

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
FOR THE PURPOSE OF A
BOARD/SUPERINTENDENT/CABINET RETREAT**

**Thursday, October 28, 2010
4:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Board Room at the Education Center
3115 Pole Line Road
Pocatello, ID 83201**

BOARD MEMBERS/SUPERINTENDENT PRESENT:

Marianne Donnelly, Chair	John Sargent, Member
Janie Gebhardt, Vice Chair	Jackie Cranor, Member
Frank Rash, Clerk (Excused)	Mary M. Vagner, Superintendent

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bart Reed	Carl Smart
Doug Howell	Bob Devine
Patti Mortensen	Chuck Wegner
Lynda Steenrod	Shelley Allen
Kent Hobbs	Bill Davis
Liz Killpack	Rena Johnson

Purpose: To frame discussion based on the District’s Vision/Mission/Beliefs/Learner Goals Statement; discuss evidence of Board Beliefs identified for behavioral emphasis; Review Board of Trustees Operating Principles; Conduct Board self-evaluations; Review Roles and Responsibilities for Board of Trustees, and Superintendent; and Brainstorm Challenges for the Next Three Years.

Welcome and statement of purpose

Ms. Donnelly welcomed everyone at 4:42 p.m. and said the purpose of the Special Meeting/Work Session was a Board/Superintendent/Cabinet Retreat. She said the group would discuss the direction of the District, the Beliefs, Operating Principles and conduct the Board self-evaluation. She turned the meeting over to Liz Killpack. Ms. Killpack conducted introductions.

Warm up activity

Ms. Killpack asked everyone in the group to think about one good thing that happened in their life in the last year. She said she had just finished reading a book titled “The 17 Second Miracle”. She said the book was about a young boy whose life changed dramatically in just 17 seconds. She said a person’s life could change dramatically for better or worse in a matter of seconds. She asked everyone to think about how many times something could change in a matter of seconds and challenged everyone to read the book. She said thinking about that made a person realize that the way you treat someone or the way someone treats you could change everything in seconds. She asked everyone to think of one word that summed up the District for them.

Ms. Steenrod introduced herself and said one good thing that happened to her was having the support of a particular circle of friends. She said the group had been friends for about forty years and had connected in the past year. She said the word that came to mind when she thought of the District was “longevity.”

Mr. Devine introduced himself and said his good experience that year was appreciating his family a little more. He said on the commute home that week the car hit a patch of ice and slid off the road. He said he hugged his family a little longer and was glad to still be with them. He said the word that described the District for him was “professional-renewal.”

Ms. Donnelly introduced herself and said one good thing that happened for her and the District was the jury deciding in favor of the District on a trial. She said the word that described her experience with the District was “dedication.”

Mr. Smart introduced himself and said his good experience happened that day. He said he was able to get the ISEE state report down to four errors. He said he had been with the District for about twenty years and there were a lot of ups and downs along the way. He said his word for the District was “rollercoaster.”

Ms. Vagner introduced herself and said her husband had been hospitalized for a couple of months and her good experience was the day before when a member of the District Leadership Team, Cory Phelps, told her he was very impressed with the leadership of the District. He said the administration knew what they were doing and where they were going. She said the word that described the District for her was “direction.”

Ms. Gebhardt introduced herself and said the good thing that happened to her recently was receiving a ceramic cross from her son and his significant other. She said it was very special and meant a lot to her. She said the word she thought of when thinking of the District was “integrity.”

Ms. Cranor introduced herself and said the good thing that happened to her that year was getting their house paid off. She said another good thing was having a friend of hers comment on the article she and Mr. Sargent worked on saying they appreciated the Board taking the time to inform the public of issues. She said the word she thought of when thinking of the District and her experience was “inquisitive.”

Mr. Reed said he had a couple of good things. He said the first two of his children had married that year. He said his family had three out of five children move out of the house in a nine month period. He said his auto insurance premiums had gone down which was always good. He said he had been at the District for almost twenty four years and the word that described the District for him was “diversity.”

Mr. Wegner said his good experience that year was becoming a grandparent. He said it was wonderful. He said he had lunch with his daughter and grandson that week and was a great experience. He said the word he thought of when thinking about the District was “passion.”

Mr. Hobbs said a lot of good things happened in the last year, but his was adopting a 17 year old foster son. He said the word he thought of when thinking about the District was “hectic.”

Mr. Sargent said his good experience was his grandson being born two weeks ago. He said it was really fun being a grandparent. He said his word to describe the District was “patience.”

Mr. Davis said he was a teacher at the Alameda Center and the PEA President. He said his good experience that year was being able to spend time with family that lived far apart. He said one of his daughters was able to find good airline tickets and get the family to L.A. for Christmas. He said his word to describe the District was also “passion.” He said that was why everyone in the District did what they did.

Ms. Allen introduced herself and said one good thing that happened was being able to facilitate the rescue of a litter of puppies. She said one of the rescued puppies laid its head in her lap and she was able to get a picture of it. She said it just made her feel really good knowing the puppies were now safe and content. She said the word that described the District for her was “whirlwind.”

Dr. Mortensen said her good experience was being able to go to Disneyland with her grandkids. She said it was really special and fun. She said the word that kept coming to her when thinking about the District was “resilient.” She said the District faced challenges and came out better for them.

Ms. Johnson said her good experience was coming to work for the District. She said the word she thought of when thinking about the District was “family.”

Ms. Killpack said this District was one of the few Districts where she was able to conduct a Board evaluation. She read a quote that said “School Boards are directly responsible for the community.” She said an accountability system could keep the focus on student achievement. She said a good quote by Steven Covey said “A leader’s role is to keep the main theme the main theme.” She noted the agenda that night was really focused on the “main theme.”

District Vision, Mission, Beliefs, Learner Goals drives the work of the Board

Ms. Killpack said it was important to have evidence that the Board and administration really believed in the District Vision/Mission/Beliefs and Learner Goals Statements. Ms. Killpack said she would start with the District’s Beliefs. She asked the group what evidence there was of the first Belief. Ms. Gebhardt said it was evidenced by the Board and administrative support of student discipline. Ms. Donnelly agreed that the safety and welfare of the student, but also the safety and welfare of all students and staff were taken into account with student discipline. She said the welfare and safety of students and staff was always at the front of the Board’s mind when handling those issues. Ms. Steenrod said another example was the Board’s recent adoption of a physical restraint and seclusion policy. She said the District adopted the policy even though it was not required by the state yet but because the Board and administration were concerned for the safety and welfare of students. Ms. Allen said it was evidenced when she saw students and teachers respecting one another and it was clear they knew what the expectations were. Ms. Gebhardt said it was evidenced through the implementation of programs like the Virtues Project. She said in some cases it was the only way some of the students learned those things. Ms. Steenrod said another evidence of supporting a safe and orderly learning environment was holding morning meetings to make sure everyone was okay and things were running smoothly. Dr. Mortensen said there were a lot of efforts and programs in place to support the learning and behaviors of students. She said the list of program support was pretty long at both the elementary and secondary levels. She said each of the programs was based on creating a safe and supportive environment so student could achieve. Ms. Donnelly said when the Board conducted their monthly school visits they were constantly looking for those evidences. She said if the Board could not see evidence of its Vision, Mission, Beliefs and Learner Goals than they recognized that something needed to change. Ms. Killpack commended the Board for participating in monthly school visits. Mr. Davis noted that prior to the current School Board and administration teachers had never seen a Board member in schools. He said it was good for the Board to walk around and see everything teachers were doing. He said sometimes it was hard to meet certain goals when parents were not supportive of student achievement and the work usually fell to the teachers. Ms. Vagner said the annual review of the Board’s Operating Principles held the administration accountable for a safe and caring working environment. Ms. Gebhardt said another example was District facilities were maintained to be safe and welcoming. Ms. Killpack asked what some evidences were of “High expectations promote high levels of student achievement.” Dr. Mortensen said a great example was Jefferson Elementary. She said the school was one of two schools in Idaho to be selected as the most improved Title I school and would be recognized nationally. She said the key to actualizing the Belief was changing the thinking and beliefs of the teachers and the students. She said the Principal and teachers were able to change the thinking of the students from believing they were the worst academically to believing they were the best. Ms. Donnelly said another actualization of the Belief was the secondary buying into the Belief that no child is allowed to fail. She said since adopting that Belief there had been a lot of improvement. Ms. Gebhardt said having an alternate school was a key piece to

the Belief that students learn in different ways and at different rates. She said during the Curriculum Committee the group emphasized the importance of implementing curriculum that would help students reach higher expectations. She said it was evident that people cared but wanted to make sure they were implementing the right things and not just putting a band-aid on a problem. Ms. Cranor said all of the Committees in the District worked very hard to make sure students had the support they needed. She said high achievement was evidenced during recognitions at the monthly Board meetings. She said students across the District were constantly winning academic championship awards. She said she wanted to commend the administration for planning ahead on the maintenance of District buildings. She said these efforts show the planning and concern for the wellbeing and achievement of students. Ms. Gebhardt said the Board recognized so many students for achieving highest honors. Ms. Killpack noted that at a different meeting she had been to, the facilitator asked the group the percentage of kids they thought could learn. She said most of the group answered 75%. She said she thought it was sad that more people did not feel that all students could learn. Mr. Sargent noted that an evidence of a safe and supportive environment was the fact that this group could have discussions in a safe and supportive environment without being made to feel like your opinion doesn't matter. Mr. Davis asked what was discussed during the school visits. Mr. Sargent said the Board discussed students and programs and what was working. Ms. Gebhardt said teachers often told her things they would like to see but did not talk about things they were angry about. Ms. Donnelly said each school had plans and most often wanted to share what was going on in their school with the Board. Ms. Killpack asked what evidences there were of "students learn best through active engagement in their learning with highly qualified, professional staff." Mr. Davis said the graduation rates were evidence of the Belief. Ms. Cranor said the Board had Student Representatives that attended the monthly meetings and were evidence of being actively engaged in their own learning. Mr. Davis said there were a lot of areas that were doing well, which was evidenced in the schools. Ms. Allen said teachers actively engaging students could be seen in every classroom. She said teachers were constantly making sure students were involved. Ms. Steenrod said another example was the level of professional development provided to all staff. She said the District provided praxis tests and all types of online courses. She said there were also monthly trainings with building coaches to create a team with the teachers. Ms. Killpack asked what evidences there were that "parents and the community play a vital role in a student's educational success." Mr. Hobbs said he recently saw evidence of the importance of the parent role in a child's educational success when during a DDRRC hearing he recognized the student was acting out to avoid anyone recognizing that his skill set was low, and was able to get the parent involved in a creative solution for the student. He said it did not always work out that way, but if teachers and administrators could get parents engaged it was always gratifying. Ms. Cranor said it was part of the Board's responsibility to help parents feel that their input was valued. She said parents and the community got frustrated if they felt they were being dismissed. She said when parents and the community were treated with respect it helped diffuse negative situations and garnered trust. Ms. Steenrod said the Belief that parents and the community play a vital role was actualized when the schools worked together to host an American Indian Family Night that took an active step in engaging parents and the community. She said there was a grandmother that attended the family night who said it was the first time any of her family had been reached out to by the schools. Dr. Mortensen said the District had taken great strides in promoting parent involvement through the Love and Logic and STEP courses offered for parent support. She said Superintendent Vagner had done a great job of getting parents and the community involved through the various District Committees. Ms. Donnelly said the implementation of Infinite Campus also helped keep parents involved in the student's education success.

Ms. Killpack said the Board should discuss any challenges for the coming year before selecting the Beliefs for Actualization for 2010-11. She asked what challenges the Board anticipated.

Ms. Cranor said one challenge was communication with the public. She said the "Face of the Board" was created to get the word out on a quarterly basis. Ms. Gebhardt said growth was a challenge. Ms. Allen said sustainability was a challenge. She said asking everyone to do more with less was difficult to sustain and the District did not have the resources to give. Ms. Cranor said another challenge was the negative publicity nationwide. She said it was important for the Board to focus on the positive and help people understand that the system does work. Mr. Davis said there were polls that showed schools were falling apart but no one ever thought it was their school. He said perceptions like those create their own problems. He said the negative publicity on the national level was a political agenda. He said the District was doing a good job but the state had trouble communicating the good things. Ms. Killpack said the NSCBA came out with a tool to help School Boards combat the negative focus on "Waiting for Superman". Mr. Wegner said another challenge was the transition to the common core standards without any resources or technology funds. Mr. Reed said the District was one of excellence but could not stay that way without the resources. He said the District could not sustain programs without the resources. He said teachers and staff could not take on anything more. Mr. Davis said programs could be sustained for a period of time but were not sustainable long term. Mr. Smart said not all students learned at the same level and sustaining AYP was a problem as well. Ms. Steenrod said turnover was problem too when there were no resources to hire and train highly qualified staff. Dr. Mortensen pointed out the new compliance regulations would be a challenge to meet. Ms. Donnelly said there were penalties if compliance regulations were not met. Mr. Davis said after six years there was no evidence that Arne Duncan's restructuring plan was working. Ms. Cranor pointed out that the federal stimulus dollars came with strings attached which added to the workload far longer than the money lasted. Ms. Gebhardt agreed that a whole new set of programs and procedures were required in order to receive the money. Mr. Sargent noted that even after Districts received stimulus dollars the federal government dictated how 90% of it was spent. Mr. Reed said another challenge was a shift in cost. He said the state did not have the reserves to spend and the federal government would eventually pull funding and the cost would shift to the local level. He said it was a burden that would eventually face every community across the nation and Districts needed to find a way to get the support of the community. Ms. Allen said it would be a challenge if the state did not do anything to enhance revenue to support public agencies. Ms. Vagner said it was also unknown if the legislature would give District the flexibility to choose another election date. Ms. Cranor said another challenge was capacity. She said she had been asked by a patron why the District could not open two buildings rather than one. She said she told the patron that it could if it had the funds. Ms. Vagner said the District had been challenged with negotiations with the certified staff and was faced with pay reductions and did not know how much longer teachers and staff could hang in there without enhanced revenue. She said on top of that the District was faced with growth challenges and possibly another charter school coming on board which would mean a loss of students. She said it was even more difficult with various legislators and elected officials being proponents of the deterioration of public schools in favor of private schools and charters. Ms. Gebhardt said the District did well communicating with its local representation but holding the state legislature accountable to uphold the constitution in providing education was a challenge. Mr. Sargent agreed Districts needed to push harder to hold the legislature accountable. Ms. Cranor said she was disappointed that there was not more of a push or passion from the ISBA at the last conference. Mr. Davis said he heard from Mr. Ruchti that there were three groups within the legislature that had common goals but two of the groups ended up breaking off and cutting their own deals. He said the groups that broke off end up scrambling to get what they can while they can. Ms. Cranor said the ISBA needed to be more passionate in

presenting the District cases. She said there were a few issues that the ISBA took a stand on but not enough. Ms. Gebhardt said it appeared that the ISBA did not want to take a stand on certain issues because it might ruin their chances in negotiations. Ms. Cranor said another problem was that a lot of rural issues were addressed but not for the larger Districts. Ms. Vagner said there was a conservative element in the ISBA organization that would not be reflective of the passion of this Board. Ms. Killpack noted the new president was more passionate and not as conservative. She said there were not too many on the current Board that could express issues with a lot of passion. Ms. Vagner said this legislative session was the Districts one shot for advocacy for education. Ms. Cranor said the legislature reviewed funding education with the attitude that everyone else was suffering financially and now it was the schools turn to suffer. She said she understood that times were tough right now but education should be priority and was mandated by the constitution where other services were not. Ms. Allen said one of the biggest problems Districts had was that the state did not invest in education when there was growth and had the means to do so and now there was nothing left to take away. Ms. Allen said the legislature needed to hear that kids were going to suffer and not just that school board and Districts would suffer. Ms. Gebhardt said students did not get a do-over. She said you could not give a student his/her second grade back once the economy recovered. Ms. Allen said students would also not be able to compete in a technological world without technology.

Ms. Killpack asked the Board to select two Beliefs to focus on for the 2010-11 school year. She asked the group to split into teams and discuss which Beliefs should be the main focus.

Ms. Steenrod and Mr. Smart selected “Students may not opt out of their learning” and “Parents and the community play a vital role in a student’s educational success”. Ms. Steenrod said she believe that parents and the community playing a vital role was an important focus for the District with the Supplemental Levy coming up and the need to stick together in difficult times. She said she felt that students may not opt out of their learning was critical focus to emphasize the importance of interventions.

Mr. Hobbs said he chose “High levels of expectations create high levels of achievements” and “Students must be challenged to think critically and work in teams.” He said those Beliefs supported the Belief that students may not opt out of their learning.

Mr. Sargent said their group chose “Students have a right to learn and are responsible for their learning” and “Parents and the community play a vital role in a student’s educational success.” Ms. Vagner said the District had invested a great deal in actualizing a safe and supportive environment and focusing on parents and the community playing a vital role supported that.

Mr. Davis asked what perspective the focus was meant to come from. Ms. Vagner said it was a systematic perspective and focused on the direction of the District as a whole.

Ms. Cranor said she thought that parents and the community playing a vital role was an important focus because of the eventual cost shift that Mr. Reed talked about. Mr. Sargent agreed it was a critical focus this year.

Ms. Gebhardt said students must be challenged to think critically and work in teams was an important focus. Mr. Sargent said it was important for students to work in teams if they were all working. He said students should not be allowed to float on the work of others.

Mr. Reed said he thought that high expectations promote high levels of achievement was an important focus and pointed out that Jefferson was a perfect example of that. Mr. Davis agreed that adults needed to change their expectations before they could expect students to change theirs. Ms. Killpack shared a story about a teacher setting high expectations for her students and the amazing result that followed. Ms. Allen said in order for teachers to have high expectations of their students they first needed to have high

expectations of themselves. Ms. Gebhardt said she thought that “education is a means to a quality life” and “students have a right to learn” were important focuses to keep throughout the legislative session. Ms. Cranor said that education is a means to a quality life was too encompassing and should be a more specific focus. Ms. Vagner suggested grouping the beliefs into two main categories with sub-Beliefs. She said the first group of Beliefs could be “High levels of expectations create high levels of achievement” with “Students have a right to learn and are responsible for their learning”, “Students may not opt out of their learning” and “Students must be challenged to think critically and work in teams”. She said the second group could be “Parents and the community play a vital role in a student’s education success” and “Education is a means to a quality life”. She said the Beliefs could be documented collectively for actualization. The Board agreed it was a good solution to focus on the group of Beliefs. Ms. Vagner said the Board would take action to affirm the Beliefs at the November Board meeting. She said once the Beliefs were affirmed they would be added to the District’s Strategic Plan.

Ms. Cranor said she heard concerns from patrons about public comment being at the end of the agenda. She asked if the public comment section could be moved. Ms. Killpack noted that control of a meeting could easily be lost if public comment was allowed on every topic. She said it was important to remember that Board meetings were meetings held in public and not public meetings. Ms. Vagner noted that the format used to have public comment at the beginning but patrons realized that as the topics were discussed most of the questions they had were answered and eliminated the need to comment. She said the purpose of the meetings were to inform the public of the work of the Board. She said the Boards two meetings per month were planned so the public had the opportunity to review and comment on issues. Ms. Cranor said she understood waiting to hear about the issue first but was concerned that some patrons got tired of waiting through the long process. Ms. Gebhardt noted that the Board had Work Sessions to lay out the issues and not just the Regular Board Meetings. Mr. Davis said he had been around through several School Boards where meetings could go on until midnight or later and thought ending at 8:30 or 9 p.m. was great but should not be short just for the sake of being short. He said he was critical of the process when commenting on a topic with no reply. He said sometimes dialogue was necessary but agreed that not every topic needed discussion. He said he know Work Sessions were open meetings but were held in the day while people were at work and were difficult to attend. Ms. Vagner said one value the Board had in setting up the meeting schedule was for the Board to access the people it needed to have access to. She said another important thing to remember was that the purpose of Board meetings was for the Board to do its work and was not for dialogue or a discussion with the public. She said the Board could not pick and choose what it would and would not debate. She said if dialogue is necessary on a certain topic then the Board should direct any discussion to the administration. She said an example was an individual wanting to change a school’s curriculum. She said the individual would be directed to the Curriculum Committee, not to have a public debate with the Board. She said individuals have the right to appear and the right to be heard but was critical to remember the meetings were for the Board. Ms. Donnelly noted there were times when public meetings were held to gain input from the community and allowed for discussion. Ms. Gebhardt noted that a lot of people felt that if the meeting was open it entitled them to participate. Ms. Cranor said she did not want to alienate people or make them feel like they shouldn’t come if they couldn’t be heard. She said she just thought there might be a better way. Ms. Killpack said the Board could not hold a meeting a certain way one time and a different way the next. Ms. Vagner said the purpose of structuring the meeting to go from Curriculum and Instruction, to Business Operations, to Employee Services to Human Resources to the Superintendent’s Report was to get the big picture of what was happening before public comment. Ms. Gebhardt noted there was also public comment at the beginning of the agenda for items not on the agenda. Ms. Cranor said she thought it was common courtesy to tell people their comments were appreciated and would be addressed. Mr.

Reed said the most efficient way to address the issue was to refer them to the appropriate administrative department. He said when patrons were referred to the proper administrative department it often resolved the concern without having to bring it to a public meeting. Ms. Vagner said when the administration was aware of the issue it could avoid confrontation by directing it through the appropriate channels. She said she would not advise entertaining public comment after each issue. She said if the Board entertained public comment on each issue and sent every issue to the administration it would be directing the administration's time away from the direction to implement the Strategic Plan. She said she had been in that situation before but not for several years and was counterproductive. Ms. Cranor said she saw her point but had heard the complaint on several occasions and wanted to raise the issue. Ms. Allen said some of the concerns could be addressed in an editorial from the Board clarifying the meeting process and outlining the proper procedure for addressing concerns through the administration. Mr. Smart said there was nothing worse than surprises during a Board meeting. He said it was always better to direct concerns to the correct administrative department to give them a chance to solve the problem before surprising them with it during a Board meeting. Ms. Vagner noted the administration was sensitive to preserving the Board's time by directing and addressing concerns before they reached the Board. Ms. Cranor said she was okay with the current format but thought an editorial would be helpful. Ms. Killpack suggested reading the Board's Operating Principle #22 before the public comment section. Ms. Vagner said the Board's Operating Principles #22 and #23 could be added to the agenda in the public comment section and integrated into the public comment form. Ms. Cranor agreed it would be helpful to outline the protocols beforehand.

Review Board of Trustees Operating Principles

Ms. Killpack reviewed the Operating Protocols and asked the Board if it needed a communications protocol. Ms. Cranor said she was okay with the communications changes implemented by Ms. Allen that year. Ms. Killpack noted she reviewed this Board's Operating Principles as an example to all Boards. She said it was important the principles were reviewed. Ms. Vagner asked if the Board was agreeable to affirming the current principles at the November Board Meeting. The Board was in agreement with the current Operating Principles. Ms. Vagner noted the Board was committed to its annual review of the Operating Principles and set the expectations of the Board and District.

Brainstorm

Ms. Vagner noted the Board was good about bringing questions or concerns to the administration before a Board meeting rather than surprising it in the middle of the report. She said the reporting process helped the public understand the issues before asking questions. Ms. Steenrod said often times the reporting process helped clarify certain points for the public that they misunderstood before. Mr. Sargent said it was sometimes hard to sit through the Board meetings when it felt like the issues had been discussed before until he realized it was a summary for the public and a chance to readdress a topic that needed further discussion. Ms. Allen said she had been on several types of Boards that did not control their meetings and could sometimes be there for hours on one topic. Mr. Sargent said if an editorial was done on the meeting format it should included something about the open meeting law.

Conduct Board Self-Evaluation

Ms. Killpack reviewed the Board self-evaluation. She asked the Board if there were any sections that needed to be strengthened. Ms. Gebhardt said the Board's involvement with the PTA could be strengthened. Ms. Vagner noted that section #7 applied to smaller communities but was comparable to the District's committee or administrative work which was a shared effort. Ms. Killpack asked the Board

how they felt they did on Policy making. The Board agreed it did pretty well with Policy making. Mr. Sargent noted the administration did a good job of bringing necessary policy changes to the Board. Ms. Vagner said the administration brought controversial policy changes through a committee to work out any problems before bringing it to the Board. Ms. Killpack asked how the Board did with planning and goal setting. Ms. Cranor noted that Jefferson was a good example of planning and goal setting. Ms. Steenrod said that not one school had a sub-group of American Indians that did not meet AYP. Ms. Killpack asked how the Board did on financial issues. Ms. Cranor said Interest Based Bargaining had not been easy. Ms. Killpack said she would be attending IBB Facilitator training and would appreciate any comments the Board or administration had on the process. Ms. Vagner and Mr. Davis agreed that would be a good idea. Ms. Vagner noted there were challenges to work through in the process. Ms. Cranor said the District did well with its planning and purchasing of the Stock's Building. Mr. Smart said with the growth in the community and businesses wanting to come to the areas said something about what the District was accomplishing. He said he hoped it would attract more people. Mr. Reed said the administration appreciated the Board taking a stand on certain issues to do the right thing which was not always the easy thing to do. He said it did a good job of seeing the big picture and doing what was best for the students and community as a whole. Mr. Sargent said as a Board they looked further ahead than just the here and now or just one year down the road. He said it was important to plan for the long term. Ms. Vagner noted the District was severely understaffed and the Education Jobs Act did not benefit any of the Education Center staff. She said being able to maintain was a very real challenge. She said morale was an issue. She said departments were running on all cylinders but were short handed. Ms. Killpack asked how the Board did with personnel issues. Ms. Cranor said she thought the Board did a good job with personnel but did not get to hear the employee's side of things. Ms. Vagner said it was the Board's team's job to present the perspective of the Board and if the Board got into discussion with employees it could be charged with an unfair labor practice by not remaining impartial. Ms. Vagner noted the administration took its marching orders directly from the Board. Mr. Davis stated the Board did not work for the administration or the community. Mr. Reed noted another challenge for the District was attracting highly qualified teachers due to new businesses coming in with better pay and benefits. He said the District was not as competitive as other businesses in the area. He said the District had not been fully staffed in transportation since the beginning of the school year. Ms. Vagner agreed it was true for any position in the District including substitutes. She said the District was above the state's salary reimbursement schedule even with the reductions. Mr. Smart shared that a neighbor of his was considering leaving the District because there was no movement. He said it was an issue that would need to be addressed. Ms. Gebhardt agreed it was difficult for employees to spend money on educating and bettering themselves with no benefit. Ms. Cranor said it was something to consider when setting the Supplemental Levy rate. Ms. Vagner said it was important for employees to review District Policies annually and sign off that all policies were reviewed. Ms. Killpack asked how the Board did with working with the Superintendent. Ms. Cranor said she felt this was the Board's strongest areas. Ms. Gebhardt said her only concern was whether or not the Board provided enough feedback for the Superintendent and not the other way around. Ms. Vagner noted that the Budget and Insurance Committee's had been retooled as a result of the Board's feedback. Ms. Killpack asked how the Board did with its meetings. Mr. Davis said he had seen Board meetings go late in the past due to the Board's being unprepared. He said that was never a problem with this Board. Ms. Killpack asked how the Board did with Legislative/Political issues. Ms. Gebhardt said it was a challenge to stay informed on federal legislation. Mr. Reed said one challenge in that area was getting feedback from other Districts. He said if Districts could join together in support of an issue it might make a greater impact. He said he knew there were other Districts that agreed on certain issues but there was no collaboration. Ms. Donnelly said the

Board could make a greater effort to interact with other Districts. Ms. Cranor said #1 was a challenge because the Board's input was not solicited. Mr. Davis noted that not every area was fortunate enough to have representatives that supported education. Ms. Cranor said she did not feel the legislative leadership was receptive to what School Boards had to say. Ms. Vagner said the Board did well working through issues together even when there was a split vote and not unanimous agreement it still was supportive of the final decision and was able to mover forward together. Ms. Gebhardt agreed she had received feedback from patrons that were appreciative the Board did not squabble over issues.

Discussion of the roles and responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and the Superintendent and continued growth as an effective leadership team

Ms. Gebhardt said the forward thinking of the leadership was very helpful. She said the administration's skills made it easier for the Board to do its job. Ms. Killpack noted the supportive and respectful relationship the Board and the administration had was rare. Ms. Steenrod agreed and said the District felt like a family. Ms. Killpack said it was evident the Board was willing to sacrifice and put in the time by being here.

Summary Agreements and any Direction; Set Follow-up Retreat Date and time if needed

Ms. Vagner said the Board would affirm the Operating Principles and Beliefs at the November Board Meeting and review the Legislative Agenda. She said the Board's Operating Principles #22 and #23 would be built into the Board's meeting agendas and the Request to Appear Before the Board Form.

Adjourn

Chair Donnelly adjourned the Special Meeting/Work Session/Retreat at 8:04 p.m.

APPROVED ON:

BY:

Chair

ATTESTED BY:

Clerk

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Secretary, Board of Trustees