

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25
Tuesday, January 12, 2010
Board Room at the Education Service Center
1:30 p.m.**

BOARD MEMBERS/SUPERINTENDENT PRESENT:

Marianne Donnelly, Chair	John Sargent, Member
Janie Gebhardt, Vice Chair	Jackie Cranor, Member
Frank Rash, Clerk (Excused at 4:41 p.m.)	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 12, 2010 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;

Welcome, Call to Order, and Statement of Purpose:

Chair Donnelly welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. All Board members were in attendance. Ms. Donnelly said the Special Meeting was held for the purpose of a Work Session for administration to discuss with the Board the following topics:

- 1) **Convene Meeting**
- 2) **Destiny Library System**
- 3) **ACT Explore Data**
- 4) **All Day Every Other Day Kindergarten Report**
- 5) **ISAT-ALT Assessment (Special Education)**
- 6) **CIP Update**
- 7) **2009-10 Budget Adjustments**
- 8) **Food Service Department Meal Price Increase Proposal**
- 9) **School Plant Facilities Reserve Fund Levy Election Update**
- 10) **Professional Negotiations Support**
- 11) **Management Letter to PCCS**
- 12) **Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Process Update**
- 13) **Race to the Top (RT3) Update and Direction**
 - a. *Convene Special Meeting to Take Action on Race to the Top*
 - b. *Adjourn Special Meeting for Purpose of Action and Resume Work Session*
- 14) **Infinite Campus Conversion Timeline Report**
- 15) **Wellness Plan Activities**
- 16) **Update on Financial Condition of the State/Monitor all District Budgets**
- 17) **Legislative Report**
- 18) **Public Comment**
- 19) **Adjourn**

Destiny Library System

Mr. Wegner said the District had updated its media circulation system to Destiny and Ms. Spall worked with other specialists on the media conversion. He introduced Ms. Spall and turned the time over to her. Ms. Spall said she would review the program details online. She said all of the programs were separate in the previous system and were now merged. She said the new system eliminated duplicate entries and that the new system had one record per student. She said the new program combined all of the different areas. She reviewed what

the program looked like for students and teachers online. She said they could look at all of the libraries and catalogs. She said Pocatello High School had the new Twilight book. She said the program was web based and could be accessed from any computer. She showed them the home page that listed top 10 recommended books, resources and new arrivals. She said the web page was created to build interest and awareness. She reviewed an example teacher log in and said teachers had more user rights than a student. She said teachers were connected to the District media center and not just the high school. She talked about the different search options available. She said videos were available in addition to books. She said once selected the student or teacher could choose the date they would like to check out their book or video. She said teachers had the option to recommend a book to another teacher or to a student, and the new catalog was more interactive than the previous system. She said the Destiny log in was the same as an individual's District's Novell log-in. She said the new program allowed changes to be shared with users, which had not been possible in the old system. She said with the Destiny System teachers could search the entire District to make sure they were checking out materials to the correct student. She said another benefit of the new system was being able to see past records from all of the schools which could help the District recoup some of its losses. Ms. Donnelly asked if all the materials in the District were available to all students and teachers. Ms. Spall said they were.

ACT Explore Data

Mr. Wegner said the ACT Explore was given at the 8th grade level and had been given for the past 2 years. He said the District started using the tool as recommended by the redesign committee. He said students that had taken it were shown their academic strengths which helped create career awareness in the students. He said it helped students identify their strengths and interests and identified compatible career choices and high school courses needed to be on track for careers they were interested in. He said reports had been given to Freshman Success teachers and has been used as a springboard. He said this year results will be utilized as students built their 5 year plans. He said results had come in too late to be utilized last year, but would be available this year. He said training had been provided to administrators and counselors to help them work more effectively with 8th grade students. Ms. Luras said each student received two reports. She said one report showed scores and their percentile in their school, District and state. She reviewed the section regarding student plans. She said students were able to report areas where they felt they needed assistance. She said counselors then utilize the information to help those students. She said there was a career awareness survey categorized in a student's job tasks. She said students listed their interests and strengths and careers were picked out using the selected data. She said students were also able to list their college and career interests. Mr. Wegner reviewed the District data. He said the benchmark was 13 and if a student received a 13 he/she was on track and a 13 was predictive of the ACT results in the 11th grade. He reviewed the different levels of achievement: below benchmark, proficient and advanced. He said administration would like to see more proficient and advanced levels. He reviewed the national average compared to the District and said student scores were following the same trend. He said the next slide covered reading levels for the national and district averages. He said the Districts averages were better than the national average in science and reading. He said administration had begun developing longitudinal data and reviewed the 2008/2009 comparisons. Ms. Luras said in 2008-09 two students received perfect scores. She said another two students had written that they would drop out of high school which gave teachers and counselors time to conduct interventions. Mr. Sargent asked if the curriculum contained information relevant to questions on the tests. Mr. Wegner said he did not know for certain. Ms. Cranor asked if the District had tested very much in science. Mr. Wegner said science was tested in grades 5, 7, and 10 and while it was tested at the elementary level it takes a back seat to language arts. Mr. Sargent said students should be taught how to take the tests. Ms. Luras said they had spoken to a teacher that said administration should look at its norms and track the data in order to see where scores were currently and to monitor growth. She said this would be the biggest help to the District at this point. Ms. Donnelly said it seemed that a lot of the questions students either didn't expect or were not prepared for. Ms. Cranor agreed that science was not covered as extensively at the elementary level compared to other subjects.

All Day Every Other Day Kindergarten Report

Ms. Mortensen thanked the Board for their time. She said she wanted to quickly review what was included in the packet regarding schedules and calendars from Wilcox and Tendoy. She said the packet included a sample schedule from an all day every other day kindergarten classroom. She said transportation savings information was also included. She the program evaluation summary reviewed the findings and recommendations of the administration. She said notes were included from a teacher focus group that all kindergarten teachers had been invited to attend. She said teachers had shared what was working and what the challenges were. She said there was a memo from the Greenacres Elementary teachers regarding its multi-age classroom that documented issues they felt were relevant to the Board's decision. She said information provided by day care providers was included in the addendum. She said the District kept a list of providers and selected the larger day cares in the area to survey. She said administration had also surveyed an independent provider. She said the responses were varied. She said the survey was conducted via phone calls asking providers what the impacts of the program would be to their businesses. She said the option was offered as a cost savings measure for Board consideration. She said administration did not know what the budget would be like next year. She said there was a statement in the memo that said there was diversity in programs and she supported the diversity and that schools worked hard to provide the best learning based on resources and populations. She said careful consideration was needed before making any changes to programs. She said any change should be based on what was best for the students, community and the District combined. She said schools had worked hard to maximize programs and opportunities. She said there was individual data for schools that she would address if there were questions. Mr. Rash said Greenacres was very passionate about keeping their programs. Ms. Cranor said she was in favor of saving money but had received feedback from a lot of people not wanting the change. She said one concern was extra time in Title 1 and the change in bus schedules would eliminate transportation for those programs. Dr. Mortensen said there were two types of extended times in schools paid for through Title 1, one program provided full days for student that needed extra help, and one provided extended reading time that pooled money by student and varied from school to school. She said students that needed extended time could stay after the morning session and be picked up after 30 minutes of intervention time or come early to an afternoon class and leave at the regular time. She said it depended on what the school had worked out with its regular schedule and who was available to provide the services. She said the programs were all funded by state and Title 1 funding. She said the programs were required for students that scored a 1 on the IRI in the fall. Ms. Cranor said another concern was consistency. She said if a student was sick and missed one day, depending on the timing it could result in a full week of no school. Dr. Mortensen said that because students were not there all of the time, the time should be maximized. She said Indian Hills and Wilcox felt they had taken care of that problem. Ms. Gebhardt said there were a lot more hours with the full days. Dr. Mortensen agreed. Ms. Vagner said administration did not know the scope of the state and District budgets for next year. She said administration knew people wanted a decision on program changes early to allow teachers and parents to prepare, but due to the complexity of budget issues, the item needed to be considered as a part of the budget process. She said administration recently learned that special education relies on the mid day busing for their work programs. Ms. Vagner said savings would be at the expense of the bus drivers and the District had an obligation to consider its employees. She said administration was not ready to recommend the Board move forward with any action but only to present the options and discuss the issues. She said the discussion would help the administration and Board if the issue came up as a cost savings measure in the future. Ms. Vagner recommended the issue be placed in future budget discussions. Ms. Donnelly noted that the District also needed to see what changes would be made to transportation funding. Mr. Rash said in previous debates with the Board regarding the four day week, the decision had been to keep kids in school as often as possible. Ms. Vagner said the research had been very well gathered. Ms. Cranor said she was impressed with the kindergarten programs and the teachers for maximizing their programs. Ms. Donnelly thanked Dr. Mortensen for the comprehensive report. Dr. Mortensen agreed that this was best left as a consideration piece and not to make any changes just for the sake of change.

ISAT-ALT Assessment (Special Education)

Ms. Vagner commended Ms. Steenrod for her flexibility in coping with the changes from the State Department of Education regarding Special Education and recognized that this falls on the backs of teachers. Ms. Steenrod said the SDE had changed the Alternate Assessment system that had been evolving over the past few years. She said it had been changed constantly and had a yearly learning curve. She said a summary of the changes was included in the packet. She said first the name had changed and then every section had changed except for one. She said previously the state required only one assessment for each content area and were now requiring more. She said in addition to the ISAT-Alt assessment there were now direct writing and direct math assessments. She said the deadline to submit portfolios was May 14th and that administration was also required to submit an online checklist. She said training had not been available until December 3rd and fall assessments had been missed. She said administration had received clarification from the state that fall assessments would not need to be completed and to move forward. She said the ISAT-Alt was not an annual test but was a portfolio of information that was gathered all year long. She said spring AYP results would not be received until fall. She said previously the reports had been received in the summer to allow time for administration to complete the reports. She said now the reports would not be received until November which left little time to complete them. She said building leadership teams would not have the data in time for their meetings. Ms. Cranor asked if the portfolio was submitted to the state. Ms. Steenrod said information was submitted to the state but contained no personal information. Ms. Steenrod said there were 70 students in the District that met the requirements for Alternate Assessments. Ms. Steenrod said no signatures had been required in the past and now there were 5 new forms that required parent signatures. She said one form allowed parents to give or deny permission to photograph or video a student. She said the team would fill out a three page form that required both IEP team signatures and parent signatures. She said she wanted to make the Board aware of the new forms and the time involved. She said the only resources provide by the SDE was a binder and a handbook. She said the handbook was supposed to be published by January 4, 2010 and was still unavailable to date. She said teachers were doing anywhere from 1 -12 Alt assessments. She said the teachers were troopers and were very professional and needed the District's support. Ms. Vagner noted these teachers were the same teachers that were on a deadline to submit the Medicaid paperwork. Ms. Cranor asked if the state assessed the work. Ms. Steenrod said they did. Mr. Sargent noted there was no additional funding for the new requirements. Ms. Steenrod said schools would purchase camcorders and scanners with ARRA money for the classrooms. Ms. Cranor asked if the assessments had come back as unfavorable. Ms. Steenrod said in the past students were proficient or advanced with very few that were below average but this was yet to be seen with the new assessments.

CIP Update

Mr. Reed said it was the time of year to share the CIP program. He said the makeup of the CIP Committee consisted of a group of administrative personnel and thanked Mr. Rash for his participation. He said the Technology and Maintenance departments were also part of the process. He reviewed an abbreviated timeline of projects scheduled. He said each July facilities were inspected for maintenance concerns for the upcoming year. He said every category was updated annually. He said administration met in October to review requests and potential projects which the committee would review and analyze in comparison to resources available in November. He said the final recommendations were presented to the Board in January and from January to April bids were prepared and submitted. He said property tax was the sole source of revenue for this fund and shared the projected revenues for the following year. He said the School Plant Facilities Fund had lost the lottery funds which were shifted by the legislature to the general fund. He said the District had received favorable bids this year. He said one bid was \$500,000 less than expected. He said the levy was so important. Ms. Cranor asked what e-rate funds were. Mr. Reed said they were received through a federal application from reimbursement for a complicated application process. He said the District applied for every fund available. He said sometimes it takes awhile to receive e-rate funds and there was no guarantee that the District would continue to receive those funds. He said the replacement schedule was for the most part funded by this program. He said technology had requested \$800,000 for new equipment but had to be cut back to \$500,000 because the District did not have the resources. Mr. Reed reviewed the basic maintenance schedules.

He reviewed the schools that would be improved in 2010 inclusive of asphalt, restrooms and windows. He said studies had been done to identify costs in specific areas. He said electrical panels had been replaced in all schools, most schools had air conditioning and heating repairs and almost all restroom upgrades had been completed. He said a new study would commence after the current study concluded. Mr. Reed said \$2.5 million dollars had been set aside in the levy fund to be used for potential or unexpected projects. He said required maintenance included fire extinguishers and other safety issues. Mr. Reed said one major project was installing an elevator at Franklin to make the school completely handicap accessible. He reviewed the requested areas of improvement and said these had been covered previously. He thanked our community members for their support and for passing the levy without which the current projects and maintenance would not be possible. He said each project would be brought back to the Board for approval individually. Ms. Cranor asked how it was determined that bark was the best material for the playgrounds. Mr. Reed said sand tends to be an unfavorable option. He said synthetic materials were available, but tended to be pricey and become hazardous materials when being disposed of. He said bark was the next logical and cost effective option. He said playgrounds were inspected twice a year for safety.

2009-10 Budget Adjustments

Mr. Reed said administration would come to the Board for approval of proposed adjustments to the current budget at the next regular Board meeting. He said the proposals were broken down by category. He said there were reductions in salary, staff, benefits, and supply accounts. He said the increase in the appropriated fund balance was intentional and would be used as a reserve to carry the District through the coming year and further budget cuts. Mr. Smart said the ADA and H1N1 issues had been discussed. He said the waivers that were sent to the state had been approved and had made a difference of 10.1 units. He said FTE's were right where they were supposed to be. Ms. Cranor asked what the value of 1 FTE was. He said it was about \$42,000. He said classified staff levels were right where they were supposed to be. He said the District was under-hired in its administrative staff by about 4 FTE's. Ms. Gebhardt asked what was happening with ISAT remediation. Ms. Vagner said we would use the state portion earmarked for ISAT. Mr. Smart said the District qualified for a match from the state. He said state and federal grant funds were carry over, funding adjustments or new funding. Mr. Reed said administration recommended the Board approve the proposed budget adjustments as presented. Ms. Cranor asked what the Federal Forest fund included. Mr. Reed said it was federal funding to states that was distributed to Districts depending on how many forests were in their boundaries. He said the Pocatello/Chubbuck School District received a minimal amount of those funds. Mr. Reed said he wanted to quickly give some clarification on topic 16. He said recently there was an article in the newspaper about the Hospital and there was an increase in the amount of money the District would receive. He said the larger the tax base, the larger the amount that was shared and the lower the tax rate. He said the District would not receive a windfall of money from this, but said it was a positive movement in the community to increase the market value over the years. Mr. Sargent noted it would benefit the upcoming levy because it helped to offset some of the burden to taxpayers. Ms. Cranor said she appreciated the clarification because the article stated that the District would get a large portion of money all at once. Mr. Reed clarified that was not the case. Mr. Reed said that the District's transportation coordinator, Mr. Craig Leiby served on a transportation committee that worked to identify possible budget reductions relative to transportation. He said the committee had been asked by the state to cut around \$8 million out of the \$72 million budget. He said the committee reviewed a multitude of options and the option it felt was the most fair was a percentage cut per District across the board, but would leave it up to the individual Districts to decide what to cut. Mr. Reed said administration appreciated Mr. Leiby's expertise in sitting on the committee. He said administration sat in on the State of the State Address and were told by the Governor that education would receive a 1.6% reduction out of the current years' budget which would mean a large cut for the current District budget. He said this reduction would be permanent. He said the total percentage of budget cuts that would go towards next years budget was 5.6%.

Food Service Department Meal Price Increase Proposal

Mr. Reed said administration comes to the Board to request increases in meal prices to offset increased costs and to help replace materials like tables and chairs. He said there was strong student participation in the food service program. Mr. Rash asked if the District raised prices last year. Mr. Reed said prices had been increased by a nickel. Ms. Vagner said the last time the Board took action they were aware that further increases may be needed in the future. Mr. Reed said a lot of the ovens in schools were over 30 years old and that the District needed to stay current with maintaining equipment to ensure safety. Ms. Cranor asked if the District's Summer Feeding Program had gone well. Mr. Reed said if it had which helped offset the need for a larger price increase. Ms. Vagner pointed out that a large portion of the food service fund would go towards the Infinite Campus upgrade. Ms. Gebhardt asked if price increases added up to 5% over the year and how the District had informed the public. Mr. Reed said the percent had not and a public hearing was only needed if prices increased by 5% or more at one time. Ms. Gebhardt noted that even with the increase, the District was above its budget. Mr. Reed said it was a mid-year budget analysis and would be more complete at the end of the year.

School Plant Facilities Reserve Fund Levy Election Update

Ms. Allen said preparations for the School Plant Facilities Reserve Fund Levy had begun. She said the preparations began with planning for the election and informing the public. She said the legal notices had been completed. She said election locations had been secured and staff had been notified of equipment delivery. She said the District was in the process of hiring levy workers. She said the Board would approve the hiring at the next Board meeting. She said the Shoshone Tribe had been notified of the election. She said the Chamber's local issues committee had endorsed the levy. She said the Board would be scheduled to present election information to community members. She said an informational DVD would be ready soon and would be used to show people what the funds would go towards and how it had been utilized in the past. She said information brochures were being created and would include levy details, voting locations and times. She said the information would also be placed on the District website. She said presentations would be given to committees and community groups by the District's administration and Board members. She said administration would start the presentations right away. She said information was also being provided to parents. She said the voting would begin March 2, 2010. She noted that the District could only provide factual data.

Professional Negotiations Support

Mr. Smart said there was information in the packet regarding professional negotiations support. He said the first document was a comparison between Victor Four Labor Relations and Mr. Ken Mallea. He said Mr. Mallea had informed the Superintendent that he was willing to reduce his fees. He said the minimum travel time for Mr. Mallea was generally 8 hours round trip. He said administration felt the side-by-side comparison was fair. He said the Victor Four contract was included in the packet. He said administration reviewed the 2005-06 contract minutes to estimate the amount of time spent on negotiations. He said 117 hours were spent on negotiations including fact finding during that year. He said Mr. Bohannon had been utilized by the District since the 2006-2007 and that last year he had consulted over the phone. He said Mr. Bohannon had met with the Board in Executive Contract Session on occasion which was not included in Mr. Mallea's fee estimation. Mr. Smart said the Superintendent had informed Mr. Davis of this discussion before the Board. Mr. Smart said the Board would be asked to give guidance at the next regular meeting. Ms. Gebhardt asked if Victor Four was paid a set amount regardless of hours. Mr. Smart said he was. Ms. Gebhardt asked if there were other hearing officers available if any conflict of interest issues arose. Ms. Vagner said there were but another option was to discuss any conflict of interest issues with Mr. Davis on a case by case basis. Mr. Smart noted that Mr. Mallea would not be available for half of May. Mr. Smart said this could be a problem as most of the negotiations meetings held were in May. Ms. Vagner said she had spoken to Mr. Davis who accepted that the blackout dates existed. Mr. Davis said he had spent time researching Ken Mallea and that the PEA felt comfortable with him. He said others had said Mr. Mallea was thoughtful and fair. He said other Districts that worked with Mr. Mallea were happy with him. Mr. Davis said he believed that a negotiator would be needed

less than in the past. He said he did not anticipate Mr. Mallea being unavailable for two weeks as being a problem. He said with interest based bargaining some problems required a lot of lot of work and some required very little work. He suggested the bargaining teams work on the less cumbersome issues while Mr. Mallea was unavailable. Ms. Vagner said there were times that a resource person was not necessary and it was reasonable to hold those meetings during the times Mr. Mallea was unavailable. She said interest based bargaining was a group process and was different from the traditional table. Mr. Smart said Mr. Davis had mentioned that other Districts had been pleased with Mr. Mallea and noted the Districts were much smaller. Ms. Cranor said from her experience the negotiations with Victor Four were contentious and that relationships were an important part of bargaining. Mr. Davis said interest based bargaining had started years ago and that trainings had been conducted in California but were no longer being utilized. Mr. Davis said he previously believed in the process but then things changed. He said Boise had done this for a number of years and used interest based bargaining in more than just contract negotiations. He said he felt this contributed to the good relationship between administration and staff. Ms. Donnelly said she was pleased with Mr. Mallea's professionalism. Mr. Davis agreed. Ms. Vagner said there were a number of items for the Board to consider. She said Mr. Bohannon had experience with the contract, and had a good relationship with the Board and District administration. She said the relationship with the PEA was different. She said Mr. Mallea was not as experienced and did not specialize in labor relations but that both parties would bargain in accordance with the interest based model. She said Mr. Mallea had a good relationship with the Board and would be a new personality in the relationship with the District's administration and the PEA. She said Mr. Mallea would need to become knowledgeable of the contract and the District would need to pay him for his time. She said administration could take care of the secretarial support. She said some of the hearings held with Mr. Mallea dealt with difficult issues which he handled professionally. Ms. Vagner said the choices offered history and knowledge of contracts, or a new personality in the bargaining process. She said the District was facing tough times and the bargaining teams would need to focus on the positive outcomes. She said there were strengths and challenges with both options. Mr. Sargent said some of the challenges could come out to be a positive depending on how you view them. He said one example was that while Mr. Mallea may not have experience he could offer a fresh perspective and not having history could end up being a good thing. Ms. Vagner said administration would move forward with their best skills to support whatever decision the Board made. Mr. Rash asked if administration could provide the Board with feedback from the other Districts that Mr. Mallea had provided services for. Ms. Vagner said she would contact the Districts and provide feedback to the Board before the regular meeting. Ms. Vagner said there were generally 3 hours of prep/follow up with the negotiator and administration would need to be ready for what was coming. She said both negotiators were professional before each session. Ms. Vagner noted she did not think that Mr. Mallea's services would exceed the budget. She said there was a clear difference using each individual. She said the District's administration recommended Mr. Bohannon and Mr. Davis recommended Mr. Mallea. Ms. Vagner said the Board should consider relationships. Ms. Cranor asked why Ms. Vagner did not prefer to sit at the table in bargaining. Ms. Vagner said most Superintendents delegate the responsibility to others to avoid damaging relationships. Ms. Vagner said her recommendation to the Board was to make a change and contract with Mr. Mallea. She said Mr. Bohannon was an expert but had negative history relative to relationships with the PEA. She said it did not necessarily mean there would be smooth sailing with Mr. Mallea but after weighing the options, decided relationships were important and the emotional aspect needed to be considered. She said it was important to be conscious of relationships especially in challenging times. Mr. Reed said the committee would be supportive of whatever decision the Board made. Ms. Cranor said everyone involved wanted a positive experience and to try and do what was best for everyone.

Management Letter to PCCS

Mr. Reed said a draft letter was included in the packet in response to the annual financial report completed in June. He said there had been a lot of discussion relative to the charter and the good things it does and the challenges it faces. He said some key concerns included the general fund having a negative fund balance. He said this was significant and material in nature. He said progress had been made in the previous year but not as much as the District's administration would like to see. He said adding to the concern was the line of credit.

He said the Charter reduced its line of credit from \$300,000 to \$150,000, but would like to see it at a zero balance. He said this raised some concerns and the administration was recommending the Charter maintain a balanced budget. He said the Charter had been asked to visit with the District's administration to review its budget and financial condition as well as future budget in order to satisfy statutes. He said the meeting with legislators did not offer any clarification as to a Charter maintaining a balanced budget and the District's administration was seeking an Attorney General's Opinion. He said there were no answers as of yet. He said the recommendations were listed in the draft management letter and the Board would be asked to approve it at the Board meeting. Mr. Sargent said the letter was very well done. Ms. Vagner said the District's legal counsel was researching data on legislative intent. She said intent had to be filed in writing and there was documentation to be found. Ms. Cranor asked if the Charter could be allowed to borrow against the following years' money. Ms. Vagner said depending on legislation it could be allowed to borrow against future earnings. She said it would probably look at its line of credit to cover debt.

Teacher Supervision and Evaluation Process Update

Dr. Howell said a lot of information had been provided in the packet and he would be thorough but brief. He said a state wide task force had been created and met over the course of a year. He said one of the District's teachers served on the committee and had come to administration to solicit input to enhance the evaluation form the District used that was based on the Charlotte Danielson model. He said the same frame work was now required across the state. He said it provided a level of quality assurance and validity. He said it promoted professional learning and teachers continually striving to become more skilled. He said there were 4 domains that were broken down into specific components and elements. He said there were six component areas that were broken down even further. He said the elements in the classroom environment included organizing physical space and safety issues. He said the evaluation was very detail oriented. He said the entire framework was based on 4 categories and was rated from "unsatisfactory" to "distinguished". He said there were pay for performance issues with categorizing employees as distinguished. He said the District utilized the first three categories to avoid issues. He said the model had been around for 10 - 11 years and had branched out over the years. He said effective teaching was visible and now had become collaborative. He said the process must be understood by all stakeholders. He said consistency validated the process. He said he offered to review the process with new administrators. He said the state purchased online training that the District would share with administrators. He said equity, cultural sensitivity and high expectations were issues. He said the supervision and evaluation practices included observations, conferences, smart goals, walk throughs and post conference. He said most of them were completed by the first trimester. He reviewed the different category teachers. He said Category One teachers were now required to undergo a comprehension evaluation and the District's Policy did not address this and would need to be changed. He said the suggested change was to consider requiring teachers to undergo comprehensive evaluation every 5 years. He said further discussion would begin the following day at Instructional Directors. He said administration was looking to simplify the process. He said Category 3 teachers may need assistance. He said the evaluation should be flexible, designed for support, awareness, assistance, and possible discipline. Dr. Howell said the instrument the District had been revising was no longer software supported. He said the District would create something comparable without software problems, but it needed to be simple and effective. He said the District had until February 26, 2010 to provide a response to the state. He said the state had provided a rubric and the model was required to contain certain elements. He said there were additional provisions that would need to be assessed to ensure that all requirements had been met. He said the changes would be minimal because the District's model was very comprehensive.

Race to the Top (RT3) Update and Direction

Ms. Vagner said State Superintendent Tom Luna held an informational meeting and provided a power point that was included in the packet. She said participation in the grant needed to be signed and sent in by 11:59 p.m. that night. She said the grant was divided into standards and assessment which spoke to national standards that Idaho agreed to look at and possibly adopt. She said it also spoke to developing assessments that were aligned with standards. She said the intent was to continue to move to data driven decision making.

She said the grant was encompassing of a teacher evaluation system. Ms. Vagner said there were provisions in the MOU that were not clear in the grant and were a surprise to a lot of Districts. She said she was uncertain as to the invasive nature of some of the provisions. She said the bulk of the money was to be put into a pilot program to develop a pay for performance plan. She said the plan would include ISTARs components, specialty areas and peer coaching. She said the intent of the grant was to have the state pay \$1,000 per person based on the number of people selected for the pilot program. She said another element spoke to low achieving schools. She said the MOU said if an LEA had one of the lowest achieving schools it would agree to employ a transformational model that could include replacing the principal and 50% of the staff, closing the school, and moving the students or turning it into a Charter. She said another area of concern was measuring teachers performance. She said there was no state developed measure to measure student growth. Ms. Vagner said the money from the grant would not go to schools for deficiencies or operations. She said it was incubation and money to go to the state to implement research and development for under achieving schools. She said funding a research and development pilot meant that when the pilot is over the funds were gone and the program was over. She said because Idaho's infrastructure was underdeveloped it would take more than two years to develop and implement the systems the grant required. She said the District was understaffed and human resources were stretched as far as they could be stretched from the classroom to administration. Ms. Vagner said the Strategic Plan the Board adopted was systemic and reliant on operable systems supported by the District interfacing with the state. She said it embodied many of the goals the state wanted to accomplish. She said what the state had in place was not adequate to support the District's Strategic Plan. She said being involved in a project that put the District's work on hold was not a productive option. She said the District needed to stay the course and that cabinet was in agreement. She said she had also spoken with Mr. Davis as president of PEA to express his concerns. Ms. Vagner said a number of Districts across the state were making decisions relative to sign off or on to the grant. She said if the District did not sign on it would not be the only large District to do so. She said if the state was awarded the grant, Districts that had signed on would have 90 days to withdraw their participation. She said in weighing the work that was currently being done and the new requirements from the state, it was clear the District was embedded in working its Strategic Plan, was seeing results and it was in the District's best interest to stay the course. Ms. Donnelly said she did not see the benefit of signing on to the grant. Ms. Cranor said it looked like more work than there was money to back it. She said the grant was very vague. Ms. Vagner said there was an article from the SDE that said elements in the RT3 grant addressed the needs in the nation's most underperforming schools and did not necessarily match state and local needs if District's were not in that category. Ms. Vagner said there were a lot of states that had progressed to build infrastructure to build public schools but that Idaho was lacking in moving us forward. Mr. Davis said he would speak to the PEA and IEA. He said the grant was vague and had a lot of verbiage for very little impact. He said when the grant was first made available it was passed around the Region 5 meeting and analyzed in sections. He said the changes that were made to the pay for performance piece had been done in the last two weeks and the IEA had seen them. He said a number of things were found that were questionable and the IEA indicated further changes would need to be made before they would agree to sign on. He said it was highly possible that the IEA would not agree to sign on to the grant. He said there was still time to alter the grant and the IEA may sign on before a final was available. He said the MOU that addressed the state mandating who is fired or hired causes concerns. He said he had spoken with various contacts and the majority of feedback was to not sign on. He said he understood why smaller Districts might sign on because it was their only option for extra money. He said there were a lot of Districts that had concerns about the grant. Ms. Vagner said there was a false perception that money would go to the classrooms and it would not. Mr. Davis said a lot of people that were unsure would still sign on because they had the option to withdraw their participation within 90 days of the grant being awarded. He said this grant could be a template of what the federal government might do with the Reauthorization of secondary education act and the elementary.

Convene Special Meeting to Take Action on Race to the Top

A motion was made by Ms. Gebhardt to convene a special meeting to take action on Race to the Top. A motion was made by Ms. Gebhardt and seconded by Mr. Sargent that the District not sign on to the Race to the Top (RT3) Grant. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative.

Adjourn Special Meeting for Purpose of Action and Resume Work Session

A motion was made by Mr. Sargent and seconded by Ms. Gebhardt to adjourn the special meeting and resume the Work Session. The voting was unanimous in the affirmative. The special meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Infinite Campus Conversion Timeline Report

Mr. Smart said the planning team was well underway with the data conversion process. He said the District had received data back from Infinite Campus and looked good. He said the first set of meetings was set for the next week. He said Mr. Stevens would have been present but he was heavily involved in planning meetings.

Wellness Plan Activities

Mr. Smart said the District's wellness plan was paying off and administration anticipated a 2% discount on medical premiums. He said the wellness committee was working to keep enthusiasm going and the document included in the packet was the result of brainstorming sessions with the committee. He said an email had gone out to the District to encourage people to sign up for blood draws at the health fair. He said there would be 2 health fairs. The first one would be January 30 and the second would be February 6, 2010. He said 96 people had signed up already. He said the Board was invited to participate. Ms. Donnelly asked about flu shots. Mr. Smart said Shaver Pharmacy had the serum and the health committee was working to figure out the logistics of the clinics. He said administration was setting up a reservation system rather than first come first serve. Ms. Cranor asked if the information was provided to all buildings. Mr. Smart said Ms. Giles distributes the information to all parties in the District. Ms. Donnelly noted the health fairs were well attended in the past.

Update on Financial Condition of the State/Monitor all District Budgets

Mr. Harrell said it was confirmed that the federal money the District received for Safe and Drug Free Schools would be sunset by next year. He said this translated to a \$70,000 loss in federal funding for a variety of safety programs. He said administration would have to work extra hard to get any of that funding in the future. He said the original Safe and Drug Free Schools budget was set at \$80 million and had been reduced to \$30 million for program funding across the nation. He said funding would become competitive. He said a certain amount would be allocated to each state and Districts would compete for the funding. He said it would be February or March before administration knew for sure. He said there was a \$5.5 million dollar budget for tobacco funds which were dedicated funds and that legislature could possibly go after those funds for other purposes. He said they would not know if there were any cuts until later. Ms. Gebhardt asked if the Safe and Drug Free Schools funds helped fund the District's SROs. Mr. Harrell said the SROs were funded out of the program and he could also provide a detailed list of the programs that were funded through the grant. He said the District could get some of those funds back if it qualified for the competitive grant but did not have a timeline.

Legislative Report

The legislative issues were well covered under previous topics and there was no further legislative report.

Public Comment

Mr. Sargent asked if there was any way the Board could get agenda's electronically. Ms. Vagner said that was an option administration would look in to. She asked Ms. Johnson to find out if any of the other Board members were interested in going paperless and to look at various options.

Adjourn Work Session:

The Board adjourned the Work Session at 4:49 p.m.

APPROVED ON:

BY:

Chair

ATTESTED BY:

Clerk

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Secretary, Board of Trustees