

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25
Tuesday, April 9, 2013
Board Room at the Education Service Center
8:30 a.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS/SUPERINTENDENT PRESENT:

Janie Gebhardt, Chair
John Sargent, Vice Chair
Jackie Cranor, Clerk

Jim Facer, Asst. Treasurer
Paul Vitale, Member
Mary M. Vagner, Superintendent

A Special Meeting/Work Session of the Board of Trustees of Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25 was held on Tuesday, April 9, 2013, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Room at the Education Service Center, 3115 Pole Line Road, Pocatello, Idaho, as provided in Section 33-510, Idaho Code;

Convene Work Session

Chair Gebhardt Convened the Work Session at 8:39 a.m. She reviewed the agenda and the addendum and said the Special Meeting/Work Session was for the purpose of the administration discussing with the Board the following topics:

1. **Elementary Boundary Adjustments:** *Tendoy/Greenacres; Indian Hills/Jefferson*
2. **Family and Consumer Sciences Program Audit Report**
3. **Request to Waive Learning Target Assessments and End of Course Assessments**
4. **Administrator Evaluation Adjustments:** *Parent Input and Student Achievement*
5. **Kinds and Levels Chart – New Positions**
6. **Wide-Area Network Contract with ENA**
7. **Legislative Update / Balancing for the 2013-14 School Year:**
 - *HB65 – “Fix It” Bill FY13 Education Budget*
 - *Alameda Middle School Cost Increases*
 - *Projected Cost Increases*
 - *2013-14 Wages*
 - *Wellness/Insurance & Budget Committee Reports*
 - *Estimated Revenue & Expenditure Projections*
 - *Staffing Pattern for 2013-14*
 - *Level of Available Unreserved-Appropriated Fund Balance to use for Balancing for FY14*

8. Public Comment

Board Protocols for Public Comment will be followed at all Board Meetings. Patrons wishing to address the Board will fill out Form AD 2 – Request to Appear before the Board and present it to the Board Chair or Board Secretary prior to the meeting. Because of the diversity of issues, members of the Board may not respond to delegations. Instead, issues are recorded and referred to the proper staff member for follow-up. The Board is informed of these efforts by the staff member responding to concerns.

Board Operating Principles #22 & 23:

22) The Board will follow the chain of command referring others to present their issues, problems, or proposals to the person who can properly and expeditiously address the issues; 23) Board members will refrain from communications which create conditions of bias should a problem or complaint become the subject matter of a hearing before the Board.

9. Adjourn

Elementary Boundary Adjustments: *Tendoy/Greenacres; Indian Hills/Jefferson*

Ms. Vagner said the administration was preparing for the opening of the 2013-14 school year and part of the process involved transitioning the remaining 6th grade classes to the middle schools and implementing the

boundary changes adopted in 2012. She said in preparing to implement those changes it was discovered there was a class size issue with the boundary changes for Indian Hills and Jefferson Elementary Schools. Dr. Mortensen said she appreciated the work of principals and secretaries in looking at the redistribution of populations. She said there were a couple of issues that the administration would recommend the Board consider relative to the boundary changes. She said the first change was to adjust the boundary line for Tendoy and Greenacres Elementary Schools down the center line of Walnut Street. She said there were a couple of homes on that street that had been going to Greenacres Elementary. She said only one student was affected by the change and would still attend Greenacres. Ms. Cranor asked what the long-term effect would be. Dr. Mortensen said the administration was not aware of any negative long-term effects. Mr. Reed said the original boundary should have been drawn this way and the student was actually attending the school he/she should be but the map did not reflect that. Dr. Mortensen said the second issue was in regards to the Indian Hills and Jefferson Elementary Schools boundary changes. She said the shift that was adopted would move a portion of the Indian Hills population to Jefferson. She said as the administration reviewed the number of students at each school it became apparent that shifting the Indian Hills population to Jefferson would cause a significant increase in class size at the school. She said if the District did not implement the boundary shift, class sizes at both schools would remain manageable. She said when the Boundary Committee reviewed estimated populations and assigned a capacity number it included the modular at Jefferson which was the reason for the discrepancy. She said if the Indian Hills population was shifted to Jefferson, the school would have to place an entire grade level in the modular while Indian Hills would vacate three 6th grade classrooms. She said it did not make sense to move the students to Jefferson and use the modulars when the students could be left at Indian Hills and utilize the three empty classrooms. Ms. Cranor asked why no 4th or 5th graders were impacted by the shift to Jefferson. Ms. Vagner said there may not be any 4th or 5th graders in the neighborhood affected by the shift. Dr. Mortensen said there would be three classrooms per grade with the exception of 2nd grade where an FTE would be added to keep the class size manageable. Ms. Gebhardt noted that the Kindergarten class sizes were high. Dr. Mortensen said Kindergarten enrollment was just an estimate but typically those class sizes were larger. Ms. Cranor said the 1st grade class sizes at Jefferson were pretty high. Dr. Mortensen said they were but those students could be overloaded to the sister school at Indian Hills which had room. She said there were also hundreds of students that requested transfers to other schools. She said the boundary projections only used the number of students within the actual boundary and did not take into account the number of students that transferred. Mr. Facer asked if the recommendation was to stay with the current boundaries. Mr. Reed said yes. Ms. Gebhardt asked if those students would still go to Irving Middle School. Dr. Mortensen said yes all students from both Indian Hills and Jefferson would attend Irving Middle School. Ms. Vagner said if the Board was in agreement the administration would bring the item back for Board action at the April 16, 2013 Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Vagner said it was remarkable that with all of the changes there were only two minor adjustments needed. Dr. Mortensen said for the most part the goal of 85% capacity or less had been met.

Family and Consumer Sciences Program Audit Report

Ms. Naftz said Theresa Goeltz was the State Department of Education's PTE Coordinator. She said Ms. Goeltz was responsible to evaluate programs and identify areas of improvement and what area schools were doing well. She said the District received the official report that identified areas that needed to be corrected in order to stay in compliance. She said there were currently four different occupational pathways available that received \$6,480 for each program to cover supplemental supplies for classrooms beyond District funding for items such as utensils. She said PTE classes were expensive to run. She said there were only a handful of Family and Consumer Sciences programs left in the state because the state's PTE program manager was pushing to convert them to occupational pathways due to the lack of funding. She said the District has a fashion design and merchandising pathway at Century High School. She said the program gives you a look into the billion dollar market of clothing and retail. She said Highland High School has an education assistance program that would be a valuable asset to the elementary schools. She said the program trained junior and senior students to work as math or reading coaches for elementary students that were struggling academically in those areas. She said all but one of the students in that program passed the District's parapro test. She said if those students stayed in the area and attended ISU they could be become quality candidates for future positions in the District. She said there was an early child learning pathway that was partnered with the Lincoln Center. She the District needed qualified people in child care. She said the last pathway was culinary arts and the program was doing well. She said there were three new pathways, one was entrepreneurship which aligned with the state's goals. She said there were 1,400 entrepreneurs in Idaho

that owned their own businesses which was anticipated to grow to over 2,000 which was above the national average. She said the next was hospitality and tourism. She said the number of jobs that grew statewide from October to February was 300 and included restaurants, hotels, tourism and amusement parks. She said the program had partnered with local businesses, the visitor center and the Greater Pocatello Chamber of Commerce. She said the District submitted a PTE pathway for a human services program and was waiting for approval from the state. She said the program was for students that wanted to help humanity by volunteering or being a social worker. She said there were a few issues with some of the facilities the programs were housed in that needed to be addressed like a crack in a classroom floor or caulking that needed to be replaced but overall the facilities were okay. She said another one of the reviewers concerns was that the kitchen for the culinary program was built in 1965 and had never been remodeled. She said it was a major project to bring the kitchen up to standards and the state knew that it would not be ready for the coming school year. Ms. Gebhardt asked about the kitchen equipment being rotated out. Ms. Naftz said the District had an agreement with a local appliance store and the larger equipment was rotated out every year. She said smaller items like microwaves were monitored for wear and tear. Ms. Cranor asked if the District requested funds from the state to fix any of the problem areas. Ms. Naftz said those items would come out of the Family and Consumer Sciences funds. Ms. Gebhardt asked if any of the expenses were paid for out of school budgets. Ms. Naftz said things like plumbing or a crack in the floor would come out of the school's regular maintenance budget. She said every plan had a five year goal and one fifth of the plan was supposed to be accomplished every year. She said the District's Family and Consumer Sciences programs had not been evaluated in 6 years. She said the teachers had worked hard to get all of the requested paperwork together and to make sure everything was in order. She said the administration was looking really closely at the direction it wanted the programs to go. Mr. Sargent asked if she knew the number or participants. Ms. Naftz said she did not have an exact number but knew the classes were really full. She said the goal of the programs was to give students the best advantage for finding a career that they would like to go into. She said some of the programs overlooked the importance of having a resume and switching to a pathway offered more opportunities for job shadowing and internships to gain work experience in a real-life field. Ms. Vagner said the concept had evolved from the home economics paradigm to a program that offered actual career opportunities. Mr. Vitale asked about the culinary class. Ms. Naftz said the culinary class was helping with the "Taste of Idaho" program which benefitted the community. She said the culinary program was devastated when it lost the program at ISU but just learned that CSI would pick up the articulation agreements.

Request to Waive Learning Target Assessments and End of Course Assessments

Mr. Wegner said the District was preparing for the implementation of the CCSS next year and would introduce the new assessment the following year to measure implementation. He said the District had been involved in unit development which would continue in June. He said there was not enough time to realign elementary and secondary assessments. He said the District Curriculum Committee (DCC) heard the issue during the last meeting. He said the committee approved the recommendation to waive the Learning Target Assessments (LTAs) and End of Course Assessments (EOCs). He said the assessments would be optional at the elementary level. He said the DCC recommended convening an assessment task force at the start of the new school year to evaluate what assessments might look like and bring a recommendation back to the committee. He said Ms. Vagner recommended that the Board weigh in on the request to waive the assessment requirements and take action at the next Board Meeting. He said each of the units being developed would culminate with an assessment in the future, but right now the District needed to focus on the implementation of the CCSS and the current assessments would not align with the standards being taught. Ms. Gebhardt said another thing to think about was how much time would be spent on assessments. Ms. Vagner said teachers would be relieved to have the assessment requirements waived because without waiving those teachers would be faced with having to teach a whole new curriculum and assess students on old and new targets.

Administrator Evaluation Adjustments: *Parent Input and Student Achievement*

Dr. Howell said the District revised its teacher evaluations to include parent input and student achievement two years ago per state mandate. He said IDAPA rules picked up those two requirements for administrators as well. He said both the elementary and secondary administrator evaluation tools had been updated to include those components. He said the student achievement requirement was already a part of the administrator's work and was tied to the evaluation. He said for the parent input piece 30 parents were solicited for comment per administrator rather than the 10 required for teachers. Ms. Gebhardt asked if the District was getting any good responses from

parents. Dr. Howell said the process had not changed but this year the responses were significantly lower. He said it hadn't had the impact the state had hoped for but at the least the opportunity was there for parents. Ms. Cranor asked if the administrators were able to select half of the parents solicited for input. Dr. Howell said yes. Ms. Vagner said the Board would be asked to approve the evaluation adjustments at the next Board Meeting.

Kinds and Levels Chart – New Positions

Dr. Howell said the city's current requirements for electricians and plumbers were beyond any requirements that existed at the state level. He said in 2008 the District had an independent firm complete an evaluation of the District's classified salary schedule. He said the firm recommended eliminating the lead positions. He said the city's current requirements stated that a journeyman license could not be used for any new construction. He said the employee had to have a contractor's or a master license. He said journeyman were only allowed to do general maintenance in Pocatello. He said the administration was proposing that the District bring back the lead plumber and lead electrician positions in order to avoid subcontracting outside of the District in order to do the work. He said even the city did not have lead workers and spent more money to sub out a lot of their work. He said the District had some current employees that may pursue these licenses. He said moving those positions up would be a \$3 per hour increase but would be a cost savings on any project that would otherwise have to be subcontracted out. Ms. Gebhardt asked if the requirement would affect the New Horizon Center or Alameda Middle School projects. Dr. Howell said the city gave the District a grace period until January, 2013 and now the District was at a point of having to take action. Mr. Reed said most of the new projects in the District were contracted out but just as many projects were done in-house. He said the District had been doing the same thing for over 30 years and this new requirement made it illegal to continue. He said one of the projects needed on a regular basis was to install grease traps in the schools which could cost the District around \$6,000 to contract the work and only \$1,500 to do it in-house. Mr. Facer asked if a general contractor's license would work. Mr. Reed said the city's requirements were very specific that it had to be a trade specific license or a master license. He said since ISU was a state agency it was not required to meet the city's requirements. Mr. Sargent asked why the District had a lead climate control specialist and not a lead plumber or electrician. Dr. Howell said there were two people under the lead climate control specialist and all of the electricians were journeyman which was sufficient in the past. Mr. Sargent asked if the two HVAC specialists were licensed. Mr. Reed said the HVAC specialists were not required to have a trade specific licensure. Ms. Vagner said if the Board was in agreement the topic would be brought for Board action at the next Board Meeting.

Wide-Area Network Contract with ENA

Mr. Reed said the District needed to renew its services for the wide-area network. He said the District was currently with Cable One and the contract expired in June. He said ENA was a company that provided similar services. He said the administration recommended utilizing ENA's services. He said ENA had partnered with Cable One to provide the services. He said the District was able to utilize ENA at a similar cost with a few exceptions. He said ENA would take on e-rate reimbursement responsibilities that would be consolidated and given to the District upfront in the form of reduced payments to ENA. He said the District would no longer have to submit the paperwork as that would now be taken care of through ENA. He said ENA would provide faster and greater capacity in the District's services. He said the state also contracted with ENA. He said included in the packet was the agreement with ENA and was 5 year contract which the District had previously done with Cable One. He said the pricing was detailed in the agreement. He said the agreement stated that the District would receive the same RFP as the state. He said if the agreement was terminated without cause the District would be responsible for 75% of the remaining term. He said ENA had to invest a sizable amount into the infrastructure of the District so that stipulation was not unusual. He said if ENA could not provide the level of service agreed to then the District could terminate the agreement within 90 days without penalty. He said the word "with" in section 3 in the second paragraph would be stricken from the contract prior to signing. He said everything else was in good order. He said several Districts in the state had already switched to ENA and were satisfied with the service. He said the topic would be brought for Board action at the next Board Meeting.

Legislative Update / Balancing for the 2013-14 School Year: HB65 – “Fix It” Bill FY13 Education Budget; Alameda Middle School Cost Increases; Projected Cost Increases (2013-14 Wages); Wellness/Insurance & Budget Committee Reports; Estimated Revenue & Expenditure Projections; Staffing Pattern for 2013-14; Level of Available Unreserved-Appropriated Fund Balance to use for Balancing for FY14

Ms. Vagner said the legislature passed the “fix it” bill which was the funding bill for FY13. She said the FY14 funding bill covered almost all of the original elements of SCF with the exception of one-to-one mobile computing devices. She said part of the bill set aside money for differential pay, which was pay for performance, and professional development. She said most of the debate around the funding bill was about those two components. That was part of the debate of JFAC and House and Senate Ed. She said there was \$21 million allocated for differential pay and professional development. She said only 40% could be used for professional development. She said the Pay for Performance Committee would be reconvened to determine a District format for differential pay. She said there were some technology funds available in the form of mini-grants. She said the state only allocated \$170,000 to the District for discretionary funds. She said the public had been told Districts received at 2.2% increase but did not realize it came with strings attached. Ms. Cranor asked if any of the funds allocated for technology could be used for electronic textbooks. Ms. Vagner said the administration had not yet seen the parameters for those funds. She said the administration hoped it could shift a technology training specialist into that funding. Ms. Gebhardt noted a lot of the schools had already taken the initiative to purchase compatible technology equipment on their own. Ms. Vagner reviewed the Alameda Middle School staffing costs. She said the assistant principal, counselor, custodian and registrar were authorized. She said the cost of the counselor would be covered through downsizing caused by boundary shifts. She said the attendance clerk, media assistant and accompanist had not been authorized. She said there was no authorization for instructional paraprofessionals, pass room aides or coaching personnel. She said the District had maintained bare bones in order to open the school. She said any further authorizations would be brought to the Board for approval. She said the cost of curriculum materials for the school would be reduced because some of the materials were able to be gathered from the other schools. She said principals had collaborated and cooperated with all of the changes K-8. She said steps and lanes were authorized in the funding package for 2013-14. Mr. Smart said the administration heard that steps and lanes would also be restored for 2012-13. He said on the salary schedule years 1 – 3 were grouped into one row and HB65 restored all of those years. He said if that were to happen it would change the index but the administration did not know for sure if it would happen. Ms. Gebhardt said during the ISBA Executive Board Meeting they were told it would happen. Ms. Vagner said some of the administration would attend the post-legislative tour and should receive full clarification on steps and lanes, restoration and on technology parameters. Mr. Smart said the District’s budget estimate was within \$50,000 of what he anticipated it would be six weeks ago. Ms. Vagner said the cost increases spreadsheet continued to be adjusted. She said the District had been at a 4 – 5% pay cut for almost 5 years. She said the revenue accounting list was included in the packet. Mr. Smart said the revenue account listing would be confirmed on Friday and the administration would make any necessary adjustments. He said the expenditures by object list summarized expenses by type. He said it appeared the District would have no increase on its medical insurance premiums, however, with the loss of VEBA Trust funds it would amount to a \$200,000 increase. Ms. Vagner said the District had been using VEBA Trust funds to cover health insurance increases for almost 7 years. Mr. Smart said the Unappropriated Fund Balance was at 1% and 4%. He said if the Board used the remaining fund balance, there would be nothing left in the Appropriated Fund Balance. He said there were \$68 million in requested expenditures which would leave the District \$500,000 short of balancing. He said the revenue summary was built with the strings attached from the state. Mr. Reed said the Board set aside \$2 million two years ago to help with balancing this year’s budget but had to be careful about looking at ongoing costs versus one-time revenue. He said if the state had not attached strings to the budget for technology, professional development and differential pay the District would have had \$1.7 million in order to balance the budget. He said included in the packet was a document that detailed the various budget scenarios based on the level Unreserved Appropriated Fund Balance the Board decided to use whether it be at 25%, 50%, 75 or 100%. He said the next line showed the amount of expenditures that exceeded revenue. He said the higher the percentage of fund balance used meant less money to balance in the future. He said even if the Board used 100% of the fund balance it would still need to cut \$630,000 in order to balance and would have nothing left to balance the following year. Ms. Cranor said when the Board set the money aside it intended on using it to balance. Ms. Vagner said the Board did not define how much of it would be used to balance this year. Mr. Reed said if the Board used the full 100% this year it would be faced with full cuts for 2014-15. Mr. Sargent said he understood that but did not think the Budget Committee understood how much things needed to be planned in advance. Mr. Smart said that was the reason the Budget Committee only gave recommendations and did not make decisions. Ms. Vagner said the administration was requesting the Board provide direction on the level of fund balance use to allow the administration to proceed with putting together a balanced budget. Mr. Smart reviewed the state funding estimate. He said if the experience table changed and the index went up it would mean the District would have

more salary money coming in. He said the 1.67% would come out of that. He said he did an estimate in February and was within \$50,000. Ms. Vagner said the District would not open any positions until the administration knew what the final budget would look like. She said the administration was examining teacher workloads at the secondary level for any courses with 50 students or less in an effort to cover elective courses at Alameda Middle School. She said teachers for keyboarding, TLC, band and choir would all be covered by shifting people out of the high schools. She said she anticipated being able to cover the positions at no cost to the District. She said some of the elementary teachers had to be moved around due to the boundary shifts and rolling the 6th grade up to the middle schools. She said three more teachers were needed at the elementary level in order to maintain class size but the administration had been looking at how it could cover cost neutral with less elementary PE and music. Ms. Cranor asked if that meant eliminating staff. Ms. Vagner said no it only meant there were less students involved in those classes and less need for the current FTE. She said the administration would work on finalizing those numbers when it had direction from the Board. Ms. Gebhardt asked if there was a need to reduce staff. Ms. Vagner said it would have to be that or pay cuts. She said there was nothing else left to cut. She said little was left in discretionary funds. She said the Board could decide to increase costs for extra-curricular activities but the public would have to weigh in on that. She said in looking back over the last four years of everything that had been cut the only thing left was staff. Ms. Gebhardt said she knew some of it could be done through attrition but wondered how much staff would have to be cut to come up with the amounts shown on the use of fund balance. Ms. Vagner said \$60,000 was equal to 1 FTE, so 20 teachers equaled \$1.2 million. Mr. Sargent said it could be anywhere from 10 to 20 teachers. He asked if the District could take more days out of the calendar. Ms. Vagner said the District was still required to maintain a minimum number of minutes. She said Dr. Mortensen had done that mathematical work. She said the high school minutes were tight and would probably have to add minutes to the day. Ms. Gebhardt said she hated the thought of reducing salaries again. Ms. Cranor said she really did not want to go there again but also hated the thought of cutting 20 positions. Mr. Smart said some of those positions could be pulled from other places once the budget was fine tuned. Ms. Gebhardt said she could see using 50% of the Unreserved Appropriated Fund Balance but not more. Mr. Reed noted the District would also have no increase from a Supplemental Levy for next year like it did this year. Mr. Sargent said he would recommend 50%. Ms. Cranor said she was between 50% and 75%. Ms. Vagner said she would recommend not using any of the unappropriated fund balance. She said if the District faced another year where it was not funded for months from the state it would be unable to pay bills. Ms. Cranor said she was between 62% and 65%. Mr. Facer asked how the administration would go about looking at eliminating staff. Ms. Vagner said the Board would have to implement its RIF Policy. Ms. Cranor asked if the administration was looking at courses that had low enrollment. Ms. Vagner said yes. Mr. Reed said the only reason the legislature approved Use It or Lose It was because they knew there was no other way for Districts to balance. Ms. Cranor asked if federal grant money could be used to cover anything else. Ms. Vagner said the District had done that in the past but it was losing thousands of dollars in federal funding due to sequestration. Ms. Cranor said she was at 65%. Mr. Vitale said he could go with that amount. He said even that would be devastating. Ms. Vagner said it was especially hard for the public to comprehend the District cutting positions when the legislature touted a 2.2% increase to public schools and Legislators Lacey, Meline and Smith saying the public school budget was about as robust as it could be. Ms. Cranor said somehow the legislature's idea of a robust education budget needed to change and get Districts back to the previously healthy levels of funding. Ms. Gebhardt said not only did funding levels need to change; the legislature needed to stop dictating exactly how Districts could or couldn't spend the money. She said it did not do Districts any good to have more technology funding when it couldn't pay the electricity bills. Mr. Facer said it was hard to think about the devastation this would cause. Ms. Vagner said the District would have some attrition but it was not guaranteed to be in the areas needed. Mr. Sargent asked how many retirements on average the District had each year. Dr. Howell said typically around 50. Mr. Sargent said out of 50 the administration could probably absorb around 10 or 15 of those. He said he was still at 50%. Ms. Vagner said the administration would definitely use attrition to the best advantage. Ms. Cranor said with that in mind she could go to 60%. Ms. Vagner said the topic would be on the agenda for next Tuesday in order to get clear direction on how to proceed. She said the administration did not want to put a budget together based on a \$1.6 million reduction if it did not have to. She said once the Board decided how deep it was willing to go the administration would bring back a budget recommendation for the Board. Ms. Cranor asked if the document could be updated to include 60%. Ms. Vagner said the document would be updated to include 60% and 65%. Ms. Gebhardt said she would also like to see the number of positions associated with each amount. Ms. Vagner said the administration would add the number of positions. Ms. Cranor said teachers would still want the District to cut something at the Education Center. Ms.

Vagner said a position had been cut with combining the duties of the PTE and secondary secretaries. Mr. Sargent said at 50% the District could still balance the budget through attrition and denying any non-essential budget request. Mr. Reed said the administration would look at all of those areas as it fine-tuned the budget. Ms. Vagner said the budget would be adjusted again in May after the fix-it bill was signed into law and the administration had a clear idea of exactly what the District's revenue would be. Ms. Vagner said the administration would add 60%, 65% and the number of personnel affected and would bring the topic back for action at the Board Meeting the following Tuesday.

Public Comment

Board Protocols for Public Comment will be followed at all Board Meetings. Patrons wishing to address the Board will fill out Form AD 2 – Request to Appear before the Board and present it to the Board Chair or Board Secretary prior to the meeting.

Board Operating Principles #22 & 23:

22) The Board will follow the chain of command referring others to present their issues, problems, or proposals to the person who can properly and expeditiously address the issues; 23) Board members will refrain from communications which create conditions of bias should a problem or complaint become the subject matter of a hearing before the Board.

There was no public comment at the time of the meeting.

Adjourn:

Chair Gebhardt adjourned the Work Session at 10:42 a.m.

APPROVED ON:

May 21, 2013
By:

Janie Gebhardt
Chair

ATTESTED BY:

Jackie Cranor
Clerk

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

[Signature]
Secretary, Board of Trustees