

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION  
Pocatello/Chubbuck School District No. 25  
Tuesday, April 12, 2011  
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, April 12, 2011, 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 1:33 p.m. She reviewed the addendum to the agenda. She 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. **Introduce Technology Coordinator**
3. **School Restructuring Plans Presentation:** *Alameda Center; Wilcox Elementary*
4. **New School Status:** *Hawthorne Middle School; Wilcox Elementary*
5. **Policy Updates:** *Policy 6211 – Classroom Use of Commercially-Produced Video Recordings; Policy 3220 – Supervision and Evaluation of Administrators*
6. **Summer School Program Schedule and Fees**
7. **Levy Election Precinct Analysis**
8. **Holdback Payment Update**
9. **Food Service/Transportation Inspection Results**
10. **Legislative Report and Balancing the Budget 2011-12**
11. **Resolution to Override Various Board Policies in Conflict with Idaho Code**
12. **Updates:** *Unit and Index Information from State; Quadrant Consulting; Insurance and Budget Committee Updates; Infinite Campus; ISEE Uploads; Stocks Building; Elementary Space Needs; Partnering with City on OK Ward Park Grant for Softball Fields Improvements*
13. **Public Comment**
14. 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.
15. **Board Operating Principles #22 & 23:**
16. **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.
17. **Adjourn**

**Introduce Technology Coordinator**

Mr. Smart said several technology personnel were attending Infinite Campus training in Boise including the new Technology Coordinator Jeff Jolley. He said Mr. Jolley would be introduced at a future Board Meeting. He said

Mr. Jolley had jumped in with both feet and was doing a great job. Ms. Cranor said she met him during the Technology Committee meeting and was impressed.

**School Restructuring Plans Presentation: Alameda Center; Wilcox Elementary**

Mr. Wegner said schools that were designated at a Level 4 were required to develop a Restructuring Plan that would remain in place until the school met AYP for two consecutive years. He said the Alameda Center and Wilcox Elementary would present Restructuring Plans to the Board.

*Wilcox Elementary Restructuring Plan Presentation*

Mr. Sion said at Wilcox Elementary the staff had been working on the plan all year and were in year four of the Restructuring Plan. He said the school started with Option E which allowed the school to implement restructuring plans of their choosing. He said the school met AYP last year but was in a holding pattern until it met AYP for two consecutive years. He said if the school met AYP this year it would not have to continue with the Restructuring Plan and if it did not make AYP it would have to apply for New School Status. He said the school was petitioning for New School Status in case the school did not meet AYP. He said the school was planning ahead. He said if the school met AYP it would not matter if it had petitioned for New School Status. He said in order to apply for New School Status the school had to answer four questions. One question it had to answer was why the school selected Option E. He said the school had not met AYP for several years but had implemented many major changes and was following the guidelines set in the District's Strategic Plan. He said the school had shown growth but many groups did not meet AYP. He said the next question was regarding how the school would implement the Restructuring Plan. He said the majority of the content was relative to this question. He said there were ten indicators to be addressed. He said the school started with the Idaho Capacity Builder Project the first year it was available. He said the school was in its third year of implementation. He said part of the project was a survey for all staff that provided the administration with the strengths and weaknesses of the school. He said the administration utilized the information to guide the school in a specific direction. He said some of the strengths identified were leadership teams and commitment from the staff. He said one weakness identified was that not all staff bought into the belief that all students could be proficient. He said the school had overcome that weakness and the staff had bought in to that belief now. He said the school covered all District wide plans inclusive of the Strategic Plan and the school's own professional development plan. He said another question was regarding what action had been taken in year three of the Restructuring Plan. He said school listed all relevant actions taken in year three and included research based professional development based on identified strengths and weaknesses, the implementation of new curriculum, SIOP and TIA. He said the school day had been extended with the implementation of an after school program that began as a summer library program a couple days per week. The school extended the school day with an after school program, began a summer library program which was open a couple days a week in the summer. He said the school did not consider the replacement of staff or management as a relevant option for restructuring. He said the school decided to restructure internally and implemented part of Option G which was to appoint an expert to assist the school. He said the school decided on a Capacity Builder and a VISTA Worker to promote school wide involvement from parents and volunteers. He said another question addressed the School Improvement Plan. He said the administration utilized the staff survey to build the improvement plan. He said the school built its plan in the WISE Tool. He said a lot had been done in the school with the support of the District and significant changes had been made. He said the school was now applying for New School Status if needed. Ms. Donnelly asked how much time was put into the development of the plan. Mr. Sion said he guessed it was around 50 hours. He said the time commitment was similar for the New School Status application.

*Alameda Center Restructuring Plan Presentation*

Mr. Barnes said the school chose Option E which allowed the school to implement restructuring plans of their choosing. He said the option gave the school a lot to work with. He said it was a school-wide collaborative effort for the leadership team. He said the Alameda Center was a unique educational facility. He said there were a variety of programs that addressed grades 1 – 12 including a teen parent program. He said it was a Title I School and the additional funds helped to implement the plans the school had put in place. He said one of the positive intervention programs implemented was the after school program, Building Bright Futures. He said students were

generally referred to the after school program for mentoring and homework club and was a safe environment. He said the school staff participated in Professional Learning Communities on Mondays and Professional Development every other Monday to work on TIA documents. He said the staff was working to identify students with “D” or “F” grades for referral to Saturday Academy that provided additional tutoring and homework help for students who were struggling. He said many students were improving their grades. He said a care team met weekly to review the progress students were making. He said the school had a variety of research based curriculum for interventions such as Read 180, Fastt Math, Fast Forward, Ramp Up to Algebra and a test prep program for ISAT testing. He said he hoped the program would help students do well on the ISAT. He said the school implemented the Virtues Program and if a student displayed a Virtue during the week he/she would be given a ticket for popcorn on Friday. He said it was gaining student involvement. He said the staff was working on consistent grading practices and the administration was diligent to ensure grades were being entered into Infinite Campus. He said staff knew it was the expectation. He said another change implemented was the transition from a trimester schedule to a block schedule. He said the blocks allowed more flexibility with credit recovery programs on a more consistent basis. He said student improvement was encouraged during assemblies where students were recognized for achievements such as making the honor roll. He said it helped motivate students to do better. He said there were also administrative changes at the school as both he and the Assistant Principal, Tina Vinnick were new to the school He said the school also had a new counselor. He said in all there were seven new positions and all of them were very effective in working with at-risk students. He said ISAT remediation classes were offered and a part time GED assistant had been hired to help students that could not get enough credits to graduate. He said the restructuring plan was based on the District’s Strategic Plan and included the Response to Interventions which was a very effective tool that was reviewed on a weekly basis. He said the school utilized programs that were most effective. He said Read 180 was an amazing program that helped students to improve reading levels. He said the school worked to involve parents and the community through back to school nights and family night where families could participate in activities and play games with the students. He said the staff was encouraged to frequently assess what students were learning. He said teachers would ask students a few questions at the end of each class to see if the students learned what they were supposed to that day. He said the school invited a guest speaker during professional development who spoke about “disrupting the disrupters”. He said it was very enlightening and teachers were implementing the strategies and techniques taught during the presentation. He said the skills gained by the staff were evident and students knew to settle down when the strategies were utilized by staff. He said the students were great and did what they were supposed to do. Ms. Cranor said she was concerned about the staff turnover rate. She asked if it had any effect on students. She said she thought it was a rewarding place to work but could understand how it could be hard to attract quality staff. Mr. Barnes said some of the turnover was due to retirement. He said it did take a special type of person to work with some of the students. He said the school was more structured than most and staff needed to have the ability to reign in certain behaviors. Ms. Cranor asked what the level of parental involvement was. Mr. Barnes said since family night participation had increased by 23%. He said staff made phone calls to parents to encourage them to come to parent teacher conferences and the other family activities. He said participation was improving. He said parents that had participated in conferences and activities had enjoyed themselves and were spreading the word. He said parents could bring siblings that did not attend the school to the activities which was helping to increase participation. Ms. Cranor said she thought the care team and the Virtues Project were great ideas. Mr. Sargent said the Alameda Student Representative always had good reports for the Board during the Regular Meeting. Mr. Rash said the school was doing an excellent job and appreciated the help that was being given to the students. He said a lot of those students might otherwise fall through the cracks. Mr. Barnes said some of the students that come to the Alameda Center have said that they finally felt like they were at home for the first time. Ms. Donnelly said she looked forward to watching the progress of the students and the school.

**New School Status:** *Hawthorne Middle School; Wilcox Elementary*

Mr. Wegner said the Board was familiar with the AYP accountability timeline. He said it was the progression of accountability for what occurred after restructuring if a school did not meet AYP for two consecutive years. He said the state created a process for schools that that did not show improvement over time. He said New School Status was a separate process. He said New School Status was the process of restructuring and becoming significantly different over time with the restructuring plan. He said the two schools applying for New School

Status were Hawthorne Middle School and Wilcox Elementary. He said the schools would have to create a portfolio, a case study and submit compliance documents and the application to the State Department of Education. He said the Case Study was the story of the schools' transformation due to restructuring. He said the Case Studies for Hawthorne Middle School and Wilcox Elementary would be included in the April 19, 2011 Regular Board Meeting packet for Board review as it considered approving the submission of New School Status applications for the schools. He said the second part of the process included the appendices along with supplying artifacts which demonstrated the veracity of the school's story such as back to school night, middle school promotion policy, copies of professional development agendas and K-12 meeting agendas. He said within the appendices the schools would provide a variety of evidence which had to be organized into a binder no larger than three inches and had to be carefully put together. He said the third step in the process was the submission of the compliance documents which included the assurance page the Board would sign and the minutes from the Board meetings documenting the restructuring plan presentations from the schools and an overview of the New School Status application process. He said the compliance documents would also include a copy of the School Improvement Plan in the WISE Tool and the school's Restructuring Plans. He said the deadline for submitting a New School Status Application to the state was April 22, 2011. He said both schools would need to provide petitions and portfolios to the state. He said the state would screen all applications and documents and decide if a school could move on to the next step in the process which would be a presentation of the petition and portfolio to the Board Panel or the school would be directed to make further changes and reapply the following year after addressing the issues. He said if the Board Panel decided to hear the school's presentations it would most likely happen in June with a decision to grant or not grant New School Status in August. He said if New School Status was approved the school's AYP status would be wiped clean and the school would start on a new AYP timeline. He said it was a unique process and not many states allowed schools this option. He said for schools that demonstrated growth over time but had not been able to meet AYP it was a good opportunity for the school to state its case and get a fresh start. Ms. Cranor asked if Wilcox Elementary would wait to see if it met AYP before submitting the New School Status application. Mr. Wegner said the District would not get AYP results until June so the school would submit its application before seeing AYP results rather than having to wait another year if the school did not meet AYP. Ms. Cranor asked how other states handled this situation. Mr. Wegner said some states replaced all the staff, some turned the school over to the State Board of Education but most State Boards did not want to take that on.

**Policy Updates:** *Policy 6211 – Classroom Use of Commercially-Produced Video Recordings; Policy 3220 – Supervision and Evaluation of Administrators*

*Policy 6211 – Classroom Use of Commercially-Produced Video Recordings*

Mr. Wegner said the changes to Policy 6211 – Classroom Use of Commercially-Produced Video Recordings were extensive. He said because of the availability of such a wide variety of movies it was most important to exercise good judgment and ensure relevancy to the curriculum. He said videos were categorized as instructional or entertainment. He said the changes to the policy set certain restrictions and requirements for use of "produced for entertainment" videos. He said a lot of instructional videos were available for content areas such as science and social studies. He said the revisions to the Policy established that videos produced for entertainment needed principal approval prior to use. He said it also established that only the portions of a video that are relevant to the curriculum were to be shown and not the video in its entirety. He said included in the packet were updated forms for principal approval of the portions to be shown. He said an addition to the policy was to clarify that NR (Not Rated) videos were not to be shown. He said when movies were released it had a G – R rating and often R rated movies were released with either the R rating or a NR version. He said the NR version could contain an additional 30 seconds that was not in the R rated version and could dramatically change the content. He said any video that contained nudity or excessive violence was not to be shown. He said there might be unique circumstances where a teacher would need to request permission to show a portion of a video that contained restricted content as long as the portion shown did not contain the restricted material. He said PG-13 was added at the high school level and only G or PG rated movies at the elementary level. He said the next section dealt with copyright laws. He said there was an educational exemption if the video met certain criteria which included only enrolled students viewing the video and the video being essential to the curriculum. He said videos could not be copied or taped from TV. He said the video must be listed in the lesson plan with the rating of the video. He said if parents

objected to their student viewing a portion of a requested video, the teacher would provide an alternate meaningful activity for that student. He said parents could register a complaint through the materials review form. He said the two forms included in the packet were for notifying parents and obtaining principal permission. Ms. Donnelly asked if teachers would never be allowed to show a video in its entirety. Mr. Wegner said if the Policy was adopted that would be correct. Ms. Cranor said a lot of PG-13 and R rated movies contained restricted material. Mr. Wegner said a teacher could gain permission to show a portion of the video that did not contain the restricted material. Mr. Sargent said he was glad to see that the teacher had to be present to show the video and could not just put the video in and leave the classroom. Ms. Vagner said there had been criticism in the past for that reason and the administration was working to address the issue. Ms. Cranor asked if teachers always had to have permission prior to showing a portion of the video. Mr. Wegner said only if the teacher intended to show an R rated movie. Mr. Rash asked if a teacher could use a video to influence a student's political view. Mr. Wegner said teachers are required to teach to state standards. He said a government or history teacher could cover a range of perspectives but let the students choose for themselves. He said teachers presented multiple sides of an issue to students and he would be surprised if any of them chose to influence a student's political view. Ms. Vagner said TIA supports the breaking down of state standards to present an issue thoroughly showing all sides of an argument. Ms. Cranor said the policy directed a meaningful activity for students who opted out of viewing a video and thought the activity should be further clarified. Mr. Wegner said teachers regularly dealt with providing an alternate activity. Ms. Vagner said the intent was to avoid singling a child out or making them feel punished. Ms. Cranor said she would suggest that the meaningful activity serve the same purpose as the video. Mr. Sargent said he agreed there should be an opportunity to present the objective in a different way. Mr. Wegner said it could be clarified and brought back next week.

#### *Policy 3220 – Supervision and Evaluation of Administrators*

Ms. Vagner said the state was requiring Districts to submit administrator evaluation forms. She said included in the packet was Policy 3220 – Supervision and Evaluation of Administrators. She said the last time the Policy was reviewed was in 2004 and the content was extremely limited. She said the administration added substance and purpose to the evaluation of administrators. She said there was a clerical error to be corrected in the fourth paragraph from “f” to “of”. She said the error would be corrected. She said the substance that was added to the evaluation included goals, strategic planning built around the District's Strategic Plan and the evaluation of plans. She said the evaluation models included in the packet clearly outlined what was in the Strategic Plan. She said operational management included business, budget, professional development and student achievement aspects. She said the administration developed a matrix that had been used with elementary principals and embodied the content of the Policy. She said the model was research based and was the procedure that would be submitted to the state along with the Policy. She said part of the process was a survey of staff relative to the leadership of the administrator. She said the secondary model was based on the Correlates of Effective Schools and the District's Strategic Plan. She said the elementary model referenced Marzano which was embodied in effective schools research. She said the models covered a safe and orderly environment, climate of high expectations, instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, opportunity to learn and student time on task, frequent monitoring of student progress and home school relations. She said the process was established in different ways at the elementary and secondary levels but both models got at the same thing. She said the Policy would be brought to the Board for a first reading at the April 19, 2011 Regular Board Meeting pending any changes. She said the deadline for submission to the state was May which was enough time to meet the deadline. She said the models were a good representation of working the expectations of the Board relative to research behind the District's Vision/Mission and Strategic Plan. She said she was very pleased with the processes in place and gave principals opportunities for self examination.

#### **Summer School Program Schedule and Fees**

Mr. Devine said Summer School planning was underway. He said he met with Ms. Erickson to lay out the details. He said the schedule and proposed cost increase was included in the packet. He said the administration was requesting to increase the Summer School fee to cover the increased cost of supplies. He said in order to maintain the program in its current format the fee would need to be increased from \$80 to \$83. He said the increase was under the 5% limit per Board Policy and would not require a public hearing. He said the administration was working to modify the curriculum to include a study skills course. He said most students that did not meet the

middle school promotion requirement needed a study skills course. He said Summer School would be held at Pocatello High School which was in close proximity to the summer feeding program. Ms. Vagner said the Board would be asked to approve the increased fee at the Regular Board Meeting the following week. Ms. Cranor asked if there was a scholarship program for students that qualified for financial aid. Mr. Devine said there were scholarships available based on recommendations from counselors. He said scholarships were provided by the state and a good percentage of students qualified. Ms. Vagner said the District was looking into online course options to streamline costs. Mr. Sargent said it was nice that so many courses were offered. Mr. Devine said the goal was to maintain the courses and possibly add online coursework to provide further options.

### **Levy Election Precinct Analysis**

Ms. Allen said the administration received the County Commissioner's canvas of the Supplemental Levy certifying the passage of the levy. She said the additional detail was being presented at the request of the Board. She said a breakdown of the election results by precinct was included in the packet. She said in addition to the breakdown were four maps detailing the precincts in which the levy did not pass. She said the first precinct that did not pass was Precinct 12 within the Pole Line, Quinn, Hawthorne and Eldridge boundaries. She said there were 218 total votes with 106 in favor and 112 against. She said the next was Precinct 40 within the Parks Road, Pocatello Creek and Buckskin boundaries. She said the student population in the area was 98 students. She said there were a total of 68 voters with 31 in favor and 37 against. She said there was a vocal opponent in that area. She said the next Precinct had a student population of 215. She said it was Precinct 57 and included Chubbuck Road, Highline and 2-1/2 Mile Road. She said there were 255 voters with 103 in favor and 152 against. She said the last location was Precinct 60 which was the Fort Hall area. She said the student population was 301 students. She said the voter turnout was low with a total of 74 voters with 36 in favor and 38 against. She said those were the only precincts that didn't pass. She said the Precincts that passed with the highest margin were Precincts 31 and 32 passing by over 80%. She said those precincts were in the upper and lower University area. She said Precinct 37 had a very high voter turnout which was in the Highland area. She said there were a total of 343 voters with 223 in favor. She said Precincts 1 and 2 also had a high voter turnout. Ms. Donnelly said she was surprised to see that the Washington area barely passed. Mr. Sargent said the Board was very grateful the levy passed.

### **Holdback Payment Update**

Mr. Smart said he spent the last few days trying to finalize holdback payments. He said it took a lot of work to verify the accuracy of all payments. He said when Districts received direction from legislative bodies to plan for a holdback the administration put the proposed holdback amount into a reserve account with the stipulation that if a holdback did not occur it would payout 1.9% of the employee's income in a one-time payment. He said he was working to calculate the payment amount for all employees on the April checks. He said he would have payouts ready by Thursday and would split the payment over five pay periods with the exception of classified employees who would be paid out over three pay periods because their last check was in May. Mr. Smart said he anticipated paying out a little over \$800,000 in one time payments. He said it would come out to just over \$1 million in salary and benefits. He said an unanticipated benefit was that it would increase the highest 42 months for PERSI benefits.

### **Food Service/Transportation Inspection Results**

Mr. Reed said the state was constantly monitoring District programs to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations. He said recently the state conducted audits of both the transportation and food service departments. He said audits were conducted every few years and were very important for the District to ensure programs were in compliance and could affect funding for the programs if they were not in compliance. He asked Mr. Wilson, the Food Service Coordinator, to summarize the food service audit.

Mr. Wilson said the Coordinated Review Effort was conducted in February. He said the four schools selected for the audit were Century High School, Hawthorne Middle School, Jefferson Elementary and Washington Elementary. He said the focus was on Free and Reduced Lunch eligibility and ensuring the kitchens served the food listed on the menu. He said the food service staff did a great job and went above and beyond to ensure all meals contained the required components. He said the Audit Team provided good direction for the department

relative to free and reduced meal tracking. He said the state noted the department had a cohesive team. He said it really showed during reviews. He said in the past audits were conducted every five years and were now conducted every three years. He said the Audit Team was very professional and it was clear they were here to help. He said change was a constant in the department. He said the new federal regulations were 78 pages long. He said some of the changes had been incorporated and were working to ensure all regulations were met. He said one main focus was on reducing the amount of sodium in menu items. He said the focus a few years back was on getting more whole grain food items on the menu which the department worked hard to incorporate even before it was required by the state. He said the department was working with vendors to ensure regulations were met. Mr. Reed said the audit was originally scheduled for November but the department was unprepared due to the implementation of Infinite Campus and asked for an extension. He said the department was now in a much better position to provide the state with the information it needed. He said the food service department was a self sustaining entity that operated as a non-profit to keep meals at the lowest cost possible. He said the regulation to reduce sodium would be an increased cost to the department and would be a challenge to provide a low sodium menu that kids would still enjoy. He said the department would stay on top of the new regulations.

Mr. Reed said the transportation audit was important because if it was not in compliance it would affect the reimbursement from the state. He said overall the department received a high review. He said the Audit Team indicated the staff was dedicated to the safe transportation of students and were very courteous and thoughtful. He said the department was organized and maintained. He said one unique piece of the transportation department was the discipline of students which most Districts did not do. He said any discrepancies found during the review were corrected prior to the Audit Team leaving. He said most of the issues identified during the review were minor. He said 15 buses were inspected and 7 were ridden. He said the department received a 95.6% overall rating. He said the transportation department had a high turnover of bus drivers and the 95.6% was a good rating considering that fact. He said during the review of bus routes and stops there were five stops identified that did not have continuous adult presence which reduced the rating to 75% in that area. He said continuous adult presence would be a challenge to maintain with staff reductions and reduced funding. He said three buses were taken out of service for safety violations that included an ABS light being out, an emergency prop did not latch on the first try and the front buzzer did not go off on one bus. He said the incidents were serious but were minor fixes. He said the transportation department did an excellent job. He said little things like lights burning out on buses happened every day but the department stayed on top of the fixes and was committed to providing safe transportation for all students.

### **Legislative Report and Balancing the Budget 2011-12**

Ms. Vagner said included in the packet were rolling documents relative to legislative and budget updates. She said first document was a summary of the legislative bills that passed that effected education. She said the first bill was SB1108 the labor relations bill and the trailer bill that went with it. She said the intent of the trailer bill was to nullify any contract or policy in violation of the new Idaho Code. She said the next bill dealt with pay for performance and the trailer bill addressed student achievement and hard to fill positions criteria. She said the next bill reduced the salary base by 1.67% and redirected the money to pay for performance, laptops and Superintendent Luna's priorities. She said JFAC cut another 1.87% from salaries and benefits. She said discretionary funding was also cut by 10%. She said HB 201 passed and requires applicants to sign a waiver releasing personnel files to the District to which the applicants are applying. She said the personnel file would follow a person from job to job and would add another new work load to Districts. She said the bill that affected funding for drivers training did not pass and the District would offer summer drivers training courses. She said the protection bill passed for one year but dropped from 99% to 97%. She said after next year protection would be eliminated. She said she was unsure if the bill that dealt with 10% severance passed. She said the intent of the bill was to set aside funding for releasing teachers in October if enrollment was down. She said the next bill dealt with lifting the cap on charters. She said during the discussion of the bill promotional items were distributed and the bill had to be pulled due to a conflict of interest. She said another charter bill came forward but did not make it in time. She said both the bullying and the gun bills did not pass.

Mr. Smart said the administration still did not know how many units to anticipate. He said in the past the administration had a good idea of how many units to expect and what the index was. He said the state was unprepared to give Districts that data due to the new system. He said the District received unit and ADA

information but still did not have index information and the administration was still working to resolve unit calculation issues. He said the administration would submit new data on Friday and there would be a three day turnaround from the state. He said the unit calculation for kindergarten had been resolved and the administration was trying to resolve the same issue with the alternate schools. He said the current report from the state was not correct. He said all of the issues had to be resolved before the administration knew how many units to expect and if the District did not receive that information it could affect the fund balance. He reviewed the document that dealt with the number of units the administration anticipated receiving and the number of units the state was showing. He said the number of units the state was showing for the alternate school was off by quite a bit. He said the secondary units had gone down for no apparent reason. He said it was probably due to the state adjusting the calculation formula. He said at first it was too high and now it was too low. He said the only units that were close to the District's calculations were the special education units. Mr. Sargent asked if the difference between the District's projections and the state's calculation was off by 30 units. Mr. Smart said that was correct for now and the administration was working to figure out why the state's calculations were so much different than the District's projections. He said the state would also need to add summer school to the report. Mr. Reed said one unit was equivalent to \$85,000 and if you times that by ten its equals \$850,000 which was why accuracy was so important. He said if the District balanced the budget based on this report it would be start off with \$2 million less that anticipated. He said Mr. Smart had been working tirelessly to resolve the discrepancies for over six months. Mr. Smart said the administration had also been working on the implementation of Infinite Campus. He said Mr. Jolley had identified student reporting issues with the data in Infinite Campus and was creating fixes as he came across any discrepancies. He said the alternate school and kindergarten calendars were not set up correctly in IC which had caused some reporting issues but had been fixed. Ms. Vagner said Districts had been informed by the state that if the District and the state could not agree on the number of units then the state would assign the number of units until all calculation errors could be resolved in which case the state would either compensate or deduct the amount owed from the District the following year. Mr. Reed said the administration had hoped to bring a lot more data pertinent to balancing the budget but was unable to do so until the District received the information from the state. Ms. Cranor asked if we were the only district experiencing these issues. Mr. Smart said it was his understanding that other Districts were experiencing the same type of problems. He said some of the problems the District was encountering were due to Infinite Campus but the biggest problem was the state calculations. He said the next couple of documents detailed the reductions over the past two years. He said the District's state funding had been reduced by 12%. He said state funding was by far the highest percent of the District's budget. He said the District had to cut \$5.3 million from its budget over the past two years due to state reductions. He said base salaries were also significantly reduced by the state. He said it equaled about a 5% pay cut over a two year period. He reviewed the state funding estimate. He said the index listed on the estimate page was the information that the District was still waiting for. Mr. Sargent asked if there was a timeline from the state. Mr. Reed said Districts were told by the state that it did not expect to resolve index calculation issues this year. He said most likely Districts will have to determine a best estimate as to units and submit the number to the state. He said if the District's estimate turned out to be lower than actual units then the District would be reimbursed by the state and if the estimate was higher, the District would owe the state. He said the state had quite a challenge in resolving the issue. Mr. Rash asked if this was all due to new laws. Mr. Smart said it was based on the new ISEE reporting process. He said previously the state had a report for salary and employee information that the District provided to it and the state would send a summary almost immediately. He said now instead of using that program as a backup the state implemented the ISEE system and was unprepared to handle the quantity of diverse data and to produce consistent reports. Mr. Sargent said it was comparable to the District completely eliminating SASI and converted to Infinite Campus without running a parallel system for awhile. Mr. Smart said Idaho was one of the only states without a longitudinal data system so the State Department of Education jumped in and implemented ISEE without a backup plan. Ms. Cranor asked if there was any legal timeline the state was accountable to for providing Districts with data. She said the District could not operate without the correct data. Mr. Smart said the administration would work to clean up the data as much as possible and hope for an accurate report from the state. Mr. Reed said the next document illustrated how the passage of SB 1184 changed salary based apportionment. He said when the administration first started working on budget calculations based on SB 1184 things were not adding up until the District received the missing piece of information that JFAC had reduced the salary base by another 1.87% in addition to the 1.67% that SB 1184 had reduced it. He said it was a double hit and ended up

being a 3.54% reduction overall. He said the starting base salary for next year would be \$30,000. He said the entitlement would be reduced by almost 10% in discretionary dollars which was about a \$1.3 million reduction. He said overall it was a \$2.7 million reduction in revenue from the state. He said it reiterated the need the District had to go to the community for additional funds. He said the additional funds from the increased levy were already more than eaten up with the reductions from the state. He said last year the appropriation was \$1 billion based on 14,000 support units. He said the reduction was over 2% for Districts with no new growth, not 1.3%. He said the District would not get the full 2.5% reduction but it would be more than 1.3%. He said the dollar amounts highlighted in green on the document were earmarked dollars for dual credit, high school redesign, technology/laptops and college entrance exams. He said the administration did not know how the money would be allocated to Districts. He said there was an upcoming meeting with the state that would explain how all of the changes would affect Districts. He said the bottom line was that revenue would be significantly reduced from the state for the upcoming school year. Ms. Vagner said in addition to the known revenue reductions the District could face even further cuts if the unit calculation issues were not resolved. Mr. Reed said there were not a lot of discretionary funds to reduce. He said dollar amounts highlighted in yellow on the document were fixed costs that included but were not limited to utilities, supplies, water/sewer, garbage and postage. He said items highlighted in blue were costs that could be reduced such as health services, training and facility rentals. He said about 73% were fixed costs and 27% were variable. He said the District had very little latitude with what it could reduce without taking away from required costs. He said there was only \$6.2 million in the budget allocated for purchased services. Ms. Vagner said most of the resources were parked in salaries and benefits. Mr. Reed said the next document detailed the projected cost increases over a four year period. He said PERSI would implement an increase over a three year time period. He said the administration was meeting with its insurance consultant to discuss options but at this point was facing a 22% increase for the next year. He said the administration was exploring all option to reduce the cost. He said a lot of Districts were facing this type of an increase. He said if no changes were made to the plan it would equal a \$1 million cost increase. He said the Insurance committee would meet Monday to discuss the options. Ms. Cranor asked what the insurance company's reason was for the drastic increase. Mr. Reed said there were a number of factors. He said the District got a 2% reduction in premiums this year and was now being hammered with the dramatic increase for next year. He said the insurance company told the administration that the 2% reduction was not the reason for the increase next year. He said it could have something to do with changes from President Obama's Health Care. He said the District also had a number of medical claims this year. He said the administration was working to figure out how it could address the increases and present a balanced budget to the Board. Mr. Sargent noted that the District was only 8 to 10 people short of receiving an addition 1% reduction in premiums which could have saved the District even more money. Mr. Reed said the administration was doubling its efforts to create awareness and encourage participation in the Wellness Program. He said another estimated increase was in utility costs which equaled about \$50,000. He said fuel was an unpredictable cost increase. He said currently diesel fuel was about \$4.20 per gallon which is what buses use and costs about \$18,000. He said there were stimulus pushins which would be absorbed back into the general fund. He said movement would have to be addressed per SB 1184. Mr. Smart said the District currently paid over and above the state's minimum base salary of \$30,000 for beginning teachers. Mr. Reed said worker compensation costs were increasing and the District had staff returning from military leave which would also increase costs. He said the administration was waiting to see how reductions to the Teacher Quality (TQ) budget would affect the overall budget. Ms. Vagner said the District may have to understaff depending on the allocation of funds from the state based on the number of units. She said there would be a cost associated with the implementation of the common core standards and would apply to more than just textbook adoptions. Mr. Reed said textbooks were the highest budget item next to salaries and benefits. He reviewed the known cost increases for textbooks and said the District would probably not be able to purchase any of them until the state decided to fund them. He said the District was already significantly behind on textbook adoptions which would only compound for the following year. He said those were the known cost increases the District was facing. Mr. Smart said the budget timeline had been pushed back due to changes in the law. He said the Insurance Committee would meet on Monday to discuss carrier and coverage options. He said the administration would have a better idea of projected revenues after April 27, 2011. He said all coordinators and department heads had been asked to submit budget to the administration by April 29, 2011. He said the administration would continue to present budget information as it was received by the state. He said the District had to have a balanced budget by the first part of

June. He said the District would advertise in the Idaho State Journal. He said the Budget Hearing would take place June 21, 2011. He said both the Trustee election and the issuing of contracts would take place in the middle of all of this. Ms. Vagner said the administration would like to be able to offer letters of intent at the May 17, 2011 Regular Board Meeting. She said the administration would send the letters of intent so employees would know whether or not they had a position, but contracts would not be issued until July 1, 2011. She said the administration had hoped to go further with the budget discussion but could not proceed until it had pertinent information from the state. She said the administration proposed to hold a Special Meeting/Work Session to present options for balanced budget on May 3, 2011. She said the Board could consider that date beginning at 4:30, 4:45 or 5:00 p.m. depending on availability. She said Ms. Johnson would solicit Board member availability and confirm the date and time. Ms. Vagner reviewed the known affect to the District budget over a six year period based on SB 1184. She said the bill implemented a permanent reduction to salaries and benefits. She said the intent was to eliminate staff. She said Superintendent Luna got what he wanted, just in a different way. She said it was not an optimistic fiscal picture and everything the District did this year would affect the next. Mr. Reed said it was interesting that the state could not guarantee revenue from one year to the next but could guarantee salary reductions six years out. Ms. Vagner said textbooks adoptions were a critical element the state could not fund and yet were implementing the use of mobile computing devices that would still require electronic textbook adoption which was not any cheaper. Mr. Rash asked if the reduction to salary based apportionment was cumulative. Mr. Reed said the number shown was the new base from the state but was not cumulative. He said every year the base would roll back to the new base with the reduction taken off every year. He said it was an additional loss every year but not a cumulative loss. Ms. Vagner noted the reductions had no connection to JFAC so if JFAC decided to reduce even further it would be compounded by SB 1184. Ms. Cranor asked how the bill could reduce the funding set by JFAC. Ms. Vagner said the new law dictated the budget in addition to the action of JFAC. Ms. Cranor asked if JFAC knew that when they set the budget. Ms. Vagner said she believed they did. She said JFAC made the Student's Come First plan fit to the budget. She said JFAC could have disregarded the plan and set the budget but instead agreed with the plan and set the budget to fit. Ms. Donnelly said she could not see a clear purpose for implementing such a drastic plan during a time of major budget reductions.

#### **Resolution to Override Various Board Policies in Conflict with Idaho Code**

Ms. Vagner said included in the addendum was the Resolution to Override Various Board Policies in Conflict with Idaho Code with one change removing the Collective Bargaining Agreement language from the Resolution. She said the Board had Polices that were in violation of the new laws. She said the Board was subject to follow its Policies but not if the Policies violated Idaho Code. She said the Resolution stated that due to the action of the Idaho State Legislature and as the Board had Policies, Procedures and handbooks in violation, any of these found in violation of the new laws were declared null and void. She said there was insufficient time to review all of the Policies and make the appropriate changes since the new laws were implemented as emergency legislation. She said the Resolution gave the District time to review and revise any Policies in violation at a later date. She said the Board would be asked to consider adopting the Resolution at the April 19, 2011 Regular Board Meeting.

**Updates:** *Unit and Index Information from State; Quadrant Consulting; Insurance and Budget Committee Updates; Infinite Campus; ISEE Uploads; Stocks Building; Elementary Space Needs; Partnering with City on OK Ward Park Grant for Softball Fields Improvements*

Mr. Smart said the administration was working to resolve the issues relative to the number of units. He said Quadrant Consulting had started the process of reviewing populations of Trustee Zones. He said the contract for Quadrant Consulting had been issued and if boundary populations were within 10% of each other the Trustee boundaries would remain the same. He said if there was more than a 10% difference in populations the boundaries would be reworked and would be an additional cost to the District. He said Quadrant Consulting would inform the administration in about three weeks whether or not any changes were needed. He said the Budget Committee met and discussed a lot of the same budget issues that were discussed with the Board. He said the committee discussed various options for reducing and balancing the budget. He said the Insurance Committee would meet Monday and had its work cut out. He said it would be difficult to decide how to proceed with medical insurance. He said the administration was learning more about Infinite Campus as it went along. He said a group of District personnel were in Boise for Infinite Campus training and hoped to find ways to improve on processes. He said he was

hopeful the group would have more information to bring back to the District after the training. He said the administration completed another submission of November data to the state and had still not heard anything back. He said an April submission was due that week and would be complete by Friday. Ms. Vagner said the Board would receive bids for the Stocks Building and Alameda Center projects at an upcoming Board meeting. She said the administration was still working to resolve issues with elementary space needs but had no clear resolution as of yet. She said the District agreed to commit to \$15,000 for improvements to the OK Ward Park softball fields in order to receive grant funds and help from the City. She said students played softball at the park which was in need of repair. She said the grant would invest a lot more and would be to the benefit of the students. Ms. Vagner asked the Board members to rank the following items as low, medium or high for consideration of reductions: Positions – (4) medium priority; Pay – (4) low priority; transportation for extra-curricular – (1) high, (1) medium/high and (2) medium priority; supply budgets – (2) medium and (2) low priority; insurance benefit changes – (1) high, (2) medium/high and (1) medium priority; textbooks – (4) low priority; four-day school week – (1) high, (1) medium and (2) low priority.

### **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.

#### **Mr. Bill Davis**

Mr. Davis said it was hard to gather any one thing to say about everything that had taken place over the last few months. He said he planned to talk about the Resolution, Negotiations and about some partially good news. He said when he first saw the Resolution he was certain the District was headed down the path of the administration acting in overdue haste without input from constituents but felt better after the revision to the language was made. He said he believed the PEA would prefer to collaborate and offer solutions unlike what happened last year. He said last year the PEA and the Board agreed to a two year IBB contract but did not believe that would happen even though he thought it was a good way to proceed. He said the Board would be told that it was required to do things in a certain way to meet the new regulations but there were many ways to meet the requirements. He said Wendy Shelman had contacted Superintendent Vagner and were setting a date to meet and review the process for this year. He said the PEA bargaining team had six members. He said it would be a rough start if the team the PEA faced was similar to last year with two accountants, and a paid gunslinger and the head of Human Resources who was not allowed to say much. He said in the past when the PEA negotiated with the Board team they were very successful. He said the teams sat across the table with people who had classroom experience and it was much easier to come to creative solutions. He said he would like the Board to add an elementary and secondary principal or the directors to its team so when classroom situations were discussed everyone would understand. He said he would also recommend appointing a Board Member to be a part of the team so the Board would hear what took place unfiltered. He said however since the new law required negotiations to be held in public with the press in attendance the Board could see for themselves. He said negotiations would not happen in a closet anymore. He said the PEA was fully aware of the timelines and requirements in place per the new law. He said the PEA was aware of the time constraints but did not mean the negotiating teams could not be flexible or come to creative solutions. He said there was far more flexibility allowed then some would have the Board believe. He said the Boise School District was already working with BEA to find creative solutions and had come to a few already. He said the ball was in the Board's court and would be up to them to decide how it would handle the negotiations process. He said the legislature laid the responsibility onto the Board. He said if you come to a fork in the road, take it. He said two significant petitions were kicking off in Idaho that weekend. He said he first was the Recall Tom Luna petition that would be available Saturday and the second would be decided by the IEA delegate assembly as to whether or not to move forward with the referendum petitions to repeal the newly implemented Student's Come First bills. He said he did not anticipate any problems in getting a yes vote. He said both of the

petitions served a different purpose. He said the Recall Tom Luna campaign was a grass roots organization. He said the woman who started the campaign was an interesting person. He said he expected an angry parent but found the woman was a 67 year old sweet grandmother. He said she attended the legislative hearings in Boise and afterwards asked how to recall Superintendent Luna. He said the drive was progressing rapidly. He said he did not know if drive would be successful and knew it would be very difficult to accomplish. He said 157,000 signatures were needed to pass the petition, but in all actuality it would take at least 200,000 signatures to ensure passage. He said the referendum was different as it required a separate petition for each of the bills. He said people could sign all three, or could pick and choose which petitions to sign. He said each bill was required to be attached to the petition and each of the bills was at least 45 pages in length. He said the number of signatures required was around 60,000 statewide. He said it was a doable thing. He said the Recall Luna campaign was kicking off in Pocatello that weekend. He said it was positive news in the sense that people were taking action rather than sitting back and not having any input. He said if the petition was successful the bills would be on the ballot in November, 2012 so pass or fail the law would be in effect for at least 15 months.

**Adjourn**

Chair Donnelly adjourned the Work Session at 4:27 p.m.

**APPROVED ON:**

MAY 17, 2011

**BY:**

Marianne E. Donnelly  
Chair

**ATTESTED BY:**

Frank G. [Signature]  
Clerk

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

[Signature]  
Secretary, Board of Trustees