

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25
Tuesday, January 13, 2015
Board Room at the Education Service Center
1:30 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS/SUPERINTENDENT PRESENT:

Janie Gebhardt, Chair
Jackie Cranor, Vice Chair
Dave Mattson, 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, January 13, 2015, at 1:30 p.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 1:30 p.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. Restorative Justice Presentation**
- 2. Head Start Grant Presentation**
- 3. Social Worker and School Psychologist Case Load and Services 2013-14 and 2014-15**
- 4. Idaho Special Education Manual 2015**
- 5. 2014 LEP Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) Determination and Final Title I Budget**
- 6. ISAT 2.0 Testing for 9th Graders**
- 7. 2015-16 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Presentation**
- 8. Policy Updates:** *Policy 5511 – Wellness/Nutrition; Policy 7500 – Assign Employment Related Duties to Superintendent; Policy 8211 – Student Athletic Code of Conduct*
- 9. 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.

10. Adjourn

Restorative Justice Presentation

Mr. Hobbs said the administration explored the Restorative Justice practice and learned that the Bannock County Juvenile Justice Department was also using the program. He reviewed the social discipline window. He said the whole idea was to maintain control while having high expectations of both parties. He said the District maintained high expectations for all students both academically and behaviorally and provided a lot of support. He said if an administrator is the only with control the discipline process becomes punitive. He said with Restorative Justice the entire “community” was included in the process. He said all students and staff were part of the community and expectations were clear to everyone. He said the discipline process became easier because everyone in the community knew the outcome. He said Restorative Justice used a fair process which did not mean the process was democratic. He said not everyone got their way but they understood why and what the expectations were. He reviewed the “compass of shame” that demonstrated when you try to build fear or shame within a person the person either withdraws or begins attacking themselves or others. He said it was not a productive approach. He

said the Restorative Justice approach used both control and support. He said the administration was conducting two trainings which included the introduction to Restorative Practices and Using Circles Effectively. He said a lot of the practices were not much different from what the District was already doing; it just systemized the process District-wide and involved the whole school community. He said circles were used to solve problems by allowing members of the school community to come together to find a solution. He said he and two staff members from the New Horizon Center, Brad Wallace and Tom Dickman, attended a training in Pennsylvania to become certified trainers and had been teaching and training District staff ever since. He said 165 staff members had been trained. He said the first staff members to be trained included administrators and non-classroom personnel. He said the trainers just started training sessions with teachers. He said the District just received a grant to pay for the training. He said the biggest cost was to pay substitutes while teachers participated. He said it was a very different experience conducting the training with teachers compared to non-classroom personnel. He said the goal was to train every staff member in the District in every department within a three year time period. He said there were 1,236 major discipline entries in Infinite Campus in 2012-13 that included violations like physical aggression, truancy and weapons. He said he hoped to reduce that number by 1/3 in three years. He said school SROs issued over 600 citations that year and he hoped that number would also be reduced. Ms. Cranor asked if coaches would be included in the training. Mr. Hobbs said that was his goal. He said the part-time or volunteer coaches may not receive the training. He read an email from a teacher who did a circle with an unruly class that said "there were 14 boys in each circle and all of the students got into it quickly. I was amazed how respectful and honest the students were in the circle and thought it would really work well." He said the New Horizon Center staff and students had really embraced the training. He said the process culminated with a restorative conference which took a lot of time but was only for very serious incidents. He said each side brought support groups and had a conference. He said New Horizon Center had a restorative conference with a student that wanted to return to school from the Youth Development Center. He said the staff was hesitant to have him return to school, so the administration suggested a restorative conference with the staff, the student, the student's family and himself. He said it was a very scripted process and each side agreed to certain terms. He said after the student had been back at school for a while he asked the staff if they had seen a change and one teacher said she didn't notice a huge change in the student's behavior but she did notice a big change in how she reacted to the student's behavior. He said due to the change in adult behavior and response the student was on target to graduate that trimester. He said a lot of people in the community claimed that the District didn't listen or respond to concerns and he hoped this approach would change that perception. He said the change would take time but he hoped the process would continue to make a difference. He said Board members were welcome to attend any of the training sessions.

Head Start Grant Presentation

Ms. Brey thanked the Board for its time. She said she was the new Head Start Coordinator. She said for the past 46 years the Head Start Grant had been on a three year cycle and the Head Start Program recently shifted to a five year grant cycle. She said the Pocatello Head Start Program recently finished year three of the three year grant and received notice that it would be required to submit the new five year grant. She said the Regional Office had been in contact to help update the current grant application from a three year to a five year format. She said a majority of the grant was still applicable and did not require amending. She said the program would be awarded the same amount of money and the community assessment would still apply. She said the goals and objectives and the action plans would have to be reformatted. She said goals were written based on the content objectives. She said she hoped that by completing the new goals and objectives the program would see growth and success. She said teachers would not only focus on education in the classroom but would be able to work directly with families. She said it took several hours to condense over twenty goals into three main goals. She said out of the twenty goals most of them became objectives under the three main goals. She said the three main goals were: Healthy Families and Healthy Programs; Attendance; and Positive Classroom and Program Culture. She said the team was successful in adapting current action plans to fit the new grant. She said goals and objectives would be amended as needed when resubmitting the grant annually. She said the Head Start family was part of the District family as the Head Start students would transition from the Head Start program into the District's kindergarten classes. She said the goal was to make sure that students were ready for kindergarten and would be successful in the transition to kindergarten and beyond. She said it was important to look at the long term in order to ensure a student's success. She said the revised application would be submitted by January 31, 2015 pending Board approval at the Regular Board Meeting on January 20, 2015.

Social Worker and School Psychologist Case Load and Services 2013-14 and 2014-15

Mr. Miner said last year special services personnel were realigned due to the retirement of one of the social workers. He said the position was filled by bringing on an additional school psychologist. He said increasing the number of school psychologists allowed the District to focus the work of the social workers on students with Emotional Disturbances (ED). He said last year around 45 students in the middle and high schools were identified as ED. He said those students had mental health issues that prevented them from meeting academic and attendance requirements. He said redirecting the social workers' time to middle and high school provided more time to work with ED students. He said this year there were 67 students that were identified as ED. He said more and more students were coming to the District that required a tremendous amount of individual support. He said the vacancy in the elementary schools was being filled by current counselors and CRWs. He said CRWs helped to identify needs and provided resources. He said the elementary schools also had Star Coaches that provided tiered interventions for students with difficult behavior. He said there was previously a duplication of services that was provided at the elementary schools and the shift in personnel eliminated that redundancy. He said since realigning personnel there had been less student discipline referrals and an increase in completed assignments for students with emotional disturbances. He said the social workers were able to meet with each student for about 30 minutes each week which was working out better than just checking in and checking out with a student on occasion. He said social workers now had time to work on cognitive behavioral therapy, skill building, dealing with conflict, time management and completing assignments which was resulting in fewer discipline referrals. He said the social workers were eligible for Leadership Premiums. He said the social workers were coordinating with CRWs and Bannock Juvenile Probation to provide support systems for students. He said one of the .5 FTE social workers worked specifically with students at New Horizon Center. He said she worked with the Turning Point students at the elementary level and provided counseling and family services before students were transferred back to their neighborhood school. He said she also worked with Kinport students. He said social workers were now able to attend the weekly special education meetings. He said now that the District had 7 school psychologists they were able to provide more traditional services like determining eligibility for special services. He said the number of students requiring services had grown which increased the school psychologists' workload. He said school psychologists were able to be more hands-on with the teams due to the additional staff member. He said school psychologists were also eligible for Leadership Premiums. He said he relied heavily on the school psychologists for assistance in developing discipline procedures and Tier 1, 2 and 3 intervention flow charts and in developing behavior management plans. Mr. Mattson asked if families were moving into the area because of the District's reputation of effective services for students with special needs. Mr. Miner said the District had recently started experiencing an influx in the number of students that were coming to the District from out of the area. He said he did an informal analysis of the number of students that moved to the District from out of area that required special services and the number was at 107. Ms. Vagner said the number of students requiring ERR and DLP services was extremely high. She said the Board may have seen the article about the correlation between poverty and the number of students with disabilities. Ms. Cranor asked if the trend was nationwide. Ms. Vagner said as the poverty rates across the nation rose they were likely experiencing similar trends. Mr. Miner said he heard from an out of state parent that told him they had heard a lot of good things about the services provided by the District. He said he suspected people were moving into the area with family members to take advantage of the District's services. He said the current child count was at 1,341 which was up from 1,309 the year before. Ms. Cranor said she had spoken to some parents that moved into the area because they were having difficulty securing services for their student in rural areas. Mr. Vitale asked at what point the District would be overrun and unable to provide services. Mr. Miner said he didn't have an exact answer but knew that teachers were already stressed. He said the number of students that were being identified with autism was growing across the nation. He said with poverty came numerous problems. Mr. Vitale said it seemed like at some point the District would have more clients than it would be able to provide services for. Mr. Miner said he didn't know exactly what the breaking point was. He said the average elementary classroom teacher caseload was around 26 to 32 students, middle school class size was round 35 and high school class sizes could be forty or more. He said the paperwork demands were massive and instead of the State Department of Education helping to eliminate workloads it kept adding more and more compliance requirements and documentation. He said the District was still managing to do a great job keeping up with the work load and staying in compliance. He said the District provided a good continuum of services but it was a challenge. Ms. Cranor said the amount of paperwork was phenomenal. She said she worried about reducing the number of social workers when workloads were continuing to increase. Ms. Vagner said the District had a greater investment in resources at the elementary level with counselors, CRWs and behavior technicians but resources were extremely limited at the secondary level so the shift in services was necessary to meet the needs at both levels. Ms. Cranor asked if the District could get a CRW in the secondary schools. Ms. Vagner said yes but it

would cost money. Ms. Gebhardt noted that the caseloads at Head Start seemed small, but the needs were greater. Mr. Miner said some of the students coming from the Lincoln Center to Greenacres Elementary were pretty time intensive. He said the evaluations that were needed were much greater than a typical SLD referral. He said a typical eligibility packet for a student six years ago was about six pages long. He said that same eligibility packet was now 25 pages long to ensure that Districts were identifying students appropriately. He said it was good that the eligibility process was more thorough but it was a lot more work than it used to be.

Idaho Special Education Manual 2015

Mr. Miner said included in the packet was the Idaho Special Education Manual 2015 along with a summary of the changes that were made since the last adoption in 2007. He said there were a number of changes to review. He said a few of the changes were made to the terminology used in the manual. He said one significant change to the new manual was that in a divorce situation if one parent wanted services and the other did not the District could not provide services until the situation was legally resolved between the two parties. He said if parents were unable to come to a resolution on their own the District had to revoke services. Ms. Gebhardt asked how the District would ensure FAPE in a situation where the administration knew the student needed services but one parent refused. He said if a student needed services the administration would never cut off services, the school would still have tiered interventions in place. He said the IEP team was diligent to determine what was best for a student. Ms. Cranor asked if a student would be revoked services if there was a dispute between the parents. Mr. Miner said the parents were responsible to come to an agreement relative to services. Ms. Vagner said if one parent directed the revocation of services the District was obligated to discontinue services. She said if the other parent disagreed they would have to go through the legal process and request to start the evaluation process all over again. She said the District could potentially become a bouncing ball between two different sets of requests. She said in extreme cases the District would request a parent coordinator to decide. Ms. Cranor asked if the student's wishes were taken into account. Mr. Miner said only if the student was an adult. He said usually a non-adult student was able to convince one parent that they did or didn't need services. He said some families wanted to pick and choose services and the District was continually rewriting IEPs but with the changes to the Manual a family had to accept an IEP as it was written and could not pick and choose services. He said some things that had been added to the Manual had been standard practice for years but were now spelled out. He said due process hearings that went to the state level were outlined in the Manual. Ms. Vagner said the Board would be asked to adopt the Idaho Special Education Manual 2015 at the January 20, 2015 Regular Board Meeting.

2014 LEP Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) Determination and Final Title I Budget

Ms. Anderson said she would provide an overview of the District's LEP program. She said there were 73 students involved in the District's LEP Program. She said 28 of those students were receiving direct services in grades 1 through 11. She said there were currently ten languages served by the LEP Pullout Program. She said the majority of students in the LEP pullout program were Arab. She said students were spread throughout fifteen different schools which was a challenge. She said there were only two full time teachers and one paraprofessional that provided services to all of these students. She said each staff member provided services to five to six schools per day. Ms. Gebhardt asked if most of the students were elementary or secondary. Ms. Anderson said most of the students were elementary but there were quite a few students in all of the secondary schools. She said teachers were compensated for in-District travel. She said the secondary students were on a schedule, so the teachers had to be there at a particular time. She said the schedule had to be adjusted for Lewis & Clark and Washington Elementary Schools that required more services this year. She commended the LEP teachers for their outstanding performance regardless of the high number of students. She reviewed the SDE communication regarding the District's Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). She said the SDE commended the District for continuing to meet AMAOs. She said on page two of the report the District was listed as meeting LEP targets for the past five years. She said the District also exceeded targets for growing by one level for ELA. She said the District had highly effective teachers. Mr. Mattson asked what happened to Districts that were not meeting targets. Ms. Anderson said it depended on the size of the District. She said Districts that had less than 81 LEP students were part of a statewide consortium that received additional funding to address any deficits in meeting targets. She said some Districts served up to 28 different languages which was a major challenge. She said the last five students that came to the District had zero English and those students were held to the same achievement standards as English speaking students. Ms. Cranor asked if the District was part of the consortium. Ms. Anderson said yes. She said the state had two LEP coaches that would meet with the District staff tomorrow to review the LEP programs. She said the consortium was gathering information on individual District needs and was looking at what resources were available and what professional development was needed. She said it was a challenge to find

certified LEP teachers and the state was trying to address the need through the consortium. Ms. Vagner said Districts that did not meet AMAOs were required to notify parents. She said if a District hadn't met AMAOs for multiple consecutive years additional measures had to be met. Ms. Cranor said those Districts probably lost funding. Ms. Vagner said Districts were not funded for LEP. Ms. Anderson said Districts only received funding if they had more than 81 LEP students and were funded out of Title III funds which were separate from Title I. She said also included in the packet was the final Title I Budget. She said the District received the final allocation from the state and the budget was up by \$800. She said the total allocation was \$2,513,377. She said the District was only allowed to carryover a certain percentage of the Title I Budget. She said this year the District was over the allowed amount and was granted a waiver to keep the higher percentage of carryover. She said the additional carryover would be used to provide Six-Trait Writing Training for teachers. She said approximately 95% of elementary teachers would be trained by next fall. She said teachers would receive materials to support the training in the classrooms. She said the District was able to purchase 34 Chromebooks and was piloting the use of the Chromebooks at Jefferson Elementary. She said the pilot was going very well. Ms. Cranor asked what Chromebooks were. Ms. Anderson said they were similar to laptops but were web-based and were a lot quicker than traditional laptops. She said web-based programs were fast, easy to use and much cheaper than laptops. She said the District hired a part-time CRW, paid for out of Title I, to serve homeless students at all four of the high schools. She said the District was notified that it might receive additional Title I funds next year and if so the District planned to increase the part-time CRW to full-time. She said the CRW currently worked with 58 homeless high school students and was doing a great job. She said the rest of the budget remained the same.

ISAT 2.0 Testing for 9th Graders

Mr. Wegner said the Board previously discussed exempting juniors from taking the ISAT 2.0 this year and the administration just learned that the state was allowing the same exemption for freshman. He said Ms. Luras and Ms. Harwood discussed the proposal with high school principals who recommended that freshman be exempt from taking the ISAT 2.0 this year. He said the principals believed that the benefits of freshman taking the test did not outweigh the loss of instructional time. He said the previous explanation in the packet said those freshman would have to pass the ISAT 2.0 in their junior year at a 9th grade level which the administration just learned was not the case. He said the SDE was recommending that those freshman students would only have to participate in the ISAT 2.0 test in their junior year but were not required to pass. He said the recommendation was still under review and the administration would notify the Board as soon as it was approved. Ms. Gebhardt said taking the test would familiarize students with the test but was not worth the complexity of trying to schedule testing for all of those students. Ms. Cranor agreed that the testing would take up valuable instructional time. Ms. Vagner said taking the test year had no merit and there was no motivation for students to do well. Ms. Cranor said that was especially true if those students wouldn't even have to pass the test in order to graduate. Mr. Wegner said the Board would be asked to exempt 9th grade students from taking the ISAT 2.0 for the 2014-15 school year at the January 20, 2015 Regular Board Meeting.

2015-16 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Presentation

Mr. Reed said planning for the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) took about nine months. He said there was a lot of money that went into supporting the District's facilities and required a lot of planning. He said the CIP Committee was made up of two separate groups. He said one group included instructional staff, administrators and Board Members and the other group included the M&O Coordinator and the Grounds Foreman. He reviewed the timeline. He said requests were submitted by the schools in October and the Committee met to review the requests in December. He said there were always far more requests than funds available. He said the Committee's job was to prioritize and refine the requests within the budget. He after the Committee approved the final project and budget schedule it was presented to the Board for final approval. He said after the CIP schedule was approved by the Board the District would begin to bid projects which helped save hundreds of thousands of dollars by bidding early. He said the major source of funding for CIP projects came from the School Plant Facilities Fund Levy. He said it was a ten year levy and each year the amount increased by 5%. He said next year that amount would be just under \$4 million. He said the District received very little interest earnings because rates were low and because the District had to spend a majority of the funds within a two month period so the funds did not sit long enough to earn any interest. He said another source of funding was from the Idaho Lottery Fund. He said a few years ago the state shifted the Lottery Fund to the state's General Fund but had been working to restore the funding to School District facilities over the last couple of years. He said the District also received bus depreciation funds which could only be spent on bus replacement. He said another source of funding was from the sale of assets but was a smaller allocation. He said the Board directed that money be set aside for future facility

projects so the total allocation was more than it had been in a few years due to the completion of the New Horizon Center and Alameda Middle School projects. Ms. Cranor asked if the restoration of the Lottery Funds to facilities would reduce the District's General Fund budget. Mr. Reed said no it just shifted the funds from one line item to another. He said 83% of the facilities funds came from local property taxes. He said the CIP Budget was split into different expenditures. He said the first was the maintenance of effort projects which included those projects that were necessary in order to maintain safe facilities. He said \$3 million was set aside for required maintenance. He said the next section was the equipment budget for schools and departments. He said the next section was the director's budgets which were for school related projects that would not come out of the school's budget. He said the furniture and equipment budget was the final section. He said the furniture and equipment budget was used to maintain equipment and furniture to keep schools in good repair. He said the total for all CIP Projects was approximately \$2.9 million. He said about \$100,000 was spent on replacing asphalt and cement and nearly \$440,000 would be spent on replacing busses. He said the District had been able to extend the life of the school busses much better than in the past. He said HVAC upgrades at various schools would cost approximately \$550,000. He said a few of the school's roofs would have to be resurfaced this year. He said the amount of money spent on upgrading technology amounted to \$732,000 in order to maintain switches, networks and computers. He said overall the replacement costs came to just over \$3 million. He reviewed the spending history on replacement schedules over the last ten years. He said there was a major reduction in spending on replacement items during the Alameda Middle School and New Horizon Center renovations. He reviewed the current interior and exterior needs. He said school principals were asked if there were any specific requests and the Committee reviewed and prioritized requests. He said Highland High School requested to replace the bleachers that had been there since the school was built and that request was finally able to be approved. He said another school requested to upgrade the electrical in its science room. He said some schools had sound panels that were so old they were falling apart. Mr. Mattson asked if the District had a backup switch for the one that went bad at Pocatello High School. Mr. Reed said the District had spare parts for it for the little things that went bad more frequently but not for the main switch. He said the exterior requests amounted to \$61,500. He said Pocatello High School requested a football scoreboard to be installed at Irving Middle School. He said a lot of those scoreboards were in dire need of replacement. He said it would cost \$25,000 to replace the siding in the annex at Alameda Middle School. He said the brick in the entryway at Tyhee Elementary school was completely deteriorated and had to be replaced this year. He said there were two projects that were included in the original request in error and were removed on the current report. He said those projects were the electronic reader board for the Education Service Center and the new walls for the Curriculum Department. He said the Committee agreed that those projects were not a priority for the current year. He said the Committee also discussed the fact that schools had to fundraise to have their electronic reader boards installed and agreed that a reader board for the Education Service Center should not come out of the CIP Budget. He said there were a lot of ventilation projects coming up. He said the District planned to upgrade one middle school and one high school to the Climatech HVAC system this year which would save money in the long run. He said several fire alarm panels had to be upgraded due to the move to a digital phone system at those schools. He said the proposed project at Cheyenne Crossing had been shut down which would eliminate the need for the District to install a new bus turnaround at Indian Hills Elementary. He said parking was still an issue that would have to be addressed in the future. He said the parent drop off and parking lot at Hawthorne Middle School had been an issue for a long time and the District would improve the parking and parent-drop off area in partnership with the City of Pocatello over the summer. He said the B Wing at Highland High School would be renovated this year including replacing the window, stucco and ceilings. He said it would be similar to the work that was done on C Wing last year. He said the fire sprinkler system had to be replaced and would cost \$950,000. He said earlier in the year Pocatello High School had a steam leak caused by the underground boiler so the steam line was being relocated to an area that would not require the chiller to be moved during repairs. He said the projects amounted to \$1.4 million overall. He said the District conducted a comprehensive facility study 15 years ago and 100% of the required electrical upgrades in the District had been completed. He said at one point the District's electrical was so outdated that some schools could not power on their computers. He said 97% of schools were fully air conditioned and the only ones remaining were Bonneville and Washington Elementary. He said 98% of the plumbing upgrades had been completed. He said the District had \$4 million in the sinking fund which could only be used to upgrade equipment or building renovation. He said those funds could not be used for salaries or school supplies. He thanked the community for supporting the School Plant Facilities Levy for the past 50 years. Ms. Vagner said the Board would be asked to approve the CIP Plan at the January 20, 2015 Regular Board Meeting.

Policy Updates: *Policy 5511 – Wellness/Nutrition; Policy 7500 – Assign Employment Related Duties to Superintendent; Policy 8211 – Student Athletic Code of Conduct*

Ms. Vagner said included in the packet was Policy 5511 – Wellness/Nutrition which was a complete rewrite due to federal changes implemented to the National School Food Service programs. She said the oversight of the requirements would be provided by the District Curriculum Committee. She said the Committee would review the policy annually to ensure the District was in compliance. She said also included in the packet was Policy 7500 – Assign Employment Related Duties to Superintendent. She said the policy wording had been realigned to Idaho Code and allowed the Board 21 days to ratify a Leave of Absence that was directed by the Superintendent. Ms. Harwood said also included in the packet was Policy 8211 – Student Athletic Code of Conduct. She said the policy needed clarification on middle school eligibility due to a shorter season for middle school students. She said some students had been participating in sports without any practice time due to the probation guidelines outlined in the policy. Ms. Cranor asked if a student was typically notified in the middle of a game that they were not eligible to participate. She said she thought that should be avoided. Ms. Harwood agreed and said another issue they were trying to avoid was students turning in poorly done assignments just to be able to play. She said the normal process was to notify students prior to a game if they were ineligible to participate but she would talk to the ADs to ensure the process was being followed. She said the middle school needed consistency and amending the policy to allow flexibility for middle students allowed them to participate while reiterating that the most important piece was a student’s academics.

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.

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

Adjourn

Chair Gebhardt adjourned the Special Meeting/Work Session at 3:11 p.m.

APPROVED ON:

17 February 2015
By: Janie Gebhardt
Chair

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

[Signature]
Secretary, Board of Trustees

ATTESTED BY:

[Signature]
Clerk