

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION  
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25  
Tuesday, October 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 (Excused)	Jackie Cranor, Member
Frank Rash, 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 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 1:36 p.m. She reviewed the addendum to the agenda. Ms. Gebhardt was excused. Ms. Donnelly said the Special Meeting was held for the purpose of a Work Session for administration to discuss with the Board the topics outlined in the agenda.

1. **Convene Meeting**
2. **Policy 8110 – Student Placement, Retention, Credits, Promotion and Acceleration.**
3. **Ability to Maintain Current with Curriculum Cycle**
4. **Athletic Facilities Strategic Planning Committee Update**
5. **SRO Program Coverage and Data**
6. **Financial Condition of the State and Monitor all District Budgets Update (*Projected cost increases for 2011-12*)**
7. **Renovation of Stocks Building, Relocation of Alternative Programs, Modification of Alameda Center and Opening of a 4<sup>th</sup> Middle School Committee Update/Architect Selection Committee/Alternate School Design Committee Report.**
8. **Education Jobs Act Report/Budget Committee Update and Recommendations**
9. **Summer 2010 CIP Update**
10. **Policy 5511 – Wellness/Nutrition**
11. **ISBA Resolutions Review**
12. **Public Comment**
13. **Adjourn**

**Policy 8110 – Student Placement, Retention, Credits, Promotion and Acceleration – Mr. Wegner**

Mr. Wegner said the changes to the Policy would require students in non-core or elective classes who needed more intervention time be placed in retention classes and give flexibility to the administration to place them in such. He said another change addressed the number of transfer correspondence and virtual credits that the current Board Policy limited to six credits. He said recently the administration received a memo from the State Department of Education notifying Districts that any school accredited through Northwestern Accreditation Commission is required to accept all accredited transfer credits. He said the requirement eliminates the District's ability to cap the number of credits allowed. He said schools would still maintain the ultimate discretion in accepting credits for recognitions such as Honors or Valedictorian. Ms. Cranor asked what would happen if parents objected to the intervention classes. Mr. Wegner said the principal and counselors would work closely with parents but this would give the school the authority to place students in those classes which were necessary due to the state holding schools and Districts accountable to meet AYP standards. Ms. Vagner said the right of

student placement was vested with the District and the Policy provided schools with the grounds to authorize a placement decision. She said it was a preventative measure and the Policy would prevent any conflict with a challenge to student placement. Mr. Wegner said the last change addressed Middle School Promotion. He said last year the District implemented a Middle School Promotion Policy for 8<sup>th</sup> grade students moving on to 9<sup>th</sup> grade and the change to the policy included a standard for promotion from 7<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> grade and 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> grade. He said Mr. Devine was in the process of working out the Middle School Promotion details. Ms. Cranor asked if there was currently a program in place. Ms. Vagner said there were interventions in place and in some cases students received additional support in content areas but tracking would be increased with the change.

### **Ability to Maintain Current with Curriculum Cycle**

Mr. Wegner said the current Curriculum Cycle was included in the packet. He said the document showed the state's implementation cycle. He said the District would have implemented Social Studies, Economics and Sociology this year but there was no funding to move forward with the implementation. He said the District's ability to move forward with new materials was limited. He said the District would look into implementing a review of Science textbooks the following year but would have to wait and see if the budget would allow the District to implement. Ms. Cranor asked if online sources were available. Mr. Wegner said teachers search for online sources and post them in the TIA document. He said some teachers were in favor of electronic textbooks and some publishers were moving in that direction but currently the cost was the same as a hardbound copy. He said in the future teachers would become more reliant on electronic textbooks. Ms. Cranor noted there were grants available for textbooks. Mr. Wegner said teachers were aware of the grant information. Mr. Wegner said the Common Core Standards would be implemented in 2012 and assessments were to be in place in two to four years and if Districts could not keep up with contemporary materials the state would fall far behind.

### **Athletic Facilities Strategic Planning Committee Update**

Mr. Devine said the Athletic Facilities Strategic Planning Committee had its first meeting and members shared their preliminary concerns. He said there were four main concerns and subcommittees were established for those areas. He said one subcommittee would address the availability of field space. He said another area of concern was the issue of Varsity home football games held at the Holt Arena. He said the double header on October 1, 2010 was normally a large revenue event for the schools but only netted \$5,186 dollars that would be split between all three high schools. He said if the event had not been held at Holt Arena the schools would have netted closer to \$12,000. He said the schools missed out on gate receipts and concession costs. He said the committee would explore other facility options and costs. He said the fourth subcommittee would explore revenue and fund raising to meet the needs of the facilities. He said a member of the committee reported that ISU was considering replacing Holt Arena's artificial turf with grass and may not even be available in the future. He said the high school Athletic Directors were asked to gather data on facility maintenance issues and availability. He said the information would be distributed to committee members. He said the committee would meet next Thursday and would report to the Board after the meeting. Mr. Rash asked how the committee came up with the rationale that schools would have made \$12,000 somewhere other than Holt Arena. Mr. Devine said the Athletic Directors provided a printout of gross sales compared with the costs and expenses for Holt Arena. He said expenses were \$5,000 for broken chairs, security officers and ticket takers. He said a normal double header at a different facility would have incurred around \$800 in expenses rather than \$5,000. Mr. Rash said the estimated profit was based on the assumption that another facility would draw the same size crowd. Mr. Devine said that was correct. He said the Athletic Directors tracked data from other football games held at high school facilities to come up with the number.

### **SRO Program Coverage and Data**

Mr. Hobbs said that due to a lack of District resources for SROs the city had assumed the cost through the month of September, 2010. He said the only change was that once per week SROs were not in their assigned buildings and rotated duties. He said Sergeant Canfield tracked SRO calls and data which were included in the packet. He said Sergeant Canfield requested that administrators track other SRO responsibilities that were not included in the Police Department's data. He said one example of another type of responsibility was an SRO taking care of a staff

member that needed attention. He said the SROs responsibilities went beyond the scope of issuing tickets. He said Chief Miller met with Mayor Blad to discuss the SRO Program and no decision was made which meant the city could reconsider its support of the program. He said the Police Department and the city would meet the following week to discuss the issue again. He said there was some concern that no decision had been made but the District was hopeful that the city would continue to support the SRO Program in the schools. Ms. Cranor asked Mr. Hobbs to clarify which offenses were in school and which were not. She also asked what informal diversion meant. Mr. Hobbs said informal diversion was usually given on a first offense rather than a formal charge or probation. He said sometimes SROs were able to handle diversions in the school. Ms. Vagner said September tended to be a lower volume month and the numbers would increase as the school year progressed. Ms. Donnelly noted it looked pretty busy already. She said there was a safety need to have SROs in schools. Mr. Hobbs said the city was looking at facts and numbers. He said the SROs were not in schools at the same time every day and yet students were very aware when the SROs were out of the building.

### **Financial Condition of the State and Monitor all District Budgets Update (*Projected cost increases for 2011-12*)**

Mr. Reed said the administration worked to keep the Board up to date as to the financial conditions of the state and District. He said the three year phase in from PERSI would begin in the upcoming school year and the employer portion would cost \$71,000 based on the current FY payroll. He said it was an 8.95% increase for the first year, 8.13% the following year which would raise the cost by another \$70,000 and 11.52% for the third year for a cumulative cost of \$250,000 over three years. He said that was the portion the District would absorb. He said the District was reimbursed based on the state's salary schedule. He said the state was considering a \$10.4 million decrease to offset PERSI increases which would take away from the budget available to Districts. He said this was a significant issue. Mr. Sargent asked if PERSI costs were over and above what Districts got reimbursed for. Mr. Reed said that was correct. Mr. Sargent clarified that the District would have to pay \$250,000 more than it currently was. Mr. Reed said yes. Ms. Donnelly asked if the increase affected employees. Mr. Reed said the affect to employees was slightly less but not by much and employees would have an increase as well. He said PERSI interest rates were very low and had not increased in a number of years which was the cause for such a large increase now. Ms. Cranor said the Budget Committee discussed allocating the Jobs Bill money to offset PERSI increases. Mr. Reed said it was discussed but was not a priority. He said the District's transportation reimbursement was reduced by 10% and would only increase by 2% for the upcoming school year which meant the District would be under similar budget constraints in transportation again next year. He said even with the Block Grant it would be a tight transportation budget. He said another big concern was medical insurance. He said there was no way to know how much an increase would be but a 1% increase equaled \$40,000 to the District. He said other increases facing the District were utilities and fuel increases, material's increases and moving ARRA positions back into the general fund. He said the TQ budget had been reduced and there were no resources for text books. He said the implementation of the Common Core Standards would mean more unfunded mandates for Districts. He said most of the increases were typical but some were unexpected and larger than expected.

### **Renovation of Stocks Building, Relocation of Alternative Programs, Modification of Alameda Center and Opening of a 4<sup>th</sup> Middle School Committee Update/Architect Selection Committee/Alternate School Design Committee Report**

Mr. Reed said the Architect Selection Committee met and the Board was able to hear presentations from the Architectural firms at a Special Meeting/Work Session. He said the Board and committee looked at the experience and qualifications of the firms specifically regarding experience with renovating schools and the working relationships the firm had with previous clients. He said after listening to the presentations the Committee recommended Plan One Architects or Jensen Barnard Architects, Inc. for Board consideration. He said the strengths of each firm were listed in the memorandum. He said Plan One was a large Regional firm with over 25 years of experience in school renovations. He said the firm fee was 6.2% of the construction cost. Ms. Donnelly asked if the firm's fee was inclusive of the engineer fee. Mr. Reed said yes. He said each firm had additional costs such as printing of blue prints. He said Plan One had an innovative approach and design. He said the firm was experienced in its method of including the school and the Board in the project. He said the firm was looking at

eight other schools and had a lot of projects in Wyoming. He said the firm used local mechanical and electrical engineers. He said Jensen Barnard was a local firm in Pocatello and was currently the District's architect. He said the firm completed roofing projects, the Pocatello High School gym addition and the Century High School build project for the District. He said the firm had varied experience with local Pocatello buildings and represented the lowest fee. He said the firm was familiar with District's schedule and staff and understood how to work with the School Board and Committees. He said the firm also used local mechanical and electrical engineers. He said the Architect Selection Committee was comfortable with the selection of either firm. Ms. Cranor asked what the cost difference was between the two firms. Mr. Reed said it was about a \$15,000 difference. He said all costs would stay within the \$3 million budget which would mean \$15,000 less towards the project if the Board went with the higher cost firm. Mr. Sargent noted that Wyoming had a 5% rider or tax on construction. He said bidding on a Wyoming company automatically put the District at a 5% disadvantage. Ms. Donnelly asked if the firm was operating out of Driggs. Mr. Reed said the firm had a satellite office there. Ms. Cranor said she like that Plan One had such innovative ideas but would like the project to stay local as much as possible. Mr. Sargent said there was a lot to consider with the decision. Ms. Cranor said the biggest concern with patrons would be to use a local company. Mr. Sargent said one of the largest projects in Pocatello had been through an out of state company and he himself was not very happy about taking his business to someone that did not support the community. Mr. Rash said he did not feel comfortable asking patrons to support a levy if the District did not give a local company its business. He said it would need to be given serious consideration. Ms. Donnelly said she thought Plan One had good ideas and good processes. She said the District had worked hard on its alternate programs and were recognized state wide for the progress and wanted to give the alternate school the very best facility possible. She said she appreciated the need to utilize a local firm but should also consider the special nature of the alternate program's facility. Mr. Rash said Jensen Barnard would not have any problem providing a good facility for the alternate programs and either company would do a good job. Ms. Donnelly said it was a big concern to use the space available in the best way possible. Ms. Vagner said there were six programs that would occupy the space. She said some important considerations were shared space, common areas for the whole school and using one space for multiple purposes. She said the new building had less space than the alternate programs currently had but would be adequate for program delivery. Ms. Donnelly said flexibility within the space was very important. Ms. Vagner said each firm had a different style. She said it would be prudent to invite Jensen Barnard to the committee's planned visits to other alternate schools in the state if the firm was selected. Ms. Donnelly said the project was central to the District's educational programs for all students. Ms. Vagner said Jensen Barnard had gone to the building in order to provide a preliminary blueprint. She said Plan One did not visit the building. Mr. Reed clarified that Plan One had visited the building but had been unable to go inside. Ms. Donnelly noted Plan One had also visited the Alameda Center to see what programs were there and what the needs were. Mr. Sargent said he was unaware Plan One had done that and was something to consider. Ms. Cranor said Jensen Barnard provided a preliminary look at the outside of the building and Plan One had provided a preliminary look at classroom space on the inside. Mr. Sargent noted that a \$15,000 difference between the two firms was a big deal. He said there were patrons offering suggestions during the budget hearings on how the District could save a few hundred dollars and this cost difference was thousands. Mr. Reed said the Board would be asked to consider either Plan One Architects or Jensen Barnard Architects, Inc. under Old Business at the October 19, 2010 Regular Board Meeting. Board members acknowledged the discussion provided by Ms. Gebhardt pertinent to her preference. Mr. Devine said the Alternate School Design Committee met and had an exciting meeting. He said it was very clear to the committee that it would have to think outside the box relative to available space and needs. He said the committee would gather details so it would know exactly what to bring to the architect. Mr. Reed said the committee visited the Stocks Building and expressed some really good ideas that had not been brought up before. Mr. Devine agreed the committee had good ideas for the outside space. Mr. Reed said he met with the city last Thursday where the City council approved to send the District's rezoning request to the Planning and Zoning department for consideration. He said the administration was hopeful that the request would move forward with positive results. He said the community supported the District in moving forward with the alternate school project. He said he was confident the committee and architect would come up with viable options for the alternate programs.

### **Education Jobs Act Report/Budget Committee Update and Recommendations**

Mr. Smart said included in the packet was a memorandum prepared after the Budget Committee met on September 29, 2010. He said two Board members were present at the committee meeting. He said the committee came up with three top priorities; the first was the restoration of hours and positions. He said certain jobs were reduced last spring including middle school and high school clerical staff and elementary custodial staff. He said this reduced the budget by a significant amount. He said by using the Jobs Bill money the District was able to hire staff back and restore hours. He said the cost for first year was \$400,000 and \$500,000 for the second year. He said the committee wanted to add four FTE for a maintenance worker, a purchaser in food service, a lead driver in transportation and a warehouse worker. He said the original memorandum had not included those positions which totaled around \$140,000. Mr. Rash asked if it was onetime money. Mr. Smart said it was onetime money to be used over a 27 month period. Mr. Rash asked if the money was limited to classroom teachers only. Mr. Reed said it included staff directly involved with the school except for administrative staff at the District Office. He said the District received an update from Superintendent Luna's office stating that the state had received the money from the federal government and were working on a process for District reimbursement. He said the state was researching the rules and guidelines for receiving the money. Mr. Sargent asked if the funds would be reimbursed after the District spent the money or if it would come in a lump sum. Ms. Donnelly said the funds would not come in a lump sum. Mr. Reed said the District would spend the money and submit to the state for reimbursement. He said it was the same reimbursement process as other stimulus money. Ms. Cranor asked if the parent teacher conference days would go back to teacher salaries. She said the committee felt this would help parents and teachers. Mr. Smart said the parent teacher conferences would be a form of furlough day reductions for teachers. Ms. Cranor said Ms. Gebhardt addressed saving some of the money to use at a later date in her comments, but members of the committee were adamant that the money be earmarked so everything was clear for the Supplemental Levy. Mr. Smart said the committee wanted to make sure the District had a plan in place for spending the money. He said the committee did not want the District to receive the money with no plans for allocation. He said the committee was okay with saving some of the money for later but wanted to ensure a clear plan was in place for future allocation. Mr. Sargent asked if the money could be used to offset PERSI increases and if it was discussed by the committee. Mr. Reed said the funds could be used to offset PERSI, was addressed by the committee, and was not one of the committee's top priorities. Mr. Rash asked if there was any discussion as to teachers receiving experience or steps and lanes. Mr. Smart said it was addressed briefly. Ms. Cranor said the committee discussed experience and movement for new teachers but listed its priorities in the memorandum. Mr. Smart said the committee also discussed the false corner. Mr. Reed said the September 29, 2010 meeting was only the second Budget Committee meeting and anticipated more in depth discussion once priorities were addressed. He said the next few meetings would refine priorities for this year and year two. Ms. Vagner said as the committee did its work it discussed various budget issues and identified its top three priorities. She said Ms. Cranor addressed offsetting PERSI increases but the committee wanted more information on the other costs before discussing the issue. She said the memorandum was a full accounting of the committee's priorities and the associated costs for each priority. She said the committee did not discuss a number for parent teacher conference days. She said it also did not discuss the possibility of staff development days for certified and classified staff. She said Mr. Smart would gather the data before addressing this further with the committee. She said the committee discussed job restoration but did not address summer help or central services. She said the committee did not discuss the four classified positions until the second meeting. She said the committee had more work to do. She said Key Communicators met and there was support for the proposals but the group also discussed a greater return to teachers. She said there was further prioritization to be worked out. She said some of the budget committee members did not comprehend that the restoration of certain positions would cost so much and wanted to include a thorough breakdown of allocations for the committee so there would be no question as to what was being spent and how much was available. She said it was important that all committee members had full participation in the decisions. Ms. Cranor said the committee agreed that restoration needed to take place as soon as possible. Ms. Vagner said Mr. Smart would email the committee members to get approval from each of the members before moving forward with the restoration of jobs. She said it was critical to ensure the committee was on board with

moving forward with the first priority before any action took place, but understood the urgency. Mr. Rash asked who was responsible for deciding which positions were critical to restore. Ms. Cranor said school principals were responsible for identifying critical positions in their buildings and providing the input to the committee. Mr. Sargent noted that the committee also had to consider the fact that the positions were temporary and would be eliminated in two years. Ms. Vagner said that Mr. Reed was responsible for identifying critical positions in food service and transportation. Ms. Cranor said the committee's top priority was based on issues that were critical to teachers and principals. Ms. Vagner said payroll for any restored positions or hours would begin on October 25, 2010. Mr. Smart said the next Budget Committee meeting was scheduled for the October 14, 2010. Ms. Donnelly noted the committee could address further concerns before the Regular Board meeting. Ms. Vagner said any restored hours or positions would have to be noticed as temporary positions with no guarantee that the District could continue to fund them after two years. Mr. Smart said the committee would further discuss parent teacher conference days as it addressed both parent and teacher concerns. He said the intent was to offer parent teacher conferences while lessening the impact to imposed furlough days. Ms. Vagner said another option for consideration was to take time out of the Winter Break or Spring Break. She said it would affect the number of days in a trimester but was manageable. She said another option was to spread out professional development days over a one week time period. She said the committee would discuss further options at its next meeting. Ms. Cranor asked how much money a teacher furlough day saved the District. Mr. Smart said two days was 1%. Ms. Vagner said professional development days included all staff and the committee could consider partial professional development days. She asked Mr. Davis if he had any public comment on the topic.

Mr. Davis said he had difficulty understanding why the discussion was taking place in this format when he was under the impression the discussion would be held with a negotiations team. He said it appeared that the Budget Committee was already making cut and dry decisions without the authority to negotiate salaries and benefits for teachers. He said the Jobs Bill money was a stimulus bill that was intended to be used right away per the President of the United States. He said if the District received a lump sum amount and banked it until later it would have to pay back any interest and the 26 month timeline only existed for political reasons. He said the Budget Committee indicated it was content with the first priority but reminded the Board that 10 furlough days were imposed on teachers and the memorandum only addressed a ½% restoration and teachers would not be satisfied with that. He said the Board discussed not wanting upset taxpayers in order to pass the Supplemental Levy and reminded the Board that teachers were also taxpayers and the District needed them to pass the Levy. He said no levy had ever passed without the support of teachers. He said if the Board upset the teachers a Levy would not pass. He said this was a discussion that needed to go beyond the Budget Committee. He said the members of the Budget Committee that represented the PEA reported that plans were brought to the committee meetings and decisions were made without enough discussion. He said the PEA had been told that the negotiations team would be part of the discussion and so far it had not been included. Ms. Cranor asked Mr. Davis if he was willing to attend a Budget Committee meeting to see for himself that no plans were being brought to the committee. She said the committee heard lots of ideas and none of them were pre-conceived. Ms. Donnelly thanked Mr. Davis for his input. Mr. Davis said he appreciated the opportunity to provide his perspective because he did not feel Work Sessions were typically the best format for this type of discussion. Ms. Vagner said the administration would bring further information to the Budget Committee on October 14, 2010 for clarification. She said the administration would wait to hear the outcome of the committee meeting before presenting a recommendation for action at the next Regular Board Meeting on October 19, 2010.

### **Summer 2010 CIP Update**

Mr. Reed said he would present the Summer 2010 CIP projects with Mr. Wright. He said a lot of the summer projects were supervised by Mr. Wright. He said the maintenance staff worked very hard with limited positions. He said there were four areas of focus for the opening of the school year which included low maintenance, high quality, efficiency, and energy conservation. He said last year the District saved \$750,000 through its energy conservation. He reviewed a picture of Franklin Middle School before the installation of the handicap accessible elevator. He showed a picture of the project at the start of construction and the final result. He said the brick had been matched to the buildings current exterior. He said the elevator serviced all four levels of the school and was completely handicapped accessible. He said the District had gotten a very reasonable bid on the project. Ms.

Cranor noted that Franklin parents were extremely grateful for the District completing the project for their children. Mr. Reed said the gym floor was refinished at Franklin and had not been refinished in 20 to 30 years. He said the hallways and gym floor was refinished at Greenacres. He said school roofs were big projects. He said they had to be stripped bare and reinsulated then covered with white membrane which was considered energy efficient. Mr. Wright said the installation of new roofing would last 30 years because of the new method. He said there were roofs that were only 10 years old that needed to be replaced because it was done with an older less efficient method. He said another project made bathrooms handicapped accessible. He said every year the District had to replace asphalt at various schools. Mr. Reed said a lot of entries and doorways were replaced this summer. He said doors were replaced at Lewis & Clark Elementary, Hawthorne Middle School and Pocatello High School. He said doors take abuse from students and weather and needed to be replaced. Mr. Reed said the new entry way mats installed at schools were tile pieces that could be partially removed for easy replacement in high traffic areas that were worn down or damaged. He said another project was covering the steps at Franklin which was a good alternative to replacing the concrete steps. He said another area the District focused on this summer was windows. He said the District installed complimentary colors and lighting and teachers really liked the result. He said a lot of the windows that were replaced had been plexi glass which was no longer legal. He said others were single pane and not energy efficient. He said windows, doors and siding were replaced at a modular building to create efficiency and was more aesthetically pleasing. He reviewed the track replacement at Irving Middle School. He said the track was resurfaced and was a less expensive alternative to completely removing and reinstalling the track. He reviewed the installation of the last HVAC system at Franklin. He said the electrical system required a tremendous amount of pipe installation. He said the project also required maintenance to cut holes through the roofs to install and then replace and close the roof and ceilings. He said Irving's boy's locker area was gutted. He said the floors had to be cut out and workers removed old restroom fixtures and urinals were replaced. He said that section of the building was not used very often but had to be replaced. He said new pipes and restrooms were installed. He reviewed the small improvements that had been made to the Stocks Building with framing and enclosing the warehouse bays. He said the enclosure would be completed in 3 to 4 weeks. He said desks and chairs were already in the storage bays. Mr. Reed said most of the resources for future CIP projects would be dedicated to the Stocks Building and the Alameda Center. He said a company called PMG conducted energy efficiency program audits and reviewed a letter the District received from them. He said the company visited various school Districts and wrote the following about District 25: "Beyond the positive attitude is the fact the equipment is in great condition and the staff is fulfilling their primary factors for stellar upkeep and optimizing energy in this economy." He said the company also commented that out of all the Districts it had visited this District had the best maintained facilities it had come across. Ms. Cranor complimented the maintenance department for the great job it did.

### **Policy 5511 – Wellness/Nutrition**

Mr. Smart said the Board would be asked to approve the Wellness policy at a future Board meeting. He said the Policy was initially created for students only but one of the requirements for the District to be eligible for the Insurance provider's wellness reduction was to have an employee policy in place. He said modifying the existing student policy to include employees fulfilled the requirement. Mr. Sargent said the Policy sounded good. Ms. Donnelly noted that anything the District could do to keep the insurance rates from going higher was a good thing. Mr. Smart said the District would know what its rates would look like soon.

### **ISBA Resolutions Review**

Ms. Vagner said there were eight or nine Resolutions that the Board would vote on at the ISBA Conference and five of the Resolutions had been submitted by this District. She said the first Resolution in the packet dealt with smaller Districts having the authority to close a school which it currently could not do without bringing the issue to voters. She said a lot of times voters did not want to close a school for emotional or historical reasons which sometimes was not in the best interest of the students. Ms. Donnelly said she had a problem with the ISBA voting to not pass the Resolution regarding Student Fees. She said state laws were unclear and Districts needed clarification. Ms. Cranor said she had a problem with the "Do Pass" on the Financial Emergencies Resolution. She said it appeared to have no end. She said Districts should plan better and use more discretion with declaring a

financial emergency. She said declaring a financial emergency every time federal money was gone was not the best use of a financial emergency and the Resolution made this possible. Ms. Vagner said a lot of Districts had parked permanent positions into ARRA funds which was encouraged by the State Department of Education and they were now in need of a safety net. She said this District was fortunate it had not followed that advice and was in a better position than other Districts. Mr. Sargent said it seemed that some Districts had taken advantage of onetime money to avoid difficult times and now wanted an out. He said he did not think Districts should be able to declare a financial emergency because of poor planning. Ms. Donnelly agreed that a state of emergency was meant to be just that. Ms. Cranor said the Resolution made it possible for Districts to put prudent planning aside. She said it was possible that Districts would have the same result with the Jobs Bill money and could declare a financial emergency when those funds were gone. Ms. Vagner pointed out that offsetting PERSI increases with one time money rather than putting it into the budget was an example of that. Ms. Donnelly asked the Board if there was consensus that it disagreed with the Financial Emergency Resolution. The Board agreed there was. Ms. Donnelly noted that the Do Not Pass on the Student Fees Resolution was due to Districts not wanting to give up local control but the purpose in recommending the Resolution was to get greater clarification as to what fees a District could charge. She said some Districts had gotten into trouble with charging fees it was not allowed to charge. Ms. Vagner said in the past some parents have challenged certain fees but the fees are in the District's Policy and schools could not afford to offer certain classes without them. Ms. Donnelly noted there was a lot of inequity across the state with some Districts being able to offer certain classes without fees and some that could not. Ms. Cranor said the state needed to take responsibility for letting Districts know what it could and could not do. Mr. Rash said without clarification it could be costly to Districts to challenge fees in court.

**Public Comment**

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

**Adjourn**

Chair Donnelly adjourned the Work Session at 3:41 p.m.

**APPROVED ON:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**BY:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Chair**

**ATTESTED BY:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Clerk**

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Secretary, Board of Trustees**