

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25
Tuesday, December 9, 2014
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 (Excused)
Paul Vitale, Member (Excused)
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, December 9, 2014, 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 1:33 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. **Moodle Presentation**
2. **WISE Tool Presentation**
3. **Annual Overview of the Gateway Program**
4. **Secondary Requests:** *Proposal for Trading Out Days for Attendance and Activities Clerks; 5A Baseball Team Proposal; Policy 8111 – District Attendance Areas and Student Transfer*
5. **Discussion of Supplemental Levy Amount and Resolution**
6. **City of Pocatello Soliciting Input on Alameda/Jefferson Intersection Proposals**
7. **Superintendent Search Update**
8. **ISBA Board Training:** *Levy How-Tos*
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

Moodle Presentation

Ms. Vagner said the Board asked for a hands-on look at some of the programs that were used in the District. She said the presentation was an overview of the Moodle and WISE Tool programs. Ms. Luras said Moodle was a learning management system that created a secure learning environment. She said Moodle was an open source so there was no cost associated with using the program. She said ISU also used Moodle extensively. She said that was a key advantage for students planning to attend ISU as they would most likely have used and mastered Moodle prior to attending college. She said the Curriculum Department used Moodle to house units and to foster collaboration between teachers. Ms. Wilkes said she used Moodle to communicate with parents as it offered a more flexibility than posting to the website. She said the units and available resources were listed on the Moodle homepage. She said teachers could also provide input on units. She showed an example of where 5th grade units could be found. She said the page housed Rubrics, end of course assessments and units. She said teachers could click into a unit to see the detail. She said teachers could post resources for the unit in the detail. She reviewed a discussion board where teachers posted comments and resources to share. She said once a teacher posted a

comment or resource an email would be sent to all teachers in that grade or content area informing them of a new post and teachers could choose to join. She said an email would also be sent to all teachers if any changes were made to the units. She said one teacher created flash cards with the essential questions and wanted to share the document with all 5th grade teachers so she posted the file to Moodle. She said any 5th grade teacher that wanted to use those essential questions could log into Moodle and pull up that resource. Ms. Luras said during the unit development over the summer the teachers had so much they wanted to do and share but did not have the time. She said the Instruction Camps that were being offered provided the time to get some of those things done. She said being able to comment and share gave teachers a voice in the units and lesson planning. She said she and Mr. Wegner were included in the discussion threads so if there were any questions they had the opportunity to clarify. Ms. Vagner asked how students were using Moodle. Ms. Wilkes said her view in Moodle was a little different than teachers but she was able to use Moodle Training to get the teachers' view. She said students could log into Moodle and pull up a particular teacher's lesson plan in order to see what was coming up and what homework had to be done. She said if a student went to study hall or was sick he/she could log into Moodle and print off any homework assignments. She said it was also very helpful to be able to reprint homework if a student misplaced the assignment. She said teachers loved that about Moodle. She said it made it very easy to track down assignments from year to year. Ms. Spall said the Instructional Technology Specialists were using Moodle for professional development and online training. She said they would use Moodle for book studies to post videos, links and the document. She said it was used to communicate dates, forums and to post bulletin boards for discussion. Mr. Merica said many courses had resources available for teachers to use and all the courses were being recorded and saved on Moodle so a teacher could log in and watch training videos at any time. He said even if a teacher didn't sign up for a particular course he/she could still access the resources and could access the information anywhere at any time. Ms. Cranor said it seemed like a really good way to store evidence that professional development was being offered. Mr. Merica agreed and said video trainings were between 5 and 10 minutes long. He said one of the trainings offered was for the change in the elementary grading process and a full training including videos, resources and documents were posted in Moodle for the teachers to access. He said some teachers were using Moodle right in their classroom. Ms. Spall reviewed a high school English course. She said the teacher used it on a week by week basis. She said the teacher posted agendas and assignments every week. She said another teacher had navigation pages, assignments and quizzes. She said reviewed a middle school course. She said the teacher used it as a repository for housing assignments. She said the current week was highlighted so students could click into it and pull up the assignment. She said a teacher at Hawthorne Middle School had students upload his/her completed assignments directly into Moodle electronically so there was no need for flash drives or multiple emails. Ms. Wilkes said the computer teacher at Irving had students complete their assignment right in Moodle. Ms. Spall said the Math Counts club met in the morning and could complete quizzes to earn badges of completion if the quiz was passed at a certain rate. Mr. Merica said some elementary teachers were posting links in Moodle so their students could click on the link to upload their homework. He said even though elementary students didn't have email they could still log into Moodle. He said teachers could provide input on assignments and send the input back to the students in Moodle. He said teachers could create a course and use it year after year and modify as needed. Ms. Luras said teachers could set the student's Moodle pages up any way they wanted so that a student could only see or access certain things. Ms. Gebhardt asked if parents had a different view than students. Ms. Wilkes said the view was the same. She said parents could log into the Parent Portal on Infinite Campus to check grades or look for missing assignments and then could log into Moodle to pull up the missing assignment. Ms. Cranor asked if Moodle could be used for the Crossroads program so students could get their assignments sent over sooner. Ms. Vagner said yes. Ms. Wilkes said one of their teachers took snapshots of the whiteboard so if a student missed class that day they could log into Moodle to view what was discussed in class that day. Ms. Cranor asked how many teachers were using Moodle. Ms. Wilkes said all of the teachers at Irving used it but it was catching on at more of the schools. Ms. Luras said teachers received an initial training on Moodle when they first started at the District and had to at least use it to access the units after that. She said one teacher commented that units could be accessed on the website which was true but none of the input or shared resources was available on the website. Ms. Vagner said all of the dual credit teachers used Moodle extensively.

WISE Tool Presentation

Ms. Luras said W.I.S.E. stood for "Ways to Improve School Effectiveness". She said when the District originally started using the WISE Tool there were hundreds of indicators that had to be completed and was overwhelming. She said the District decided that it would use the Strategic Plan to guide the indicators that were completed in the WISE Tool. She said the first page showed the Turnaround Plan supports. She said if a school was in a

Turnaround status there were indicators listed to support the school in completing requirements. She said Kinport was in a Turnaround status and had completed most of the indicators. She said the District's Improvement Plan was aligned to the Strategic Plan. She said one of the subgroup achievement targets spoke to BLTs which was started in 2009 and was given a priority score of three. She said it was important for schools to have a full day to really look at their data and plan for the coming year. She said there were also opportunity scores in the WISE Tool which meant it was a goal that was easy to address within the budget. She said each area had a place to describe the current level of development. She said the Instructional Directors benchmarked progress in the WISE Tool every year and tasks were assigned to each of the responsible persons. She said the first task was the annual BLT and progress was benchmarked and included any comments. She said another task included assuring that user friendly data was available in a timely manner to all schools. She said the use of Infinite Campus, Mileposts, Moodle and SIOP Classroom Walkthroughs were all documented in detail. She said it was an example of how progress was benchmarked. She said progress was benchmarked in 2012 and expectations for walkthroughs were set and aligned to the Idaho Core Standards this year. She said the elementary and secondary directors met to reestablish expectations in the fall. She said the District worked with the schools to provide early interventions for students. She said the District ensured that school improvement initiatives were research based. She said the Social Emotional, SIOP, Professional Noticing and Six-Trait Writing curriculum was housed in the WISE Tool. She said the WISE Tool was aligned to the Strategic Plan and a clear vision was established. She said Understanding by Design, TIA and the use of common assessment data were benchmarked. She said the professional development for all of those areas was clearly articulated. Ms. Gebhardt asked if the District used all of the indicators. Ms. Luras said originally they had to document in each of them but now only five had to be submitted and documented. She said the District's initiatives were clearly defined which helped. Ms. Vagner said the Instructional Directors reviewed each of the school's Improvement Plans before they were submitted to the state. Ms. Cranor asked who was responsible to enter the data at the schools. Ms. Luras said the documenting was done by the BLTs at each of the schools. She said the team chose the indicators that would be focused on at the start of the year. She said it was a team effort between the school BLTs and the Instructional Directors to complete the plans and provide any feedback.

Annual Overview of the Gateway Program

Ms. Luras said one of her responsibilities was to facilitate the GATE Program and to outline how students are served. She said she was responsible to submit the Gateway Program Plan to the state every three years. She said the state did not provide any funding for the program but Districts were required to provide the program and was paid for out of the General Fund. She said in the past the District used to receive \$20,000 for professional development but those funds had been eliminated. She said any professional development for GATE teachers came from Teacher Quality (TQ) funds or from the General Fund. Ms. Cranor asked if this was a mandate. Ms. Vagner said it was an unfunded mandate and had never been funded by the state. Ms. Luras said the program outline was aligned to the District's Strategic Plan. She said it met the needs of students who learn at accelerated rates. She said the curriculum was also aligned to meet the social-emotional and cognitive needs of students. She said as part of the RtI process Gateway students received Tier 3 interventions to help students achieve their academic potential. She said K-2 students were not formally identified but if a teacher recognized that a student was accelerated they could refer the student to a GATE teacher or figure out how to meet the student's individual needs in the classroom. She said the state required Districts to have a process in place for identifying and screening gifted students. She said the District did this at the end of the 2nd grade. She said teachers utilized a checklist to identify GATE students and sent the list to the principal who sent the information to the GATE Coordinator. She said students are then tested at the beginning of the school year. She said about 2% of the student population qualified for GATE services. She said the checklist was an informal identification process and then those students were formally tested by GATE facilitators. She said students were required to have a qualifying score on the academic test. She said the District utilize the Sages 2 test and the OLSAT. She said students had to score in the 96th percentile on the Sages test and in the 98th percentile on the OLSAT. She said school psychologist performed a retest to make sure students were not missed. She said students in grades 3 – 6 were bussed to the GATE facility and attended one day per week for five hours. She said the students were served lunch at Gateway and were then taken back to school. She said 6th grade students attended every other Monday for four hours. She said facilitators were required to have an endorsement from the state. She said Christina Melancon and Michelle Nielsen were the District's facilitators. She said Principal Dye was responsible for the overseeing safety drills and evaluations for the GATE Program this year. She said there were 197 students in the GATE Program this year. She said there were 28 third graders, 33 fourth graders, 61 fifth graders and 76 sixth graders. She said there was always a larger number in the 6th grade. Ms. Gebhardt asked how students were divided at the

Gateway center. Ms. Luras said students were divided by content area. She said one group focused on science and math while the other group focused on literature. She said the instruction was differentiated for multiple grade levels. She said if there was a particularly large group of 5th grader then students would be clustered by age group. She reviewed the number of 6th graders at each of the middle schools. She reviewed the program goals and curriculum. She said the curriculum was on a four year cycle to ensure that students would never receive the same instruction as a previous year. She said for 7th and 8th graders at the middle school, GATE courses were taught as an elective. She said those teachers were not required to have an endorsement from the state. She said curriculum was based on higher level thinking, creative problem solving and skills development. She said the GATE Program had a chess class and used to participate in a tri-city chess match, but only two cities participated this year. She said the Science Olympiads and Math Counts clubs were also involved. She said students identified as gifted were encouraged to participate. She said even students that hadn't been formally identified could participate. She said high school students were served by AP, dual enrollment or Advanced Opportunities courses. She said high school services were not formally written into the District's plan but she included the information because those courses were being recommended to students by counselors. She said we also have Mastery Advancement Program (MAP) "challenge" tests. She said the tests were limited due to the transition to the Idaho Core Standards but the District intended to increase that number and align them to the ICS. She said the District offered whole grade acceleration and used a research based tool that considered the whole child including social-emotional and academic aspects. She said students had to get a certain score and then a school based team would make a recommendation to the District, including the GATE Coordinator and the Director of Curriculum. She said students were then monitored. Ms. Vagner said the Gateway Program had been added to the Board's School Visit Schedule two year ago.

Secondary Requests: *Proposal for Trading Out Days for Attendance and Activities Clerks; 5A Baseball Team Proposal; Policy 8111 – District Attendance Areas and Student Transfer*

Ms. Harwood said the ADs and high school principals informed her that there were some issues with the current schedule for attendance and activities clerks. She said currently the activities clerk's work year did not start until after football practice was well underway which had become a major problem. She said included in the packet was a memorandum detailing the proposal for trading out days from the attendance clerks to the activities clerks. She said the attendance clerks currently had three additional days included in their schedule after students were out of school for the year which used to be necessary due to the amount of paperwork that had to be done after students were out of school. She said the attendance clerks also had a record day and a professional development day included in their schedule during the school year. She said principals were recommending that five days be removed from the attendance clerks schedule and added to the activities clerks. She said the principals had already communicated the need for the change with the attendance and activities clerks. Ms. Cranor asked if the change would affect the pay for each of the positions. Ms. Vagner said yes which was why the administration was bringing the proposal to the Board early in order to give the attendance clerks time to prepare. She said it was a way to solve a workload issue without any cost increase for the District. Mr. Bell said the reports that used to be done by the attendance clerks at the end of the year were now automatically done by Infinite Campus. Mr. Bell said the next proposal was regarding a freshman baseball team that he had been working on for the past couple of years. He said there were currently 65 male students expressing interest in playing baseball at the freshman level. He said Highland High School was competing with schools that had 2,200 students and all of those schools had a freshman baseball team. He said Highland was the only 5A school without a freshman team. He said it would provide an opportunity for more students to participate in extra-curricular activities. Mr. Mattson asked what options freshman students had right now. Mr. Bell said younger students could participate on city teams. Ms. Cranor asked if there were enough female students to have a freshman softball team. Mr. Bell said not at this point. Mr. Mattson asked if adding a freshman team would influence students in the other high schools to want to attend Highland. Mr. Bell said that point had been brought up and was a possibility but Highland was a 5A school and needed to be able to compete at that level. He said there would not be any additional costs associated with adding the freshman team. Ms. Cranor asked if students would still be required to pay to play. Mr. Bell said yes but there would be no additional cost to the District. He said baseball was a tough sport for Idaho. Ms. Cranor asked what kind of training the freshman officials would receive. She said she sensed some frustration with the level of experience. Mr. Bell said all officials received the same training but new officials with the least amount of experience always started at the freshman level. He said all officials were graded by the Commissioner. Ms. Vagner said it was not the norm to add a program midyear but Highland High School had grown beyond the 1,500 mark and the District needed to support Highland as a 5A school. She said the proposal was structured as a pilot and if it was successful the District would look at future costs. She said nothing would become permanent until

the financial piece was in place or it could become a risky issue. Mr. Bell said Coach Green was willing to practice with JV one day and Freshman the next and was very important to him. Ms. Vagner said the proposal would be brought for Board Action at the Regular Board Meeting next Tuesday. Ms. Harwood said the last item was to align Board Policy 8111 – District Attendance Areas and Student Transfer with the accurate enrollment and capacity report. She said the capacity report was developed six years ago and in reviewing the high school rollup numbers she noticed there was a discrepancy. She said the enrollment and capacity for Century High School was listed at 1,200 on the report but the Policy listed the capacity as 1,300 which was incorrect. She said the Policy needed to be corrected with the accurate capacity at Century High School.

Discussion of Supplemental Levy Amount and Resolution

Ms. Vagner said the Board was down to the deadline to make a decision on the Supplemental Levy amount. She said the Board had discussed the issues and varying amount for three months. She said the Coeur d' Alene School Board was struggling with the same issues as this Board and most likely other School Boards throughout the state were doing the same. Ms. Cranor said she believed that the District's legislative delegation was very sympathetic to the situation that Districts were in but she was concerned about support from the public. Ms. Gebhardt said she and Mr. Facer had discussed knowing that what the District needed was not the same as what the District could ask the community for. Mr. Mattson said he believed this was the best District in the state and he wanted to keep it that way. He said there was no fat to be cut and the budget was as lean as it could get. He said it was a poor business model to implement a budget without knowing where your funding was going to come from. He said the District used all of its reserves to pay bills last year and had nothing left to do that again. He said it was just reality. He said the Board could say that it would stay at \$8.5 million because people couldn't afford to pay more taxes but that was a death spiral for the District and was not something he could put his name on. He said he was at \$ 9.5 million and could not vote for anything less. He said some legislators were campaigning for more funds for School Districts but he didn't think they had enough power to pull it off. He said if the Board did not ask for what was right today where would it cut tomorrow. He said a wise man once told him never to say "or else" but the Board did not have a choice, it was reality. He said the Board had to make a decision before it knew what the budget was going to be and that was unfortunate. Ms. Gebhardt said the Board also had to remember that the levy would stay in place for two years. Mr. Mattson said if that was the case then the Board should be asking for \$10 million. He said if the District didn't get the money from somewhere then it would have to cut. Ms. Gebhardt agreed that was the reality. Mr. Reed said the Board had discussed possibly increasing the levy to \$9.5 million which was still only one tenth of the District's budget and the District's inflation costs were greater than that every year. Ms. Cranor asked how much a \$9 million levy would cost. Mr. Reed said it would cost \$14 more per year on a home with a taxable value of \$100,000. Ms. Gebhardt asked if the assessed value would impact the levy tax. Mr. Reed said there had not been any significant growth in assessed value and the homeowner's exemption had gone down. He said he anticipated that the community would see some growth in the next couple of years. Ms. Vagner agreed. She said the recovery was limited but was happening. She said the community was at full employment even though a lot of those jobs were minimum wage. Mr. Cranor said she participated on the Budget Committee and listened to the input and she did not believe that people in the community would support anything more than \$9 million. She said she would like to go for everything but was not willing to risk all of it by going for more than \$9 million. Ms. Gebhardt said Mr. Facer communicated that he was willing to go for between \$9 and \$9.25 million. Ms. Cranor said she knew what the District needed but the Board had to be mindful of the community and the current situation. She said if community members are telling the Board they can't support more than \$9 million then the Board needed to listen. Mr. Mattson said Mr. Vitale would be back next week and he could be available by phone to discuss any levy amount further. Ms. Gebhardt said she agreed with Mr. Mattson but was worried about the same concerns that Ms. Cranor had expressed. She said it would be very painful for the District if it was unable to pass the levy since it was an all or nothing vote. She said Governor Otter did not seem to understand that certain communities could not exponentially support an increase. Ms. Cranor said it was also a double edged sword because if the District did pass an increase it sent a message to the state that it did not need to support Districts. She said the Supplemental Levy amounted to 13% of the District's budget and that was enough. She said School Boards had to tell the state that this could not continue. Ms. Vagner said the state had put School Boards in a terrible position by forcing them to run a levy before the budget was set. She said if the levy did not pass the Board would have one more chance to pass a levy in May which was when the Board should be issuing Contracts, not setting the budget. Ms. Cranor said she really hoped that the state would allocate more operational money. Ms. Gebhardt said the levy was for two years and not asking for what was needed put the District in a horrible position. Ms. Cranor said she was not sure how the Board could convince people to support an increase. Mr. Mattson said that was the Board's job. Ms. Cranor said she understood that but people

always went back to their pocketbook. Ms. Gebhardt said she could think of a lot of things that she spent money on each year for far more than an additional \$14 per year and none of those things were as important as education. She said the Board needed to plea and ask for what it needed. Ms. Cranor said she could not in good conscience ask for more than \$9.25 million. Ms. Vagner said the Board would vote on a levy amount at the Regular Board Meeting next week.

City of Pocatello Soliciting Input on Alameda/Jefferson Intersection Proposals

Mr. Reed said the Alameda/Jefferson intersection had been an ongoing difficult discussion for the City of Pocatello for several years. He said the city was holding a public hearing at Tendoy Elementary that night. He said the city had narrowed the alternative proposals down to two options which were 12A and 14A. He said Alternative 12A would have turnarounds built in because motorists would not be able to make left hand turns onto certain streets. He said the driver would have to make a right hand turn, go up the road to the designated turnaround and come back that way. He said it was a unique proposal that this area had no experience with. He said the concept originated in Utah. He said the District was involved in the discussion because of the impact both proposals would have on Tendoy Elementary. He said Alternative 12A took a number of residential spaces, as well as space from Tendoy Elementary in order to make the proposal work. He said the District would lose a sizable portion of the playground and parking space at the school. He said the city would restore the lost playground and parking space by providing property south of the school for the playground and property across the street for parking. He said Alternative 14A limited the turnaround to Pocatello Creek only. He said this option would slow traffic down considerably. He said each proposal had its advantages and disadvantages. He said the City Council had discussed the options extensively. He said the information included in the packet showed the right of way impacts and the land that would be replaced. He said the most advantageous option for the District was Alternative 12A. Ms. Cranor said the City Engineers presented an option to the Board a couple of years ago which included closing off Alameda Road next to Tendoy Elementary. She asked what happened to that proposal. Mr. Reed said that proposal would have worked out much better for the District but the LDS church that would have been impacted by that proposal was not in support of the option and it was eliminated. Ms. Gebhardt asked where the school busses would go with the current proposals. Mr. Reed said bus drivers would be able to use the current bus routes but the Transportation Department would have to decide which direction would be the best for the busses to come from. He said all motorists would face the same challenge with the proposals. Ms. Vagner said the administration would draft a letter of support for Alternative 12A which had less of an impact on District property for Board consideration at the Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Cranor said she didn't like either of the proposals but if she had to choose she would agree that Alternative 12A was the better of the two. Mr. Reed said he was hopeful that the District would be able to make some improvements to the playground area as a result of the changes. He said the District had done a number of projects with the city where the District had to give up some property but the city was always good about replacing any property that was lost in the process. He said the District gave the city some property at Edahow Elementary and gained more parking and a bus turnaround by doing so. He said the end result was better than what the District had before. He said he anticipated the same level of cooperation with the current project.

Superintendent Search Update

Ms. Vagner said included in the packet was the Superintendent Search timeline. She said the Board was in the process of opening the application window. She said any applications received would be reviewed during January 10 – 16, 2015. She said she would contact Ms. Donnell about going through the applications with the Board. She said the Board could announce the semifinalists by January 27, 2015 and a finalist could be announced as early as February 6, 2015. She said once a finalist was chosen the Board could conduct a site visit. She said if there was a good pool of candidates it was possible that the Board could be announcing a new Superintendent on February 27, 2015. She said the application brochure had been sent out to a targeted mailing list across the nation. She said Superintendents commonly received job solicitations from all over the county. She said the position was also being advertised through the ISBA Voice newsletter, on the IBSA homepage, Superintendent Job Search, K-12 Job Spot, Facebook, LinkedIn, the National Superintendents Association website and emails were sent to Universities in Idaho and Utah. She said the information also went out to the local media. Ms. Vagner brought Ms. Donnell into the discussion by phone to talk about the screening process at 3:15 p.m. Ms. Vagner explained that she had just covered the timeline and the marketing and recruiting progress. She asked Ms. Donnell to review the screening process. Ms. Donnell said she would create a checklist for the Board to narrow any candidates. She said as she reviewed applications she looked at the completeness, the letters of recommendation, the candidate's philosophy on education, their experience and reasons for applying. She said she also looked at the professional

composition of the resume, the application form, the candidate's University transcript and whether or not the candidate held an Idaho Superintendent's License or if he/she would qualify to obtain one. She said it was difficult to look at personal qualities but the letters of recommendation were usually a good indication of their skills and was a good way to look at a person's character. She said the public survey on the superintendent's qualifications really helped to identify the qualities that were important to the community and she would try to match the candidate's philosophies to those qualities. She said she would look at their leadership skills to determine if there was any evidence of governance or cooperating with a Board of Trustees. She said she was usually able to determine how a candidate was with public relations. She said she would look for experience with instructional systems including common core, student achievement and assessment. She said she would find out if the candidates were comfortable with managing large budgets, transportation departments, special education and whether or not they had any experience with facility maintenance or passing bonds. She said she would also look to see if any of the candidates had any prior experience as a Superintendent or any Central Office experience. She said she would determine if the candidate was more inclined towards business or education. She said she would really scrutinize the quality of the reference letters and who was providing the reference. She said she would outline a checklist for the Board when the applications were reviewed on January 15, 2015. She said she would probably put the candidates into three categories: the highest rated, the "maybes", and any that did not meet all requirements. She said she would do the prescreening and the Board would decide whether it wanted to review all of the applications or just the ones that she recommended. She said it was sometimes good to look at things with different eyes. She said it would also depend on how many applications were received. Ms. Vagner said the Board should plan on blocking out a whole day depending on the number of applications. She said the timeline could be adjusted depending on the quality of the candidate pool. Ms. Donnell said she would discuss with the Board how many candidates it wanted to interview and what required qualities it wanted to focus on for a new Superintendent. She said if the Board had time after reviewing the applications they could do some reference calling. She said it was always a good idea to have the Board talk to other Board Members because they were very candid. She said the application review would most likely be a full day. Ms. Vagner asked the Board to block out the whole day on January 15, 2015 starting at 9:00 a.m. in the Training Center. She said Dr. Howell would be involved in the process.

ISBA Board Training: *Levy How-Tos*

Ms. Scherz said she was asked to share the training that ISBA created with Zion Bank. She said the presentation was a review of School Levies and Bonds. She said Levies supported the operations of a District and Bonds were used for the construction of a new school or the renovation of an existing school. She said Bonds required a Supermajority to pass. She said there were three steps for running a successful Bond Campaign. She said the first was to hire Bond Counsel, hire a financial advisor and to establish a grassroots campaign. The Board asked for more information on establishing a grassroots campaign. Ms. Scherz said in order to establish a successful grassroots campaign the Board would need to involve city and county officials, the local Chamber of Commerce, senior citizens and retired teacher groups and Board Members. She said it was helpful to have a Task Force Chairperson that was passionate about the cause and who was well respected in the community. She said it was always wise to involve people that were not necessarily supportive of a tax increase because it was important for those people to feel that their voices were heard. She said during levy presentations the Board should be present but not necessarily campaigning. She said the Board should identify the need, explore solutions and determine costs in order to be very clear with voters about the needs and the intent. She said it always worked better to explain to voters how the levy would work rather than making veiled threats about what would be lost if they didn't vote. She said the campaign should include information gathering, coordination with the media, interaction and endorsement from public officials, fliers and pamphlets and public information meetings. She said it was very important to thank everyone involved whether or not the Levy passed. Ms. Cranor said it worried her that the District had not received any endorsements from public officials. Ms. Vagner said School Officials were allowed to provide information but were not allowed to influence the passage of the Levy. Ms. Cranor asked if the Board could publically support the Levy during the public information meetings. Ms. Vagner said the Board could promote the passage of the Levy because they were elected, but District staff could not affect the outcome on school time.

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 3:36 p.m.

APPROVED ON:

20 January 2015

By:

Janie A. Gebhardt
Chair

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

[Signature]
Secretary, Board of Trustees

ATTESTED BY:

[Signature]
Clerk