summative evaluation in conjunction with evidence of effort. (See HCS Transparency page for Administrator Evaluation)

Teacher (Building Principal as Negotiated with HEA input)

GRASP goals define growth in terms of student objectives. This is evaluated by the building administrator in conjunction with evidence of effort. (See HCS Transparency page for Teacher Evaluation)

Resource:

Michigan's Student Growth Metric

Adequate Growth Percentiles (Targets) explanation. This is the main explanation why not to only use the SGP without targets:

https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/OEAA/Accountability/General/Meeting_Adequate_Growth.pdf?rev=d280fdc388744c4c92728bbcb31f07f8&hash=853A00B61FB23D95CF7D9B9A7159411C

Why use Growth Index Target Scores as one of three components to assess student growth?

Notes and thoughts:

- The concern with SGP scores as a standalone data point for evaluation is that growth is measured compared to students in other districts. For an evaluation rating to be determined partially by what happens in other districts is unfair. It doesn't show the true academic growth of each student.

MDE already has an accountability rating system using SGP scores. To make it more about individual student growth, they use adequate growth targets. These are target scores that show if a student over a 3-year period is tracking adequately toward college and career ready - which is the end goal and expectation of every student in the state. (See

https://www.michigan.gov/mde/-/media/Project/Websites/mde/OEAA/Accountability/General/Meeting_Adequate_Growth.pdf?rev=d280fdc388744c4c92728bbcb31f07f8&hash=853A00B61FB23D95CF7D9B9A7159411C)

- The target scores and SGP percentiles for each building are already calculated in Mischooldata. It gives you the percentage of students in each building that met the adequate growth target score with their SGP scores.
- It makes sense to use this data since it measures individual student growth toward college and career readiness, it's already calculated for us on Mischooldata (third-party) and it's part of the total index score that grades each building's effectiveness.
- However, assigning points to these scores for evaluation is dangerous because measuring growth based on a one-day standalone assessment is just a snapshot in time. The results do not always give a true indication of growth. We must use many

(triangulated) data points across formative, benchmark and summative assessments to measure growth. A student could show great growth through a school year, but have one bad testing day (sickness, argument with parents that morning, break up with girlfriend, etc.).

Additional thoughts:

- Why would we weigh the buildings differently? Since every student is accounted for in this plan, no mean score is necessary.
- The mean SGP score calculator can figure out teacher mean scores across a three-year period but only for an ELA and Math teacher. We must use our internal assessment process to dialog and work toward student objective growth.
- The plan to utilize SGP scores is much simpler and takes every student's growth into account. Not finding a mean (average) score can be deceiving if there are more very high or very low achievers from one year to the next.

What Do Other Districts Use To Assess Growth On Superintendent Evaluation

What do other Superintendents Use for Growth Data Ratings on Summative Evaluation

(4 districts surveyed)

1. NWEA Pre and Post assessments as well as M-STEP/PSTA/SAT proficiency data.
2. Principal effectiveness ratings based on local assessment growth data.
3. NWEA Pre and Post assessments and classroom assessment growth data (teacher evaluations).
4. NWEA data regarding growth targets.

Hartland Presentation for Growth Rating:

- A. Benchmark/Smarter Balance assessments (HCS uses these instead of NWEA).
- B. Principal and Teacher effectiveness ratings based on GRASP Goal evidence of effort summative evaluation discussions.
- C. State Growth Index data.

Also presented for consideration in other components of the evaluation:

- A. MSTEP/PSAT/SAT proficiency scores and county ranking.
- B. English Language Learner Michigan WIDA data. Exiting student data.
- C. End of Year Student Assessment Data (Mr. Minsker provides this as he did last year).