

MINUTES
CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES
EDWARD A. GREER EDUCATION CENTER, BOARD ROOM
2832 E. FLAMINGO ROAD, LAS VEGAS, NV 89121

WORK SESSION

Monday, December 17, 2007

9:05 a.m.

Roll Call:	<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Members Absent</u>
	Ruth L. Johnson, President	Shirley Barber, Member
	Terri Janison, Vice President	
	Mary Beth Scow, Clerk	
	Larry P. Mason, Member	
	Sheila Moulton, Member	
	Carolyn Edwards, Member	

Dr. Walt Rulffes, Superintendent of Schools

Also present were: Mary-Anne Miller, Board Counsel, District Attorney's Office; Bill Hoffman, General Counsel, Legal Department; Dr. Lauren Kohut-Rost, Deputy Superintendent, Instruction Unit; Dr. Karlene McCormick-Lee, Associate Superintendent, Superintendent's Schools; Robert Alfaro, Region Superintendent, East Region; Jhone Ebert, Executive Director, Curriculum and Professional Development Division; Marsha Irvin, Region Superintendent, Northeast Region; Dr. Andre Denson, Region Superintendent, Southeast Region; Dr. Jolene Wallace, Region Superintendent, Southwest Region; Richard Carranza, Region Superintendent, Northwest Region; Kim Boyle, Director, Guidance and Counseling, Curriculum and Professional Development Division; Dr. Norberta Anderson, Director I, English Language Learner Program, Student Support Services Division; Cindy Krohn, Executive Assistant, Board Office; Lisa Chrapcynski, Administrative Secretary II, Board Office; and Stephanie Gatlin, Transcriber/Recording Secretary, Board Office.

ADOPT AGENDA

Adopt agenda except move Items 4.01 and 4.02 to follow Item 3.01 as 3.01a and 3.01b.

Motion: Scow Second: Edwards Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Mason was not present for the vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS/RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT

Proposed budget cuts for education – Donna Anspach

Ms. Anspach spoke about the proposed budget cuts for K-12 education by over \$96 million by Governor Jim Gibbons. She stated on Wednesday, December 19, 2007, at 4:30 p.m. there will be four candlelight vigils held simultaneously in protest of these budget cuts. She asked the Board members to support their efforts by forwarding Nevadans for Quality Education (NQE) emails to their constituents and by encouraging their parents to attend the vigils.

The trustees each expressed their support of the efforts of NQE and stated they would be present at the candlelight vigils.

APPROVE SUPERINTENDENT'S EVALUATION PREPARATION

Approval regarding the process and supporting documentation for the superintendent's evaluation to take place in January 2008, as recommended.

Mrs. Johnson stated in preparation for the Superintendent's evaluation, the Board has put together some documentation, and she asked Mrs. Krohn to briefly go over that information.

Mrs. Krohn stated the materials that would be provided for the Superintendent's evaluation scheduled for January 14, 2008, include: the Monitoring Reports for this past year, all minutes for those meetings, and the Superintendent's contract.

BOARD MEMBER ARRIVES

Mr. Mason arrived at the Board meeting at 9:13 a.m.

APPROVE SUPERINTENDENT'S EVALUATION PREPARATION (continued)

Mrs. Johnson added that the original contract along with the addendum would also be available.

Mrs. Moulton asked when those materials would be available.

Mrs. Krohn said she could provide them this coming weekend.

Dr. Rulfes offered to provide a copy of the State of Education presentation to the Board.

Mrs. Johnson stated she believed the Superintendent would provide a narrative of that report based on the annual report, and she asked Dr. Rulfes to bring forward any additional information or changes he deemed necessary.

Dr. Rulfes stated he would also include the Quality Assurance Framework.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-1: GLOBAL MISSION

Approval regarding the monitoring report for Governance Policy E-1: Global Mission, as recommended in Reference 4.01.

Motion to accept in compliance.

Motion: Mason Second: Edwards Vote: Unanimous

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Approval regarding the monitoring report for Governance Policy E-2: Academic Achievement, as recommended in Reference 4.02.

Dr. Kohut-Rost presented the Quality Assurance Framework and Appendix at the district level of a number of initiatives and strategies in connection with Monitoring Report E-2: Academic Achievement. She noted that the Indicators outlined in the framework align directly with the goals specified in E-2: Academic Achievement.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

Mrs. Johnson recognized the outstanding effort of district administration and staff in developing this data. She posed the following questions: How were the Indicators determined? How were the measurements determined? Has this framework been assessed by any out-of-district entities, and if not, is there any interest in having it reviewed by an outside entity for approval to ensure its success?

Dr. Kohut-Rost answered that in terms of the identification of the Indicators, it was an extremely lengthy process in which the goals of E-2: Academic Achievement were reviewed by Region Superintendents, Research and Accountability, Curriculum and Professional Development, English Language Learners, and others, and they identify the Indicators that align directly with those goals, including the data that was available and the data they felt should be included. She said the Region Superintendents then took that information back and shared it with their principals.

Dr. McCormick-Lee stated that the team believed it was important to provide a wealth of information for different topics regarding the Indicators. She offered that with regard to the measurements, they began looking at the data within each of the Indicators and determining what information would be statistically significant growth towards the goals and whether the growth was progress, significant progress, or a moderate growth in the direction of those goals over the next three years. She stated that the language then became adequate growth, 0.3 percentage points; moderate growth, 0.6 percentage points; or superior growth, 0.9 percentage points. She stated in terms of the framework being reviewed, it has been shared repeatedly with Dr. Douglas Reeves, Chairman and Founder of the Center of Performance Assessment, and that he has given positive feedback.

Mrs. Moulton asked if a written assessment was available from Dr. Reeves.

Dr. McCormick-Lee stated she would request that Dr. Reeves provide that. She then continued with the presentation on the Quality Assurance Framework, explaining the format of the framework.

Mrs. Moulton stated there were significant changes on page 3 of 27 in special education enrollment and the number of students receiving Limited English Proficient (LEP) and the number of students receiving free and reduced lunch (FRL).

Dr. McCormick-Lee answered that the district has maintained approximately 11 percent special education, so with the decrease she interpreted that to be an indication of a more accurate program to identify special education students and to place them appropriately. She stated that with respect to the FRL, the district relies on families reporting to identify those students, and it is a challenge to gather the information from households within the timeline provided.

Mrs. Moulton asked whether the district is then losing funds because of the decrease of FRL.

Ms. Green stated the special education count is less than usual. She stated that the English Language Learner (ELL) count hurts the district financially because the true count differs from the State's count used for funding because the counts are done on different dates. She stated there has not been any decrease in funds from the Federal government for Title 1, and the district has received a 1 percent increase.

Mrs. Scow stated being able to see the percentage as well as the numbers included in the data would be helpful.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

Dr. McCormick-Lee continued to explain the layout of the Quality Assurance Framework.

Mrs. Scow asked when the target raises next year and the measures remain the same, how would the district address the higher standards.

Dr. McCormick-Lee answered that the percent of proficient students at each school required to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) will increase close to 10 to 12 percent in elementary and middle school, which is why the data also shows the students proficient in the Criterion Reference Test (CRT) increases beyond the targets for No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

Dr. Kohut-Rost added that in the future, if there are significant decreases or increases, a notation would be made in the Quality Assurance column explaining the decrease or increase.

Mrs. Moulton commended Dr. McCormick-Lee for her work. She asked to have the attendance broken down by elementary, middle, and high school as well as a breakdown of ELL by grade levels. Mrs. Moulton wondered whether or not other school districts use data as clear and complete as this to evaluate their superintendent.

Mrs. Johnson suggested asking Dr. Reeves to include in his statement an idea of whether or not other districts are using similar data.

Dr. McCormick-Lee offered to provide the Board members with a list of school districts they looked at in formulating the data.

Mr. Alfaro addressed East Region initiatives targeting middle level promotion. He stated specific learning plans are developed for eighth-grade students who were retained in order to allow them to earn 1 or 2 credits that they would carry with them as they enter high school, giving them an advantageous start.

Mrs. Janison asked if there are steps being taken in grades 6 and 7 districtwide to help students before they get to this point.

Mr. Alfaro stated that in the East Region many of the programs to help students are initiated as early as kindergarten. He stated there is a very concentrated program to address language issues.

Dr. Kohut-Rost stated there would be a revision of Regulation 5123 Promotion and Retention: social studies and science will now be included in terms of promoting students from the 8th grade to the 9th grade; criteria is being developed for academic probation; and development of a three-year individual academic plan for middle school students.

Mr. Mason asked Mr. Alfaro for an example of what the east region was doing to address retention.

Mr. Alfaro stated this coming semester and possibly into the summer the east region will work with Dr. Edward Goldman, Associate Superintendent, Education Services Division, to have a teacher come in to every middle school classroom to work with students to help them attain a core content credit.

Mrs. Moulton asked if there was a breakdown of the 880 retained students districtwide by gender.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

Dr. Kohut-Rost stated that information could be provided to the Board.

Ms. Irvin spoke about the drop-out rate specifically in the Northeast Region. She stated there was a 6.7 percent increase in the graduation rate, and the dropout rate has continuously declined. She stated in trying to capture those students who are not returning to school, there has been discussion about contacting the homes of those students and the use of funding for credit retrieval, which includes tutoring for students. She said Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEARUP) and Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) programs have been helpful as well as block scheduling. She stated specifically in the Northeast Region, they have been cultivating their college culture initiative; the alumni day; and field trips to colleges. She said also they focus on the guiding principles – high expectations for all students; student, family, and community involvement; a rigorous curriculum; staff commitment and communication; guidance and counseling; and information and resources available.

Dr. Kohut-Rost shared that the district is looking into providing tour buses for children who are not in school to be able to visit the colleges with their parents.

Ms. Ebert spoke about AYP results. She attributed the success to schools being equipped with secondary syllabi power standards and the school communities' focus on standards-based instruction among other factors. She also listed as initiatives to move in a positive direction, the 21st Century Course of Study, smaller learning communities, a four-year academic plan, Career and Technical Academies, and enhanced course offerings.

Trustee Edwards stated she had a concern with the high school level.

Ms. Ebert stated in looking at the high school level, they are targeting elementary and middle school areas in order to build a strong base for students before they reach high school.

Trustee Edwards stated that at the elementary school level there is a tardy policy but not for the early dismissal pickup. She asked Dr. Kohut-Rost to look into that issue.

Dr. Kohut-Rost stated she would follow up with that issue as requested.

Mr. Carranza spoke about the Language Arts Indicator. Mr. Carranza credited the Northwest Region's success and the district's success to the instructional program, focus on the standards model, paying attention to quality classroom instruction, looking at assessments, and structured teacher planning time across the regions.

Mrs. Janison asked about the frustrations expressed regarding teachers being maybe too structured.

Dr. Kohut-Rost stated there are guidelines to ensure the curriculum is being covered, but that she is not aware of topics being broken down into small increments of time.

Mrs. Scow stated she was impressed that the district and the regions are targeting the needs of each individual child.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

Dr. Wallace addressed the Writing Proficiency Exam. She stated that the Southwest Region tries to focus on a standardized writing process across the region so the expectations and processes are the same for every child. She stated the resources provided to the Southwest Region through the Regional Professional Development Program (RPDP) are used for opportunities for onsite training during the course of the school day in the classroom with the children and teacher present, and there are online opportunities available for staff as well. She touched on the Southwest Region's Southwest Academic Team (SWAT), stating SWAT consists of RPDP liaisons, academic support staff, special education staff, and ELL staff.

Dr. Wallace stated SWAT meets with the region staff and identifies any problems in the academic areas in the schools, and SWAT goes in and works with the school staff to address those problems, and they report back to the region to discuss how to further address any issues. She stated they are focusing on region-wide uniformity of basic expectations of the children so that no matter where the children move, they are aware of the expectations. She said the Southwest Region is currently developing a writing expectations document for all children, which will also include the writing expectations of the local colleges.

Mrs. Moulton thanked the Region Superintendents for their presentations. She stated the writing component is very important, as is the balance between regions, as children move to different schools.

Mr. Alfaro spoke about the decrease in the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE). He stated the region has specific interventions to help students pass the HSPE, but when they do not, they are offered a very personal individualized learning plan. He said the region works with teachers and when students are given an individualized learning plan, principals are asked to hire their most qualified teachers and not to allow more than 10 students in those specific intervention classrooms. He stated that those students who have not passed the proficiency exam are immediately assigned an individualized learning plan the first time they do not pass.

Mrs. Johnson asked Dr. Kohut-Rost to address what the district is doing for students who excel and need to be kept challenged.

Dr. Kohut-Rost said she asks if those students are in accelerated courses or are they enrolled in Advanced Placement (AP) courses. She stated she believes that the principals are looking at the needs of those students who are not making the grades they are capable of making.

Mrs. Johnson asked at the elementary school level, what programs are available to those high-achieving students who are not eligible for the Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program.

Dr. Kohut-Rost stated that, for example, she was aware of students being moved up to the next grade level in the curriculum in which they are capable. She also stated that the middle schools are running accelerated programs as well.

Mrs. Johnson asked if there has been any movement toward having specific exit criteria that would determine whether or not a student is ready to move to the next grade level, specifically, from elementary to middle school and from middle school to high school.

Dr. Kohut-Rost answered that is shown at the elementary school level in the standards-based report card and in the promotion retention policy.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

Mrs. Johnson asked if this was included in the framework.

Dr. Kohut-Rost stated it would be in the future.

Dr. McCormick-Lee spoke about changes to the Norm-Referenced Tests (NRT) and the CRT. She stated the changes over the last two years are that previously there were CRTs at grades 3, 5, and 8, and the state mandated NRTs at grades 4, 7, and 10, and that with the onset of NCLB and AYP there is now at the State level CRTs at grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and the HSPT at the high school level. With that, the district determined that NRTs were not supplying the district with additional valuable information, but that it does give them an anchor of how the district is doing nationwide comparatively, and that the CRT gives an indication of how well the district is doing as compared to State standards. She further stated that 50 is an average national percentile rank, and that NRT assessments are based on a norm group to whom everyone else is compared.

Mrs. Johnson asked whether it was possible to create a norm group that possesses characteristics comparable to the district.

Dr. McCormick-Lee stated the process of norming a test is very rigorous and very costly.

Mrs. Johnson stated that is what is needed in order to be accurate.

Trustee Edwards asked how realistic it is for the district to expect 3, 6, or 9 percentage point increases above 50.

Dr. McCormick-Lee stated that 9 percent would be an enormous move of the district and that it would probably not be realistic to expect that the district could reach 65 or 75, and that would need to be addressed.

Trustee Edwards asked if that was being addressed.

Dr. McCormick-Lee recognized that there would need to be a ceiling placed on some of the numbers as the test results increase.

Mr. Mason asked how long it would take for the numbers to increase if every region followed through with their initiatives and plans and goals with respect to the NRTs. He stated if these percentages do not increase some problems exist in the regions.

Trustee Edwards noted that with respect to the NRT, it is unrealistic to expect a school district to reach 65.

Dr. Denson presented on the achievement gap on English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. He spoke about the programs and initiatives in the Southeast Region to address the individual needs of their students, such as their target school improvement plan, working with the Equity and Diversity Department, intervention programs, and developing professionals.

BOARD MEMBER LEAVES

Mr. Mason left the Board meeting at 11:08 a.m.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

Ms. Boyle spoke about Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT), American College Testing (ACT), and AP Indicators. She stated the Guidance and Counseling Department coordinates the College Board Plan of Action which is in place to organize goals and facilitate programs that support student college readiness. She explained the process of this mechanism is to help ensure that students are prepared to go on to college. She stated the PSAT for sophomores is designed to examine and analyze college readiness skills, and that the writing scores on the PSATs were reported to school administrators at the post secondary data review meeting in November and will be addressed with the English teachers at the summary of answer skills workshops in February. She touched on the College Quick Start program utilized by schools in her region and the AP tutorial program purchased by the region to assist students in preparation for the AP exam.

Dr. Anderson spoke about ELL Indicators in the areas of language acquisition and progress. She stated they have made significant progress in these groups. She noted, however, that there was a decrease in the percentage of students exiting the ELL program. She stated in 2005-2006 the Nevada Department of Education developed some very rigorous criteria for students exiting the ELL program and mandated the Annual Measurable Achievement (AMA) initiative. She stated they are hopeful that they will continue to see the students exit out of the program, and their focus is to exit 10 percent of their students out of the program each year.

Mr. Carranza addressed the Science Indicators and Social Studies Indicators. He stated the students in the Northwest Region were given the opportunity to apply for consortium funding. He noted that block scheduling at the high school level gives students the opportunity to increase the amount of science and social studies they will be able to take.

With reference to the ELL data on page 14 of 27, Trustee Edwards asked if the baseline would be changed since the criteria changed.

Dr. McCormick-Lee stated she made a note to change the information and the numbers to provide more accurate information in the future, and she noted that they were awaiting information from the State regarding their criteria for exiting the program when this data was being developed.

Trustee Edwards stated the 3, 6, and 9 percentage increase is unrealistic. She stated it would be helpful to include the moving target. She applauded those who worked on bringing this data forward.

Mrs. Johnson asked if the Board had given staff the authority to change a baseline.

Mrs. Moulton stated she believed B/SL-4: Delegation to the Superintendent and B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance gives the Superintendent the latitude to make those types of changes when appropriate.

Mrs. Johnson expressed a concern with asking schools to implement the 21st Century curriculum in the midst of having to ask the schools to cut back on other programs because of the extensive budget cuts as proposed by Governor Gibbons.

Dr. Kohut-Rost expressed appreciation for each of the people involved in this presentation today.

APPROVE MONITORING REPORT – E-2: ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (continued)

Motion to accept in compliance.

Motion: Moulton Second: Janison

Mrs. Janison thanked everyone for their work and the presentation.

Mrs. Scow showed her appreciation of the data presented today.

Mrs. Johnson offered a friendly amendment to the motion to include that the motion asks staff to immediately post the Monitoring Report and the appendix to the website as a PDF file and for this document to become interactive on the website to be able to link to different items in the document, such as "CRT" to be able to receive further information. Also, she offered that the motion include "with commendation."

The maker of the motion and the second accepted Mrs. Johnson's amendment.

Vote on Mrs. Moulton's motion was unanimous.

Mr. Mason was not present for the vote.

APPROVE BOARD ASSESSMENT

Approval of Board Governance Policies, GP-4: Board Members' Principles of Operation-Conduct and Ethics, GP-9: Meeting Planning, GP-11: Public Hearings, GP-12: Types of Meetings, GP-13: Closed Sessions of the Board, GP-14: Board Committee Principals, GP-15: Board Affiliated Committees, GP-16: Policy Development, GP-17: Cost of Governance, GP-18: Travel, GP-19: Vacancies on the Board, B/SL-3: Accountability of the Superintendent, B/SL- 4: Delegation to the Superintendent, and B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance, to improve the quality of leadership, focus on the future and serve our students, staff, and community, as recommended in Reference 3.02.

GP-4: Board Members' Principles of Operation-Conduct and Ethics and GP-9: Meeting Planning

Mrs. Scow stated with relation to GP-4: Board Members' Principles of Operation-Conduct and Ethics, number 8, the Board has strength in those items, but they should have a discussion regarding 8D. She stated in regard to number 9, the Board could be more proactive by engaging in better Ends discussions. She said the Board could improve in GP-9: Meeting Planning, number 3. She recommended breaking up GP-4: Board Members' Principles of Operation-Conduct and Ethics into possibly three policies, but at least separating the policies that pertain to the Board debriefing document.

Mrs. Moulton stated she found the Board to be out of compliance on some issues, particularly GP-4: Board Members' Principles of Operation-Conduct and Ethics, number 3E, and she stated in number 4J, the Board should identify what the "proper Board setting" is. She referenced number 6E, stating it is important to forward concerns to the Superintendent and let him handle those; and number 6G, stating this item may need an explanation. Referencing number 7D, she stated the Board needs to take action by providing the Superintendent with a statement of the Board's concerns in light of the recent announcement made by Governor Gibbons.

Mrs. Johnson asked for clarification.

APPROVE BOARD ASSESSMENT (continued)

Mrs. Moulton stated there needs to be a discussion on this issue possibly at the January 7, 2008, meeting. She stated with reference to GP-9: Meeting Planning, number 2, she may request moving the February timeline to March to allow for changes to any policy.

Trustee Edwards commented that the recent developments regarding budget cuts in education may fit the criteria for being able to call an emergency meeting, and she recommended that could take place perhaps after the Superintendents meet with the Governor.

Mrs. Johnson stated in GP-9: Meeting Planning, numbers 3 and 3A should be combined into a single paragraph.

Mrs. Scow stated if the agendas were better developed in terms of Ends development through the year, the February timeline would not be an issue.

GP-11: Public Hearings and GP-12: Types of Meetings

On GP-11: Public Hearings, Mrs. Johnson recommended changing the way the public speaking guidelines are communicated to the public. She suggested editing them so they could be included in the public speaking portion of the agenda and posted with the sign-up sheet located outside the Board room at the meeting. With regard to GP-12: Types of Meetings, Mrs. Johnson suggested changing number 1 to read, "The general practice of the Board is to meet regularly on meetings convened on the second and third Thursday..." She stated these policies have been recently reviewed.

Mrs. Moulton suggested possibly having something printed on note cards regarding the public speaking guidelines to provide to the public. She stated she believed the public speaking portion of the meeting should be time specific and suggested assigning a 30-minute window for public speaking so that the public would be aware of the time and be able to attend the meeting specifically for that portion.

Mrs. Scow agreed with the time-specific public speaking portion but added that it did not need to be set in policy but could just be the Board's practice. With regard to GP-12: Types of Meetings, number 4, she recommended deleting the word "regular" for flexibility.

Mrs. Johnson stated she understood that it would not preclude the Board from having a special meeting prior to the regular meeting wherein they conduct the reorganization.

Mr. Hoffman stated the distinction between "regular" and "special" meetings comes historically from the Board having regular meetings and special meetings and being paid for them differently. He stated now that the Board is salaried all of their meetings are regular except subcommittee meetings where the full Board is not present, and that the Board could handle this however it pleases.

Mrs. Johnson stated her preference would be to do the reorganization at what is traditionally a regular meeting. She asked if the Board could simply recognize this as their policy, but this is an unusual circumstance of trying to get the strategic plan in place and trying to ensure all Board members are present.

Ms. Miller stated the verbiage should be revised.

APPROVE BOARD ASSESSMENT (continued)

Mrs. Johnson asked Ms. Miller if she felt the Board could still have the reorganization at the regular meeting scheduled for January 10, 2008, even though there is a special meeting scheduled for January 7, 2008.

Ms. Miller advised the Board to follow through with their current schedule.

Trustee Edwards pointed out that in GP-12: Types of Meetings, number 1 still reads, "5:30 p.m." for the Board meeting start time. She wondered if there needed to be a time listed in policy. With regard to the word "regular," she noted that every other year there is an Oath of Office meeting, and she recommended changing "regular" to "business."

GP-13: Closed Sessions of the Board and GP-14: Board Committee Principles

Mrs. Johnson suggested combining number 2C with the paragraph that follows it in GP-13: Closed Sessions of the Board.

Trustee Edwards noted a typographical error in GP-13: Closed Sessions of the Board, number 2B, between "Law" and "submit."

GP-15: Board Affiliated Committees and GP-16: Policy Development

There was no discussion on these items. Mrs. Moulton noted GP-16: Policy Development was reviewed in August 2007.

GP-17: Cost of Governance and GP-18: Travel and Other Board Expenses

Mrs. Janison referenced GP-17: Cost of Governance, number 1C, and stated the Board needs to continue to work on the Community Linkage component. With reference to number 2A, she suggested looking at possible ways to fund Board activities regarding Community Linkage. She stated GP-18: Travel and Other Board Expenses was recently revised.

Mrs. Johnson suggested the language for GP-17: Cost of Governance, number 1B, "...fiscal audit, surveys, or other practices developed by the Board." Regarding number 1D, she wondered whether there needed to be further clarification that the Cost of Governance on Board Communications includes internal and external so it would be clear that it includes the costs of programs like Community Linkage, Educational Services Announcements (ESA), School Matters, and webcasting of the Board meetings. She recommended extending Board Communications to indicate internal and external issues.

Mrs. Scow suggested there may be a need for some limited resources for the audit committee, and she would like to have that considered during the next budget cycle. With reference to number 2A, she stated she wanted to make sure the Board engages in professional development. She stated the Board could improve their leadership through professional development.

Mrs. Johnson suggested that one of the Board retreats could be for the Board to receive a presentation as a whole; and the other could be used as presentations by Board members sharing information from conferences attended by them.

APPROVE BOARD ASSESSMENT (continued)

GP-19: Vacancies on the Board and B/SL-3: Accountability of the Superintendent

Trustee Edwards asked whether or not the Board wanted to consider changing the “thirty days” in GP-19: Vacancies on the Board, number 2A because with the two-week notice in the newspaper and the 30-day application period, there are at least six weeks before one’s interview. She noted that in B/SL-3: Accountability of the Superintendent, she found that although it dates back to November 2003, it is a clear and strong statement.

Mrs. Janison commented on the process of filling vacancies on the Board, and she stated with the knowledge of Policy Governance® the candidates needed to have, she felt that the time was needed.

Mrs. Scow commented that the verbiage in GP-19: Vacancies on the Board, number 5, should be reworded because of the repetition of the words “candidate” and “application.”

Trustee Edwards suggested the application time period should be changed, but that the interviews could be scheduled to allow time for the candidates to research Policy Governance®.

Mrs. Johnson asked if staff could look into proposing language that would reference the candidates’ responsibility to be aware of the application process.

B/SL- 4: Delegation to the Superintendent and B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance

Mrs. Moulton noted that it is in B/SL-4: Delegation to the Superintendent, number 3, that it gives the Superintendent the authority to change the baseline as previously discussed during the Monitoring Report presentation.

Mrs. Johnson spoke about public input regarding policies. She asked if a number 5 should be added to B/SL-4: Delegation to the Superintendent that states, “The Superintendent will author policies to direct the operation of the district through staff and public input, and the Board retains final approval,” and delete the last line in number 2 which addresses the Board’s approval. She asked if the Board needed to specifically delegate to the Superintendent issues of policy development.

Mrs. Moulton advised caution because of the Superintendent being inundated with specific individual requests. She suggested having further discussion on this issue at a later time. With regard to B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance, she suggested changing the February deadline to mid or late March to ensure time for any changes to the policy. She requested that a flowchart be developed to simplify the monitoring schedule/method.

Dr. Rulfes stated he would provide that to the Board for consideration.

Dr. Kohut-Rost stated if there were a substantive change late in the year, it would difficult to enact that change throughout the entire district for the coming year because schools are planning for the next school year in December.

Mrs. Moulton asked to have a discussion on this issue at a later time.

Mrs. Scow stated the discussion is important to have but that the February timeline is important.

APPROVE BOARD ASSESSMENT (continued)

Mrs. Johnson listed the following items for review and discussion to be spread out over upcoming work sessions based on time needed for resolution or matter of importance: B/SL-5: Monitoring Superintendent Performance, GP-4: Board Members' Principles of Operation-Conduct and Ethics, GP-11: Public Hearings, GP-17: Cost of Governance, GP-12: Types of Meetings, GP-5: Board Officers, B/SL-4: Delegating to the Superintendent, GP-13: Closed Session of the Board, and GP-19: Vacancies on the Board.

Trustee Edwards reminded the Board that they were to discuss the Attendance Zone Advisory Commission (AZAC) bylaws regarding appointment limitation dates for new members.

Mrs. Johnson suggested holding that review and discussion in the April work session.

Mrs. Moulton recommended looking at the Bond Oversight Committee (BOC) bylaws in connection with the AZAC bylaws.

Mrs. Johnson suggested scheduling a review of the Student Advisory Committee bylaws as well in the first quarter.

APPROVE POLICY REVIEW

Approval to create the 2008 work session calendar of policies including Governance Policies, Board Superintendent Linkage, Executive Limitations, Ends and Operational Policies, as recommended in Reference 3.03.

This item was done in conjunction with item 3.02.

ADJOURN: 12:37 p.m.

Motion: Edwards Second: Janison Vote: Unanimous

Mr. Mason was not present for the vote.