

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION  
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25  
Tuesday, October 11, 2011  
Board Room at the Education Service Center  
8:30 a.m.**

**BOARD MEMBERS/SUPERINTENDENT PRESENT:**

Frank Rash, Chair	Janie Gebhardt, Member (Excused)
John Sargent, Vice Chair	Nate Murphy, Member
Jackie Cranor, Clerk	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, October 11, 2011, at 8:30 a.m. in the Board Room at the Education Service Center, 3115 Pole Line Road, Pocatello, Idaho, as provided in Section 33-510, Idaho Code;

**Welcome, Call to Order, and Statement of Purpose:**

Chair Rash welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 9:55 a.m. He reviewed the agenda and said the Special Meeting was held for the purpose of a Work Session for the administration to discuss with the Board the following topics outlined in the agenda.

1. **Convene Meeting**
2. **2010-11 SRO Services & Staffing Update**
3. **Status of Parental Input into Teacher Evaluations (*SCF Legislation*)**
4. **Students Come First Legislation Timeline**
5. **Benchmarking PLCs, RtI, TIA, Beliefs, Cultural Perspectives, Second Step/Virtues 2010-11 & Benchmarking 2011-12**
6. **Alternate Route to Graduation Plan**
7. **TIA Idaho Strategic Plan**
8. **Report on Ability to Maintain Current Curriculum Cycle**
9. **Overview of Mileposts Program**
10. **ISBA Resolutions and Bylaws for Delegate Assembly**
11. **Amended 2011-12 School Board Meeting Schedule**
12. **Follow Up from the Board/Superintendent Retreat**
13. **Public Comment**

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

**Board Operating Principles #22 & 23:**

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

14. **Adjourn**

**2010-11 SRO Services & Staffing Update**

Mr. Hobbs introduced Sergeant Canfield, the SRO supervisor and said he would retire soon. Sergeant Canfield said SRO calls had increased by about 50 calls per year over the past couple of years. He said calls from the elementary schools had also increased. He said a lot of the calls were for truanancies. He said SROs had placed an emphasis on decreasing truancy by catching it early. He said 81 truancy citations were issued from January to now with a lot of warnings. He said SROs worked with principals to figure out why students were truant and to emphasize the importance of attendance with parents. He said truancy court had made a big impact on decreasing truanancies and the students involved tended to have good attendance afterwards. He said Judge Murray often said a student's first crime was truancy which led to other crimes. Ms. Cranor asked who covered the elementary schools. Sergeant Canfield said each SRO was assigned a secondary school and he usually covered the elementary

schools but if he was not available one of the SROs from a secondary school would be called. He said the SROs were good about following up on issues especially with bullying. He said when bullying occurred SROs would follow up with the victim and the family to make sure the bullying had stopped. He said as people realized police were following up on those issues, some of the continued behaviors decreased. He said every SRO rated job satisfaction very high working in the schools. He said each one of them had a soft spot for troubled kids and wanted to help point them in the right direction. He said SROs did a lot to prevent crimes from taking place and students felt more comfortable reporting things to SROs than to the police department. Mr. Sargent said he had seen how students felt safer and more comfortable with the SROs presence in school. The Board thanked Sergeant Canfield for his hard work and dedication and asked him to communicate their appreciation to the SROs.

### **Status of Parental Input into Teacher Evaluations (*SCF Legislation*)**

Dr. Howell said a committee was formed to work through the Students Come First Legislation. He said the original name of the committee was the Pay for Performance Committee which was changed to the Students Come First Committee as the committee would cover multiple aspects of the Students Come First legislation. He said the benchmark chosen for Pay for Performance was the ISAT. He said the committee discussed parent input into teacher evaluations. He said the District was required to have a process in place by February 1, 2012. He said the updated parent input forms were included in the packet for teachers, certificated staff, and school nurses. He said the forms were reviewed with the Instructional Directors and K-12 Administrators before coming to the committee. He said there were five areas of focus on the teacher and certificated staff parent input forms: safety; communication; instruction; assessment; and expectations. He said the committee recommended changing the verbiage on the form from "I have observed" to "I believe". He said the areas of focus for school nurses and school psychologists were: communication; skills; and assessment. Ms. Cranor asked if the forms were ready to be sent out. Dr. Howell said the forms had not been finalized. Ms. Vagner noted the change in verbiage to a belief statement was a better direction because as students get older parents tend to be less involved in observation and they trust the teachers and administrators to do their work. Ms. Cranor asked if the parent input would go into the teacher's personnel file. Dr. Howell said it would. He said the committee discussed having teachers select five parents and then have five more parents selected at random. He said Mr. Smart developed a process for the random selection of parents. Mr. Sargent asked if there was a parent or PTA member on the committee. Dr. Howell said there was no parent representative on the committee. Mr. Sargent said if the discussion involved parent input, having a parent on the committee would be wise. Ms. Vagner said the Key Communicators Committee had parent and PTA representation and the materials could be brought to that group. Dr. Howell said the Formative – Part 1, Section A of the teacher evaluation form addressed the Charlotte Danielson's Model. He said the teacher could select a component and choose his/her professional goals. He said Section B addressed the teacher's growth goals based on an End of Course Assessment or the ISAT. He said he anticipated the evaluation forms being completed by October 30, 2011. He said Section E addressed parent input with an option for the teacher and administrator to comment. He said the administration would develop a one page report on parent input that would be attached to the evaluation form. He said if no feedback was received nothing would be attached. He said with this process parent input would become part of a teacher's evaluation and personnel file. He said the Summative – Part II of the evaluation was a compilation of all the areas for teacher evaluation from the Charlotte Danielson model with a rating system of unsatisfactory, basic and proficient. He said the final forms would be presented to the Board for consideration of approval at the October 18, 2011 Regular Board Meeting. Ms. Vagner said a letter would be sent to parents inviting them to take the survey in Infinite Campus by the end of the calendar year in time for principals to conference with staff and submit results to the District by the February 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. She said at first the State Department of Education was not aware the process had to be completed this year and recently communicated that it did. Ms. Cranor asked if the parent input forms had to be signed. Ms. Vagner said yes and that unsigned surveys would not be accepted. Ms. Cranor said she appreciated that and liked the section allowing teachers and administrators to comment on input.

### **Students Come First Legislation Timeline**

Ms. Vagner said the Students Come First implementation timeline was developed by Amy White with input from herself and the ISBA. She said a good portion of the implementation responsibility fell to Dr. Howell's area. She said the next step would be to revise Policies. She said the SCF Committee would work through the timeline together. She said the timeline was carried out over a three year period to show the upcoming workload. She said she would review the timeline with the PEA President the following week. She said the document benchmarked the work that Districts were required to complete.

## **Benchmarking PLCs, RtI, TIA, Beliefs, Cultural Perspectives, Second Step/Virtues 2010-11 & Benchmarking 2011-12**

Ms. Vagner said Ms. Cranor asked about the District's benchmarking document at the last Work Session. She reviewed Century High School's benchmarking that evidenced the work being done by the school and departments. She said Principal Brockett documented evidences on a monthly basis. She said the school reviewed the norms for PLCs which was a guiding principle for expected behaviors. She said Smart Goals were set and an evaluation of the End of Course data was completed by PLC teams. She said midterm grade data was analyzed and utilized to make instructional decisions. She said Century's new stretch included effective grading practices. She reviewed the November benchmarking of RtI which evidenced interventions that were put in place including the school's Lunch Academy. She said TIA continued to be an area of focus as to what kids should know and how that is assessed. She said the actualization of Beliefs was clear throughout the document. She said Cultural Perspectives was benchmarked three times per year and is impacting the work of the schools. She said in December Century documented the work of Friends of Rachel to evidence students reaching out to all new students to include them in activities. She said Virtues were benchmarked three times per year. Ms. Cranor said she appreciated the benchmarking of Cultural Perspectives to show what schools are doing to counteract hate, bias and bullying. Ms. Vagner said Lewis & Clark Elementary has stretched benchmarking one step further by including grade level teams in the process. She said this helped to clearly show accountability. She said the document showed the depth of work being done at all schools and the District was making great strides in student achievement and building capacity with staff. Ms. Vagner said she prepared a summary of the benchmarking that was shared with the administration at the opening of the school year. She reviewed the Superintendent and Board benchmarking. She said the operational departments would be more involved for the coming school year.

## **Alternate Route to Graduation Plan**

Mr. Wegner said the District received notification from the State Department of Education in the spring that the legislature revised the Alternate Route to Graduation requirements which included providing an alternate route to all students by their junior year. He said this year the District was required to provide an alternate route to graduation for seniors who could not pass the ISAT. He said the District was now required to make this available to juniors. He said the District previously relied on PLATO and would now have to include multiple measures. He said a committee was convened that included Instructional Directors, counselors and an alternate route teacher to consider all options and various multiple measures to be included in the plan. He said with the input of the committee, revisions were made to the plan which would be presented to the Board for consideration at the October 18, 2011 Regular Board Meeting. He said a copy of the plan was included in the packet. He said some of the changes included adding guidelines for the class of 2013 and every class thereafter. He said students that were on target for graduation but did not pass the ISAT were candidates. He said this would be available to junior students starting this year. He said language was removed that specified the alternate route would be taken in the fall because some students did not pass the retest and may be enrolled to take the alternate route in the spring. Ms. Cranor said she was worried about students not having the opportunity to take an elective credit. Mr. Wegner said the alternate route did not dictate any particular course and was to demonstrate competencies. He said students were still able to take an elective credit that would count towards graduation requirements. He said students were awarded points on various aspects of the alternate route and had to earn a minimum of 300 points. He said 250 points were awarded for passing the PLATO alternate route. He said 90% of the measure had to be academic based which PLATO was. He said students taking PLATO were awarded points for levels of improvement to give them credit for areas they passed. He said the committee wanted to place an emphasis on attendance so points were awarded for the student's attendance rate. He said a new form was created to track students taking the alternate route. He said the forms were submitted to the curriculum department and were maintained there and a list was sent to the Board for approval. He said a new form was created to track the number of points a student earned. He said the final Alternate Route to Graduation plan would be brought to the Board at the October 18, 2011 Regular Board Meeting for approval and submitted to the state by October 30, 2011.

## **TIA Idaho Strategic Plan**

Mr. Wegner said during the work of the TIA Advisory Committee it became apparent that a formal plan for the advancement of TIA statewide should be developed. He said included in the packet was a draft TIA Idaho Strategic Plan, 2011-2016. He said the vision and mission was for all Districts to develop and maintain effective schools. He said included in the plan was an effective schools best practices flowchart modified to cover a broader statewide focus. He said the League of Schools was the decision making body. He said next in line was the Advisory Board which included Regions 4, 5 & 6. He said there was a proposal to create advisory boards in

western and northern Idaho. He said the TIA framework included training, engagement, implementation, monitoring, supervising and maintaining. He said there was a process in place for Districts to get involved in TIA and for an organization to become an affiliate. He said southwest Idaho had its first TIA working conference and the document clarifies how TIA would be implemented over a five year period. He said all regions in the state were required to implement the Common Core State Standards by 2016 and a process to do so was being developed through TIA. He said TIA teams worked to cross-walk all documents to align with the statewide TIA plan and the Common Core State Standards. He said the plan was not set in stone but articulated the work and how TIA could move forward on a statewide basis. He said the last part of the plan provided tools and direction for Districts interested in becoming involved in TIA. Ms. Vagner said the plan would be brought to the Superintendents Forum and hoped superintendents would endorse the plan. She said TIA had been shaped to work for southeast Idaho. She said the uniform process was developed to protect the integrity of the work. Ms. Cranor said the document would be an invaluable tool in implementing the Common Core State Standards.

### **Report on Ability to Maintain Current Curriculum Cycle**

Mr. Wegner said included in the packet was the state's textbook adoption timeline. He said the District would have implemented social studies and sociology last year if it had textbook funding from the state. He said this year the District was supposed to adopt science textbooks which it would be unable to do. He said elementary textbooks were very old and up until this year the District had purchased replacements through a used textbook vendor but were not available anymore. He said it was getting more difficult to replace old texts. Ms. Cranor said it concerned her greatly that kids were being taught from severely outdated textbooks. Mr. Wegner said teachers were very resourceful and were always finding ways to keep the curriculum current and TIA was a good resource for them. He said part of the state's technology implementation plan led him to believe the state may fund digital textbooks down the road, possibly in preparation for the implementation of the Common Core State Standards. Mr. Murphy asked why the Alameda Center was using textbooks from 1994 when the other middle schools had textbooks from 2000+. Ms. Vagner said the administration would research the answer and get back to the Board.

### **Overview of Mileposts Program**

Dr. Mortensen said the Mileposts program was created with input from teachers and the developers worked to understand the needs of the users. She reviewed the Mileposts demonstration site. She said the actual site would list all schools in the District but the demo site had only one example school. She said information was uploaded daily from Infinite Campus and automatically updated in Mileposts. She said the District had a highly mobile population which made tracking critical to student success. She said the program was called Mileposts because it tracked District benchmarks that delineated what students were supposed to know at certain levels and if a student did not meet the benchmark then a "Mileposts" plan was implemented. She said teachers only had access to their student data. She said the District administration had access to all students and could search by school or by grade. She reviewed sample 5<sup>th</sup> grade data showing how to pull ISAT scores and assessments. She said under the reports tab there was demographic data, student services, academic plans, performance indicators, educational supports and benchmarks. She reviewed a sample academic plan that showed remediation and the amount of time spent on programs. She reviewed a Tier II math group plan and how it could be progress monitored to show the outcome of the plan. Mr. Sargent said it was unbelievable to have all that information all in one place so as soon as a student walked through a teacher's door the teacher would know what level the student was at without having to spend weeks learning each student. She said staff had to develop a plan but once they were in place it they were easy to track and pull up the history. She said once a Mileposts plan was created it involved the student, parents and teacher to set expectations and monitor progress. She said the District had completed its intervention list and customized Mileposts with the Tier 1, 2 & 3 interventions specific to the District. She said the District was able to implement a large number of interventions through the use of ARRA funds. She reviewed the process for creating a new plan. She said the teacher would choose to add an intervention and could select remediation, determine the number of hours, choose from a list of available interventions and choose a strategy. She said Mileposts was working to add customized District templates but currently the District had to use Mileposts templates and customize to fit the needs. Ms. Vagner said Mileposts moves the District to a digital support system that tracked a child longitudinally. She said Mileposts served over 100,000 of Idaho's students. She said Regions 2 & 4 were Mileposts Districts and Region 5 was nearly all supported by Mileposts. She said the state was pushing Schoolnet which only warehoused data and did not progress monitor or allow for interventions and was funded by the Albertson's grant for two years. She said Schoolnet did not offer the services the District needed to build plans. She said the District was able to buy into Mileposts at only \$5 per student for life compared to a greater cost per

student for Schoolnet. Ms. Cranor asked what Albertson's affiliation with Schoolnet was. Ms. Vagner said she was not sure.

### **ISBA Resolutions and Bylaws for Delegate Assembly**

Ms. Vagner said the Board was responsible to provide voting direction for the delegate assembly. She said Resolution No. 1 was to reinstate the 99% protection rule. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. Ms. Vagner said Resolution No. 2 was to continue funding for drivers education in Idaho. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 3 was to renew Idaho Code 33-10044H which allowed retired teachers and administrators to be employed by a District. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 4 was to add one additional election date in either February or April to give Districts flexibility. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 5 was to reduce the supermajority requirement for bond levies. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 6 restored funding lost in Senate Bills 1108, 1110 and 1184, (Students Come First). The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 7 proposed a dedicated, ongoing additional revenue source to fund Pay for Performance. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 8 was to include classified staff in the state's Pay for Performance program. Ms. Cranor asked why classified staff wasn't included in the original program. Ms. Vagner said the state did not consider this employee group a priority. She said the Board could direct an amendment to include this group, however the state did not have the resources to fund the program in the first place and would most likely be a waste of time. Ms. Cranor agreed the funding was not there, but would like the point brought up at the delegate assembly. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. Ms. Vagner said the Resolution No. 9 was to fund field trips. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 10 was to fund extra-curricular travel. She said the ISBA Executive Board recommended a "do not pass" vote. She said the state did not fund extra-curricular activities and never had. The Board recommended a "do not pass" vote. Ms. Vagner said Resolution No. 11 was to repeal the liability insurance notification requirement. She said the ISBA informed Districts that not one single school employee purchased additional insurance across the state. Ms. Cranor said the requirement was ridiculous and an excessive amount of paperwork and a waste of school personnel time. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. Ms. Vagner said Resolution No. 12 was to improve upon House Bill 201 to address communication with Districts and the retention of employees. The Board recommended a "do pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 13 directed that preschool students should be taught in English. Ms. Cranor said she did not like the law dictating such specifics. Mr. Murphy said he was opposed to the Resolution. The Board recommended a "do not pass" vote. Ms. Vagner said Resolution No. 14 directed that Idaho should rank #1 in the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium. She said she did not believe it was the prevue of the ISBA or the legislature to direct the state's rankings. The Board recommended a "do not pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 15 directed the state's ranking to be 35<sup>th</sup> or better in the nation for students going on to post-secondary education. The Board recommended a "do not pass" vote. She said Resolution No. 16 was to increase the number of dual credit/advanced placement courses offered by School Districts. The Board recommended a "do not pass" vote. Ms. Vagner said that covered the Resolutions submitted to the ISBA and all the Bylaw changes were clean up changes. Ms. Cranor noted the Blackfoot School District was listed in both Regions 5 & 6 in the Bylaws and Blackfoot had opted out of Region 5 and suggested the ISBA amend the error. Ms. Vagner said she would bring the change to the ISBA.

### **Amended 2011-12 School Board Meeting Schedule**

Ms. Vagner said when the School Board Meeting Schedule was created the District calendar had a 2 week Winter Break which had been changed to 1-1/2 weeks and the amendment corrected the School Board's Meeting Schedule to hold the Work Session and Regular Meeting on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday in December and added a Student Discipline Hearing to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wednesday.

### **Follow Up from the Board/Superintendent Retreat**

Ms. Vagner said included in the packet were the Board Operating Principles with a change that was directed at the September 21, 2011 Board/Superintendent Retreat to include deliberation when electing officers. She said if the Board agreed with the change it would be brought to the Board at the October 18, 2011 Regular Meeting for consideration. Mr. Sargent asked if that was the only change. Ms. Vagner said yes. She said the 2010-11 Actualization of Board Beliefs was modified per the direction of the Board at the Board/Superintendent retreat. She said if the Board agreed with the changes it would be brought for approval at the October 18, 2011 Regular Meeting. She said one addition was made to the Board Beliefs selected for Actualization for 2011-12. The Board agreed with all of the changes. Ms. Vagner said Mr. Sargent and Ms. Gebhardt would work on protocols for

deliberation when selecting officers. She said public comment forms and agendas were made more visible to the public and the Board gave the administration the flexibility to respond to public comment with a copy to the board.

**Public Comment**

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

**Board Operating Principles #22 & 23:**

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

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

**Adjourn**

Chair Rash adjourned the Work Session at 11:44 a.m.

**APPROVED ON:**

NOVEMBER 15, 2011

**BY:**

  
Chair

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

  
Secretary, Board of Trustees

**ATTESTED BY:**

  
Clerk