



West Ada

SCHOOL DISTRICT

SCHOOL BOARD MEETING MINUTES

October 13, 2015

Date, Place & Time	The regular meeting of the Board of Trustees, West Ada School District, convened at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 13, 2015 at the District Service Center, 1303 E. Central Drive, Meridian, Idaho.
Trustees in Attendance	Trustees: Chairman Tina Dean, Dr. Russell Joki, Dr. Julie Madsen, Carol Sayles, Mike Vuittonet
Staff in Attendance	Barbara Leeds, Trish Duncan, Troy Stephens, Staci Low, Jeanne Buschine, Dr. Mandy White, Don Nesbitt, Dave Roberts, Dave Moser, Scott Stuart, Alex Simpson, Diane Oliva, Cindy Sisson, Karel Olsen, Michelle Sanders.
Guests	Susan Buxton, representing Moore, Smith, Buxton and Turcke, Angie Hickman, Sarah Holt, Loraine Hand, Tamara Sullivan-Watson, Marla Gothard, Lori Jones, Raelynn Grant, Debbie Lichter, Bob Neugebauer, Sue Darden, Mary Ollie, Rob Lundgren, Cory Johnson, Shana Hawkins, Katie Rutan, Nancy Rutan, Debbie Gourley, Vicente Medina, Kendra Wisenbaker, Reid Olsen, Shae Carnahan, Brittney Kearsley, Lisa Austin, Madison Vuyistelii, Monte Palmer, Nathaniel Kim, Megan Evans, Jennifer Marshall, Christine Donnell, Casey Mattox, Luke Mattox, JD Sexton, Rhonda McDonough, Susan McInerney, Bob Learsch, Lynda Learsch, Ronda Hanson, Kelli Cullen, Matt Forrester, Bonie Pack Gidley, Carla Phillips, Jennifer Fletcher, Heidi Warren, Tracy Newell, Bobby Lawrence, Cassi Sutton, Stephanie Little
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Chairman Dean called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.</p> <p>Chairman Dean expressed her thanks to Joe Yochum, Barbara Leeds, and Jackie Thomason for filling in during the absence of Dr. Clark.</p> <p>In response to queries regarding the cancellation of the special meeting on Friday, October 9th, Chairman Dean explained the meeting was rescheduled due to the absence of board counsel. She expressed her appreciation of the people who were in attendance and engaging in the public schools and the political process. She stated public schools and their buildings are not appropriate places for political speech, there have been issues in the media and although the public has opinions, it is not appropriate to voice those opinions at the meeting tonight.</p>
Consent Agenda	<p>Trustee Joki made a motion to move the following items to discussion/action. The motion was seconded by Trustee Sayles and passed unanimously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Item 9 – recommendation to approve student tours, excursions and overnight trip requests for the 2015-2016 school year;• Item 11 – request to move the December 15, 2015 board meeting to December 8, 2015;• Item 13 – request to participate in the 2016 National Youth Tobacco Survey;

- Item 15 – request from Meridian High school to survey a sample of the student body as part of the Green Dot Program.

Chairman Dean asked for a motion to approve the remaining items on the consent agenda. Trustee Vuittonet moved, Trustee Madsen seconded and the vote was unanimous to approve the following consent agenda items:

Payment of bills dated September 1-30, 2015;

P-card payments dated August 1-31, 2015;

Monthly budget report;

Minutes of the:

- September 1, 2015 special board meeting;
- September 3, 2015 special board meeting;
- September 15, 2015 regular board meeting;
- September 21, 2015 special board meeting;
- September 29, 2015 special board meeting;

Associated student body reports;

Employment recommendations;

Requests for leave without pay:

- Wendy Brown, Medicaid clerk, twenty (20) days;
- Cheryl Fortin, paraprofessional, three (3) days;
- Casey Gardner, paraprofessional, one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) day;
- Cara Jenkins, teacher, one hundred sixty four (164) days;
- Georgeanne Smith, two (2) days;
- Steven Trickey, paraprofessional, sixteen (16) days;

Requests for professional/activity leave:

- Debbie Aholt, three (3) days to attend the Teaching, Learning, and Coaching Conference in Denver, Colorado;
- Eian Harm, three (3) days to attend the International Association for K-12 Online Learning Conference in Orlando, Florida;
- Maureen Lambert, two (2) days to attend concurrent credit training in Moscow, Idaho;
- Taylor Andreasen, Brandy Funk, Alisha Henderson, Randy Mahler, David Rhoades and Sarah Wright, one (1) day to attend the Skills USA/HOSA/TSA Fall Leadership Conference in Twin Falls, Idaho;
- Casey Mattox, five (5) days to attend the World Innovation Summit for Education in Doha, Qatar;
- Teri Powell, two (2) days to attend the NWEA Fusion Conference in Portland, Oregon;
- Shawna Schneiderman, two (2) days to attend the National Conference on Peer Tutoring of Writing in Salt Lake City, Utah;
- Eric Taylor, three (3) days to attend Portland University and Portland Trailblazers Professional Basketball Athletic Training Programs in Portland, Oregon;
- Sarah Wright, off contract, to attend Project Lead the Way Summit 2016 in Indianapolis, Indiana;

Consent Agenda – cont.

Non-resident student enrollment requests for the 2015-2016 school year;

Request from Ponderosa Elementary to construct a new quarter-mile Pacer track, the project has been funded through ASB money, fundraising and donations;

Request to participate in the 2015 Drug Free Communities Support Program Evaluation of Core Measures survey at eight district middle and high schools;

Request from Kyra Mauney to conduct a research project at Renaissance High School titled “Does taking a speech class help improve a student’s confidence?”

Request from Christie Jilek to conduct a research study at Heritage Middle School titled “Engineering Attitudes in a Middle School Science Classroom”;

Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement and Warranty Deed at Hillsdale Elementary between the City of Meridian and West Ada School District;

Disposal of surplus equipment;

Recommended student expulsions.

Discussion/Action

2014-2015 Audit Approved

Bobby Lawrence, representing Eide Bailly, handed out a summary of his speaking points, required communication required at the conclusion of their audit, and a draft of the audited financial statements. The financial statements are a product of the district staff and Eide Bailly writes the opinion and gives the results of the audit. There were some changes to the accounting standards this year which will be explained during the presentation.

What happens during an audit – five staff members spend about three weeks testing federal fund grants and all items on the financial statements. The testing is done in sampling form, analytical form, inquiry and corroboration. If they find internal control weaknesses, compliance findings or adjustments, those findings are reported to the board. Mr. Lawrence thanked Mr. Simpson and his staff for preparing for the audit process so well and being responsive to their questions and requests during the audit. New for this year is a change in the accounting standards that required a prior period adjustment. Standards were written in such a way that PERSI has a liability to the retirees because of its unfunded status. That liability was required to be pushed down to all of the entities that participate in the PERSI program. There are pages of disclosure, a change to the fund balance and considerable changes related to that one item. The basic results of the audit is a clean opinion. There was nothing they had to disclaim an opinion for or give an exception to. The only thing the board will find is an emphasis on a matter of changing accounting principal which points the reader to the information regarding PERSI. The district did not receive any findings to indicate weakness in the control systems and no adjusting journal entries.

Trustee Joki asked Mr. Lawrence to talk about the total capital assets of the district.

Mr. Lawrence explained that much like any business enterprise, if the school district buys a building, land or bus, that is an expense, and on this reporting

gets capitalized, gets depreciated over the normal useful life just like a business would and that expense each year goes into the statement of activities.

Trustee Joki asked how the value of those assets is calculated.

Mr. Lawrence replied that was historical costs.

Trustee Joki asked if that was in any way connected to a general appraisal. Do we conduct general appraisals?

Mr. Lawrence replied that general accounting standards don't let you mark assets to fair value just like in normal enterprises. They are recorded as historical cost then amortized over its life so you are matching an historical cost ratably amortized over the income producing period.

Trustee Joki stated he was trying to match this up with property and casualty insurance costs.

Mr. Lawrence replied the district would be insured for a much bigger amount than this shows. For example, this building is probably worth more than when it was purchased. On the books it is recorded at historical cost, less depreciation and if appraised today would be worth "x" dollars more than that.

Trustee Joki asked about school activity accounts. Does their audit examine school accounts?

Mr. Lawrence replied not at this level of their audit. They look at bank statements and activity for reasonableness. There was a point in time where there were problems with those accounts and they were engaged to do some separate procedures. Those procedures have been taken in-house now so they are not engaged to do that currently.

Trustee Joki asked if they do follow up on those and assess to see if they have become part of protocol that was recommended.

Mr. Lawrence answered they conduct enquires of the board of management to find where the problems are each year before they do their audit.

Trustee Joki talked about school assets and liabilities at the middle and high schools and the ending fund balances for some of the schools and asked Mr. Lawrence to comment on the size of some of those fund balances.

Mr. Lawrence answered this was student or supporter money that has come in and was raised for specific purposes and essentially, the school is holding this in trust at their location. It is not part of the districts funding and that is why they don't do procedures on it.

Trustee Joki asked if they test as to the revenue source.

Mr. Lawrence replied they do not.

Trustee Joki asked if questions regarding that should go back to Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Lawrence replied that yes, those questions should go to Mr. Simpson.

Chairman Dean noted as a point of clarification for the audience members, the audit is not how we spend our money but the accounting practices and if it looks free of errors and hopefully gives protection over any malfeasance or embezzlement.

Mr. Lawrence replied their duty is to make sure the financial statements are done according to generally accepted accounting principles.

Trustee Sayles asked if this was posted on the web site so the audience would be able to peruse it.

Mr. Lawrence replied it will be. The document is in draft form until the board approves it for issuance. Mr. Lawrence continued his review by directing the board to the information on the general fund beginning in 2010 which shows revenues, expenditures, other financing sources and uses coming through that account for a change in fund balance.

Chairman Dean was sure that nobody on the board or district would want to use up most of the fund balance but that is the situation they have been in lately. Ms. Dean stated her appreciation in Mr. Lawrence's participation at the meeting this evening.

Trustee Vuittonet thanked Mr. Lawrence for the audit and asked if he would say this is a stellar audit.

Mr. Lawrence replied that it was a very clean audit.

Trustee Vuittonet stated probably cleaner than most for the size of the entity. It reflects well on the financial system and the care taken by our finance people.

Mr. Lawrence replied that if he remembers the historical perspective, it was not always that way. The board and staff has made a conscious decision to invest in the infrastructure and the results are no findings or deficiencies.

Trustee Vuittonet thanked Mr. Lawrence for the report and commended the district staff for their work.

Chairman Dean called for a motion to accept the audit report. Trustee Vuittonet moved, Trustee Madsen seconded and the vote was unanimous to approve the 2014-15 audit report.

Transportation Update

Joe Yochum provided an update to trustees stating the letter of apology from Don Kissell of Cascade Transportation had been received and was posted on the district web site with the action plan that had been reviewed at the previous meeting. The email sent to parents seeking data on families who had given up on receiving bus service has resulted in 180 responses. Of the responses, 132 have been closed and the rest are in progress. The vast majority of the dialogues have been bus stop changes and requests for transportation. In the area of special education, all students are routed with the exception of new students. Cascade has not met their expectation of having those new students routed in 3-5 days. Concerns have been expressed to Cascade that some special education students are on buses for more than an hour and that drivers are not trained. They are working to refine the job shuttle for the 18-21 year old program. Cascade has shown success in the transfer of student data, the bus portal is up

and running, they have established a toll free number for after hour issues, overcrowded buses have been addressed and Jim Lasky, a supervisor from out of state, is still on site. Mr. Yochum addressed additional concerns that include oversight from Ms. Lee and Ms. Carson; customer service is still a problem based on parent and student input, the routing position is understaffed and communication is lacking. Cascade has explained their intent to hire a highly skilled router to cover two current positions at their facility. A satisfaction survey will be sent out the first of November and the results will be shared with trustees at the November board meeting. He, Mr. Exline, and Ms. Carson will continue to monitor the situation with weekly meetings.

Trustee Madsen asked if the district has reached a consensus of the cost of services to fortify CST and if we have been reimbursed.

Mr. Yochum replied he is still working on those costs and he has been assured CST will reimburse the expense.

Chairman Dean was pleased to hear they are making progress and there is still someone on site. She was not okay with the timing to get new students on buses and the special ed issues. She asked Mr. Yochum how long it would take to have the system accessible to patrons and students in the format and quality of service they expect.

Mr. Yochum replied that once the new router is hired, it will cut down on the amount of time taken to place students. They have been impacted by the shortage of help to establish routes and stops.

Chairman Dean asked if they have a highly skilled person in mind or if they are looking for someone.

Mr. Yochum replied they are looking for someone.

Chairman Dean asked if he or Miranda would help provide training for the new router, or are we relying on Cascade to provide the training and support.

Mr. Yochum replied they are relying on Cascade to provide that support and training. He felt it was an excellent point and they should visit with them and make sure the district is part of that process.

Trustee Madsen asked if there was a procedure in place if there is a complaint of a nature that puts the district at risk. For example, unwanted sexual activity towards a student on the bus. By contracting services, do we lose the ability to adequately monitor and intervene in situations where some inappropriate activity would occur?

Mr. Yochum replied, it was decided Cascade would still follow our transportation handbook and an investigation would be conducted in cooperation with the district.

Chairman Dean opened the floor to comment.

Bob Learsch, 8955 S. Broken Wheel Lane, Kuna, Idaho

Mr. Learsch asked if there had been an audit done for 2014-15, and whether the district had realized the \$1.5M savings on the transportation budget. The audit should include the cost of the fuel, maintenance, the bond issue that was floated

for that and the use of buses and everything else. He continued that if that figure was not realized, 300 people had their lives torn apart and are down 40-50% of what they had as employees of the district. They have an enormous number of new drivers and he thought people should know before the bond vote on the 3rd, was this amount realized or was this done for no savings?

Chairman Dean directed the question to Mr. Yochum and Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Yochum replied the district has seen the \$1.5M in savings which includes the cost of bus replacement through the capital process. There was a certain amount saved in what we paid to Cascade, somewhere around \$300,000, but when you add everything cumulatively, the savings was closer to the \$1.5M.

Mr. Simpson stated Mr. Yochum covered almost everything except mid-day kindergarten busing. When it was cut, they saved \$1.3M, and then it was a service added back as part of the contract. If the district was still running this program, we would have had to buy replacement buses.

Chairman Dean stated they would bring a more detailed explanation of the savings to the next board meeting.

Report on Board Meeting
Relocation and ADA
Compliance

Mr. Yochum reviewed three options for ADA compliance with trustees.

The first option is to keep the meetings in this location and to add ADA compliant signs to the District Service Center, along with other signs, to create a clear path to the board meeting – this option would also place one staff member at the front entrance to assist with transition. The cost of signs would be \$135-\$273; and by flexing time, there would be no cost for one staff member to assist in the front lobby. If the board decided to pay time and a half for the staff member to stay three hours to help with transition, the costs would be dependent on the staff member's hourly rate.

The second option is to relocate the board room –move the dais to the Salmon Room and build infrastructure. The dais is 23 feet long and will fit in this room. Estimated costs would be \$40,067.

The third option is to relocate the board room – move the dais to the Clearwater Room and build infrastructure. Estimated costs would be \$55,992.

Chairman Dean asked if the capacity in the Salmon and Clearwater rooms was similar, more or less than the current room.

Mr. Yochum replied the Salmon room is similar to the current board room and the Clearwater is about 25% less capacity.

Trustee Joki asked if the staff consulted with an ADA compliance officer or the fire marshal considering egress out of room located on the second floor in the case of an emergency as opposed to a first floor room.

Mr. Yochum replied he had no discussions along those lines but he had spoken with Ed Daniels from Hummel Architects who designed this facility and was told the room was ADA compliant when it was constructed. There was no discussion on the egress.

Chairman Dean opened the floor for public comment.

Monte Palmer – 6128 North Spurwing, Meridian, Idaho

Mr. Palmer asked if the board had considered an option to reach out to the city to use the city council chambers and partner with them to save \$40,000-\$55,000.

Mr. Exline replied they have not. The board used the city council chamber in the past but there could be a conflict with their city council meetings.

Trustee Vuittonet concurred the city council was meeting tonight, and the board would have to change nights if they wish to use that space.

Chairman Dean stated she would be okay changing nights if they could save \$40,000 but she was just one person. She asked if this was something they would have the district staff look into.

Trustee Vuittonet stated this seemed to be a lot of cost and staying in the current location would be the least expensive. He would like to put the move on hold and see how they do with folks needing ADA and to see if there is an issue. If it comes up in the future and patrons say this is difficult or complain, then look at moving forward with the change. He proposed they watch and monitor before this money is spent.

Trustee Joki understood the concern about cost, but he also understands what a single compliance violation would cost and it would exceed these costs many times over. He suggested another alternative, try one of these rooms without the AV equipment. A number of districts don't have this elaborate sound system setup and he was not sure what it adds, particularly when they might be meeting in a smaller room. He requested that staff have conversations with the City of Meridian and the City of Eagle to see if they would like to host one or more of the meetings. There are a number of second meetings and they could have one of those in the Salmon room and see how comfortable that space is. He would like for the board to try some of the alternatives before they forget about this particular item.

Chairman Dean asked if it would be okay to seek out other alternatives and stated her appreciation for Mr. Palmer sharing the idea with them.

Trustee Sayles commented there are five very large high schools, and asked if they have meeting rooms. Why not move the meetings to a different location so we are more accessible rather than using the central location.

Mr. Yochum replied that all five high schools have auditoriums of various sizes that could be used.

Trustee Vuittonet stated there was a point and time the board did move around to different high schools and they found it be confusing to the patrons as to where the meetings would be held even though the meetings were posted.

Chairman Dean stated no action was required and thanked Mr. Yochum for his report.

Ms. Leeds replied they had submitted some information to the state in July with the understanding we would be updating the policy and evaluation form to include the 33% and 67% as required by law. The State Department has been very gracious to us, she would prefer that it be passed tonight but if it is an issue, they can have another reading. In response to previous questions from the board, there currently is a short form for Category 1, 2, and 3 staff. They are required to have an evaluation at the beginning or end of each semester, and we have allowed principals to use the short form for that.

Chairman Dean stated than in best keeping with open meeting laws, the policy will be placed on the next board meeting and they will deal with the evaluation forms this evening.

Chairman Dean requested a brief description of categories 1, 2 and 3.

Ms. Leeds explained that by state code, Category 1, 2, and 3 is an annual contract given to teachers in their first three years of teaching. A Category 1 contract is typically given to a teacher that is hired after August 1 and has no promise of ongoing or continuing employment. Category 2 and 3 are still annual contracts but the due process rights increase. Our district separates Category 2 contracts into 2a and 2b to make sure we are providing adequate mentoring. Category 2a is a teacher hired before August 1 and Category 2b teachers are in their second year of teaching. A Category 3 contract is continuing and that is where the other form comes in. The regular evaluation form is extensive, it is the complete Danielson format, has all of the domains exactly as the current rubric for Danielson. It includes the two components reported to ISEE (67% professional practice and 33% achievement). She pointed out the evaluation used for Category 1, 2, and 3 uses domains two and three, which are the domains that are observable. If the evaluation is too short, new teachers are not getting the feedback they need from the principal. The second form is for the rock stars. For two years the "rock stars" would get this form and in the third year, the long form. Part of the reason they went to the same form for everyone was the requirement in the Luna laws for a retroactive RIF. The district was required to have the exact same scoring because RIF was no longer based on seniority but on performance.

Ms. Leeds continued her discussion with the professional learning plan. She commended the teachers on the committee, and how intuitive they were about the teacher's needs. The purpose of the PLP is to conform to the new career ladder law. It is their belief this form is very minimalist compared to other districts in the area, and feedback indicates 99% of teachers will do far more. Conversations principals should be as teacher directed as possible. The teacher will pick the rubric to create and decide on pre- and post-tests. There will be multiple ways for them to show growth. This has been a great start, as the career ladder law changes, it will give them a basis to see if this is the right form. Ms. Leeds would like to bring the committee back to see how things went in their schools.

Chairman Dean stated for those in attendance, RIF means a reduction in force. Teachers are assigned a qualitative score and then listed numerically and staff with the lowest score would be let go.

Ms. Leeds reminded trustees that 120 teaching positions were cut during the downturn, but with retirements and teachers moving out of the district, they were able to keep everyone employed except a .167 position.

Chairman Dean asked if the PLP is a state requirement now or is it becoming one?

Ms. Leeds replied it is a state requirement as you move through the career ladder and end up with the master teacher premium and professional endorsement. After four years of data is collected, it might be part of qualifying them for an increase in salary. The administration would like to put it in place now, the goal setting is important, and the district will need to be able to track data through the fourth year of the ladder. If we don't have the data, we won't be able to help teachers access the master premium and professional endorsement.

Chairman Dean clarified that it is not required now, but it won't put a block for teachers earning their master premiums.

Ms. Leeds stated it is required for first year teachers now, and they would like veteran teachers to have access to that potential.

Chairman Dean stated her concerns about the amount of time taken for principals to do evaluations.

Ms. Leeds replied it would take more time, but a conversation is worth as much time as they need, it is really about professional practice. The feedback they have received from principals is that it is good to get back and connect with both the teams and the teachers.

Chairman Dean opened the floor to public comment.

Sue Darden – 1858 West Santa Clara, Meridian, Idaho

Ms. Darden made the following statement:

“Thank you for the opportunity to share my concerns about the Professional Learning Plan guidelines and the teacher evaluation.

I realize that state law dictates that 33% of the evaluation must be based on student achievement, and I will work with my principal to create a goal, but then what? On page 8 of the evaluation form for student achievement, it says, “choose one”, but there are no choices.

I'm assuming the committee meant distinguished, proficient, basic, and unsatisfactory, but what determines if I am proficient or distinguished on this goal? Is meeting the goal of having 50% + 1 of my students showing growth itself proficient, or is that distinguished? If it is proficient, what does it take to be distinguished?

Since 67% of the evaluation is based on the Danielson model, won't that automatically determine if I am proficient or distinguished? What happens if my student achievement is exceptionally high, but I only have 11 distinguished categories instead of the 12 required on the evaluation to be distinguished? I would be proficient on 67%, but possibly distinguished on 33%. How exactly will these two score be melded together for one overall rating?

I do appreciate that I get to work with my principal on the goals, but how much guidance are administrators receiving? Will one principal allow a goal based on growth on a unit test while another requires growth over multiple units or a semester? We do need flexibility because of the wide variety of ages and subjects being taught, but when administrators are trained, what will they be told? If a teacher feels that their administrator is requiring more than a similar teacher at another school, will there be an appeals process?

Another concern is that rumors are flying throughout the district that administrators are being told to limit the number of distinguished teachers so that the numbers of teachers in each category forms more of a bell curve. Is there a quota on the number of teachers who can be distinguished? At Galileo, we consistently score near the top of the district on state tests, but there is concern that only a small percentage of us can be considered distinguished. These rumors are prevalent and very concerning. Teachers are extremely frustrated and discouraged by the whole evaluation process. Teachers have been told by evaluators in this district that receiving a "proficient" is good and that "distinguished" will be rare. "Why bother?" is being heard frequently in conversations. There is this imaginary \$4000 carrot that MIGHT appear in four years, but honestly, most of us don't trust the legislature to deliver on that.

An award-winning teacher told me that she has always done her best every day to try to help her students to grow and become the productive citizens that we all want. Evaluations and fantasy money are not what motivates her. She just feels that it is very sad that she has always been considered a distinguished teacher but now she will spend the last couple of years of her career as "proficient" because of this evaluation, and rumors of a quota by the district, make it impossible for her to be distinguished.

Why are teacher concerned about the evaluation?

I do believe the teacher evaluation itself is biased against elementary teachers. For instance in Domain 1, D, to be distinguished the teacher needs to have ongoing relationships with colleges or universities. If I don't need any credits, do not have a student teacher, and don't teach concurrent credit, how am I supposed to do that? In the same category it says "teacher pursues apprenticeships to increase discipline knowledge. Seriously, when do I have the time, and where would I apprentice to improve my discipline knowledge for sixth grade math?

In Domain III, section C, to be distinguished, "students take initiative to adapt the lesson by 1- modifying a learning task to make it more meaningful or relevant to their needs, 2- suggesting modifications to the grouping patterns used, and/or 3- suggesting modifications or additions to the materials used. I spend hours and hours designing engaging, differentiated lessons and I will be "proficient" because my students do not modify my lessons. I teach 6th grade, and I can't fathom this. How do you expect a kindergartner to initiate a change in lessons? If this is required for distinguished, why hasn't the district offered in-service so that we could even begin to understand what that means?

In Domain IV, which is professional responsibilities, section B, which is maintaining accurate records, a teacher can only be distinguished if, "students contribute to and maintain records indicating their progress in learning, and

students contribute to maintaining non-instructional records for the class.” NOTHING that I do in this category counts towards a distinguished rating. I work hard to keep Power School up to date, but I am somehow supposed to have my students keep a separate record of their grades? This really concerns me with the stress on student privacy. And, wow, a kindergartner keeping their own records, seriously? Training on how to achieve this would be greatly appreciated!

Some of the same issues arise in Domain IV, section B, which is communicating with families. For a teacher to be distinguished the students have to regularly develop materials to inform their families about the instructional program, maintain accurate records about their learning progress, and frequently share that information with their families. Students also contribute to regular and ongoing projects designed to engage families in the learning process.

I have a master’s degree in Curriculum and Instruction, and I really have no clue how I can continue to provide high quality instruction on the state standards, and still find the time and knowledge to become distinguished in the categories I have mentioned.

In conclusion, I appreciate the time and energy that the committee put into creating the professional learning plan guidelines, and the evaluation, but I am concerned about how the scores meld together to form the final rating, the bias on the evaluation, which makes some categories almost impossible to get a distinguished on, and the lack of training provided to teachers on how to achieve distinguished in every category. Thank you”.

Chairman Dean clarified some of Ms. Darden’s key points about training on some aspects of the evaluation, bias against elementary teachers, the appeals process, flexibility, their ability to work with the principals, a rumor of a bell curve on the quota of teachers marked distinguished and that the distinguished mark would be rare.

Trustee Sayles thanked Ms. Darden for her passion in teaching. Our teachers are passionate, and they give that to students every day.

Ms. Leeds explained there is absolutely no quota for the number of teachers receiving the distinguished mark. The state requires districts to adopt the Danielson model. They have done a lot of training with principals about making the evaluation fair and trained them on the professional learning plan. This first year there will be a lot of give and take and they want as many teachers as possible to be successful and have a voice in the process. The administration’s concern is to make sure there is enough consistency and continuity in the buildings. At the next leadership meeting, they will tie all of these parts together. The most important thing is to put this in place, bring it back with input and to let teachers tell them what worked and what didn’t.

Ms. Thomason added a comment about student’s record keeping. They want students to become full partners in learning. This may appear to be duplicating the efforts of teachers, but students need to be aware of their assignments and be part of that process. She would like the opportunity to review the sections Ms. Darden talked about and give teachers more information on what they are trying to convey.

Chairman Dean clarified that to be marked distinguished, they don't have to have every item marked distinguished.

Ms. Leeds responded her belief is that principals want to give the highest mark they can. Last year there were 492 distinguished and 1300 proficient teachers in the district and they want to be able to move them forward.

Chairman Dean asked if there was any way they can communicate to staff there are no restrictions on the number of teachers marked distinguished.

Ms. Leeds responded they would do that.

Chairman Dean asked if the committee will continue to meet through the year.

Ms. Leeds answered she would like for them to reconvene throughout the year to get feedback.

Chairman Dean stated that if teachers have questions or concerns, they can contact the committee.

Trustee Joki remarked that he had asked for broad based teacher involvement and a board member on the committee when they met. Is there a way to get faculty more involved now. He is hearing a sense of concern and confusion and the importance of the system is weighing heavy on them. The state department will be generous and if they aren't, they will have to take that under consideration. Could they take this model and give a month of meeting time at each school and let the teachers speak up now instead of at the end.

Ms. Leeds responded they do not want teachers to feel pressure. They want to do what is right for teachers, principals and students learning. This is about how student learning is measured. She will call on the team and share they need time for more broad based input.

Trustee Joki remarked this is something they should do to satisfy teachers, not the committee. He hoped they can have focused meetings at the schools. Let the teachers complete some interactive model of what are their biggest concerns. In regards to the profession learning plan, he is having trouble finding that it is a requirement in IDAPA and in statute. They need a fair and consistent policy and he wants that to be their priority.

Ms. Leeds replied they would have some difficulty coming up with a team to go to 52 buildings. The principal and the assistant principal need to be part of that and they will talk about it at the next leadership team meeting. The committee wants what is best for teachers, but she is trying to hit a deadline.

Ms. Thomason explained the PLP is somewhat hidden in the law. One place to look is under receiving a professional endorsement, and the second place is the master premium. It is one of the criteria that comes into effect July 1, 2018.

Trustee Madsen shared a few comments on what she observed in reading the document. This is illustrative on how teachers can become disenfranchised with the process. She would not want her parenting judged by criteria that is part of the evaluation. We need to find things that are achievable. We can't say there is an opportunity to achieve when we know these are not meaningful. If it needs to be different at the grade school or high school level, then it should

be. The state funding is elusive, could they use this year to deploy these two pieces and collect data from the administrative side and from those who were evaluated? Then come up with a document that best represents all entities without fear or confusion.

Ms. Leeds answered they have to submit something to the state department. We will be audited and they will want to look at our documents. The district will need to show what they are doing. We can do this as a draft and a process, then use this to gauge for this year and see if it worked.

Trustee Sayles ran the numbers and they indicate only 24% of the teaching staff was considered distinguished this year. Her belief is every teacher promotes the learning process within a school. The district continues to be above the state norms and to reach these achievements, there has to be more than 25% of the teachers that are distinguished. She realizes we are limited to the Danielson, and we model our evaluation based on that. It doesn't mean we have to copy and she would like to see more distinguished areas that are attainable to a teacher. Our district is continually above the norm, which means the teachers are above the norm. Being defined as proficient means all of their hard work and passion is not recognized, which causes teacher burnout. She doesn't want to see teacher's burnout when they are not recognized for all of the work they do every day. When the form is reworked, she would like to see the distinguished not a copy of Danielson, but reflective of the achievement within the district. She likes the short plan, they can look at this and principals won't spend two hours doing this because the time commitment is unrealistic. Where is the form for the continuing contract people?

Ms. Leeds replied the continuing contract piece is the really short form. If the board agrees to that, every third year they would get the full evaluation. There are two different short forms, one is for continuing contract. Ms. Leeds continued that some districts choose not to have a distinguished category at all and she did not feel that was fair. The district had their own evaluation before the Danielson which had significantly different information in distinguished, she will try and find that form and bring it for the board to consider.

Chairman Dean asked if action was needed to accept this as a draft form.

Ms. Leeds replied they need to start working on it and get input.

Trustee Vuittonet asked if the district can get by with a draft and meet the timelines with the state.

Ms. Leeds stated that she believed so. The most important piece is the evaluation policy that will need to be reflective of this. She will send in the PLP and evaluation as drafts and explain the board has requested more time to do a more in-depth study.

Trustee Vuittonet asked if there was any drop dead calendar date.

Ms. Leeds replied the drop dead date was July 1st, they wanted to engage the teachers but couldn't get them in the summer.

Trustee Vuittonet stated his appreciation of including the teachers in the process and asked how much time it would take to go to every building.

Ms. Leeds stated the problem was they didn't want to be talking to teachers on January 30th for something they could have been working on earlier. In the PLP plan the teacher also helps decide the interval. The administration will work with principals about what is a logical interval.

Trustee Vuittonet clarified the district had their own evaluation form and then went to the Danielson model because the state wanted it.

Ms. Leeds stated that was correct, but the form does not have to be exact. It has been a frustration of the principals to spend two hours working on the evaluation. They imbedded Danielson in different places in our own rubric, assessment was separate and there were six domains which made it a much longer evaluation. The principals were required to be trained in Teachscape and would have to recalibrate and keep up on that certification.

Trustee Vuittonet stated that what he is hearing is the district can modify and change some things that teachers have issues with.

Chairman Dean called for a motion on accepting the draft form of the evaluation. Trustee Sayles made a motion to accept the personal learning plan, the short form, the super short form and long form as drafts. The motion was seconded by Trustee Vuittonet and passed unanimously.

Dr. Mandy White reviewed the administrator evaluation form explaining that three years prior the form was created using the Danielson model and submitted to the state. The draft was sent back for a rewrite. A year ago the district chose to follow the Idaho principal evaluator framework, which is in alignment with the teacher framework. The form was piloted this year and they found the distinguished category on the form caused the principal to go out of their building to accomplish the work to attain the distinguished mark. Their committee looked at that and decided the principal should stay in the building. They thought district personnel could do that with their input. Those were the changes the board saw last month. The professional leaving plan is a goal setting process, which isn't new to principals. What is new is the creation of the professional learning plan in addition to student achievement and alignment with the teacher professional learning plan. She stated that principals have the same concerns with the evaluation as teachers. The student achievement piece is uncharted territory. Principals are looking at their professional learning plan to see what goals are effective for student achievement. They feel it will be an ongoing procedure and are hoping to develop goals that are at an appropriate interval. She shared an example of the professional learning plan which looks similar to the teacher plan. They are struggling with the part that measures student achievement. What is an appropriate target, what is appropriate rigor, how do we standardize the process? This is something that is new, we are the trailblazers. She would like the board to consider their plan and evaluation and if it is a draft the board could approve for submittal. They would continue with the principals revisiting this all year, and amend in the spring as needed.

Chairman Dean stated the teacher's professional learning plan is tied to the hope and promise of additional funds. There is no additional monetary interest for principals.

Dr. White responded the draft lends a model of consistency and continuity which principals are happy to do.

Trustee Sayles made a motion to approve the draft form of the principal evaluation and professional learning plan. The motion was seconded by Trustee Madsen and passed unanimously.

The board recessed at 7:21 p.m. and reconvened at 7:39 p.m.

Strategic Plan/Continuous Improvement Plan

Jackie Thomason provided an overview of the steps taken to formulate the new document based on Trustee Joki's analysis. The analysis was discussed and based on state statute, they identified the key goals of the strategic plan. The format was redesigned and reorganized; and sections were added and reformatted. The table of contents page has required elements as identified by statute and suggestions from Trustee Joki. There will be a letter from the board chairman and the page has been reorganized with the mission statement and belief. There will be a high level view of the demographics of our students. The new data includes a statistic that is not generally seen and that is what part of the graduating class has been through our system. That gives a sense of mobility and stability of the student body. With a focus on student outcomes, they took the current plan and identified five key areas:

- 1- Instructional quality, they wrote ideas on what they were looking for. Hiring highly trained teachers, developing rigorous curricula and providing on-going professional development to our staff.
- 2- Responsive learning opportunities. A responsive system responds to strengths and needs.
- 3- College, career, and citizenship at multiple levels.
- 4- Safe and supportive schools. This captured how they want to provide a supportive learning environment both physically and emotionally.
- 5- Family and community engagement. This area was identified as needing strengthened and there was recognition they needed improvement.

Included is the key performance indicators and data that has been given to the board previously. An organizational chart connects with sections of the plan.

At the end of the document, they pulled the goals and strategies that matched each of the five key areas. They notated what goal was in the original plan as well as which strategies were pulled over.

Chairman Dean stated this change is more visually appealing and looks easier to digest.

Trustee Joki thanked Jackie and her staff. He believes this is what parents have been asking about and it speaks to the transparencies they have talked about. It is an excellent improvement and he offered his congratulations.

Update on the number of teachers, administrators and support staff added this year

Ms. Leeds provided an historical overview of staff allowance vs. actual from 2009 through projections for 2016. She reminded trustees this was general fund FTE. If you compare our position in 2009, we were over the state allotment by 36 teachers. As they moved through the cuts in 2012, we were down 126 teachers to try and balance the budget. Currently we are at 1922 with the 22 staff awarded. They have also added another .5 ERR teacher at Barbara Morgan and .5 ERR at River Valley because of the numbers of students they have, and a 1.0 SLP. On admin we qualify for 135 and have 117, which is an

increase of 1.17 over the previous year. In classified we qualify for 676 and the actual is 650. There are more classified in special funds such as paraprofessional and fund service. There are about 212 additional classified not paid out of general fund and about 100 extra FTE in certified paid out of special funds like title and special ed.

Chairman Dean asked if the reason we qualify for more than we have is because we pay more than the state gives us for those positions.

Ms. Leeds replied we qualify for more than we have because of the number of students we have, we qualify by the virtue of our population and our ADA. The district qualifies for 1,984 and we only hire 1,922. They continue to make up for the loss of 126 positions.

Trustee Madsen asked if Ms. Leeds could tell her whether they need more staff in specific areas and if so, have they addressed it.

Ms. Leeds explained that at this time of year it becomes problematic when you have to shift kids out of classrooms, which is hard on the students. She would want to take a look at middle and high schools at the semester for increases. Some school gave back their FTE because hiring at this time would have created issues in their schedules. She will look at hot spots at the semester and is watching the elementary where a .5 interventionist may have to be added so there is no classroom disruption. She will let them know.

Trustee Joki asked about the roving special education teachers, how do they look at the ratio there and provide assistance. This would be a teacher that has multiple schools assigned, how do they reduce the caseloads.

Ms. Leeds replied special education director Ramona Lee is working on that. They will look again to see what they need after the SLP and ERR positions are added. There has been an uncontrollable influx of students they can't plan for and if caseloads are too large, they will need to analyze and possibly come back to ask for additional FTE.

Trustee Joki commented he would appreciate having that report from Ms. Leeds and Ms. Lee in terms of sped ed caseloads and how they are looking at that issue.

Review of Supplemental Levy Campaign

Eric Exline gave a brief update on where he is at in the process of getting supplemental levy information out and making the materials less complicated and more understandable. Those materials will appear first electronically on the web site and should receive about 37,000 views a day. Then he begins other methods of electronic distribution, making sure the information remains consistent. This information is intended to be factual and not persuasive, that is the intent of the law. He will begin using the parent notification system and in addition, will rely on the media and community groups to get the information out. Mr. Exline handed out a copy of the mailer that will be sent to every mailing address in the district to let them know there is an election.

Trustee Joki noted that Mr. Exline had done some speaking engagements and assumed that a number of the board would be available and happy to accompany him to speak to the importance of the election.

Mr. Exline made note of Trustee Joki's suggestion and will keep it in mind when he receives invitations to speak.

Chairman Dean asked if the cost of the mailing and printing will be covered by the district or the foundation.

Mr. Exline replied that an outside organization can use their funds to advocate a yes vote. This mailer does not advocate a yes vote and the printing and mailing cost of \$16,000 will be paid by the district.

Chairman Dean opened the floor for comment.

Kendra Wisenbaker, 620 North 6th Street, Boise, Idaho

Ms. Wisenbaker, president of the Meridian Education Association, offered her support as well as the members of their organization to help pass the levy renewal. They know the issues the districts faces as enrollment continues to rise. Overcrowded classrooms, insufficient space, and scarcity of technology and resources. If this levy fails, the district stands to lose teachers, which means even larger class sizes and less individualized instruction. The teachers are dedicated to the students and profession and the Meridian Education Association will do everything they can to support this levy renewal. She hopes they could work together and stated the primary focus should be the importance of the yes vote.

Chairman Dean reminded those in attendance the district cannot advocate a yes vote on school time or property but could on their own time and outside the school boundaries and stated her appreciation of their support.

State School District
Transparency Laws

Alex Simpson responded to the article in the Idaho Education News that indicated the district was not in compliance on one item. The contracts were on the web site the first year the law took effect. All the expenditures, budget, and audit are on the web site but the contracts were not posted the last couple of years, which was an oversight. The information is now on the district web site and the district is in compliance at this time.

Chairman Dean stated that nobody likes to be notified in public they made a mistake and her appreciation for his willingness to correct the issue.

Trustee Sayles asked how the information was put on the web site, she has looked at contracts in the past and they don't seem to be in alphabetical order or any rhyme or reason.

Mr. Simpson replied the list of all employees is in alphabetical order for every employee including classified and certified. There is a disclaimer at the top about employee's exempt status for addresses.

Chairman Dean opened the floor for public comment.

Bob Neugebauer, 2189 North Arment Way, Meridian, Idaho

Mr. Neugebauer, who publishes the Gem State Patriot.com, thanked the board for recent attempts to bring more transparency to the district. As the largest school district in the state, it is critical that the district set an example for the other 163 districts and charter schools. He finds it unfortunate there has been a movement to recall members of the board, they feel that those promoting this recall are like the prosecutor asking the jury for a verdict before all the evidence

is heard. Of the 164 districts, only fifteen districts are in compliance with the state transparency laws. It has become clear that transparency is an important obligation especially given that the K-12 education comprises more than half of the state budget. Perhaps district's that can't get their act together should be barred from seeking tax increases. If they can't be transparent about how they're spending taxpayer money, they shouldn't be allowed to ask for more. He believes the board is moving in the right direction and applauds and supports them in the supplemental levy. He hopes they would remain steadfast to improve transparency and accountability and continue to serve the best interest of the taxpayers.

Chairman Dean stated her appreciation of his efforts and support of levy. She reminded the audience that to be in compliance with open meeting laws, they could not discuss anything of a political nature or leanings one way or another.

Proposed Revision to
Technology Use Agreement

Chairman Dean explained there was an issue when new trustees joined the board whether or not the agreement to use district email was appropriate since they were signing the same agreement as employees. She asked if there has been any adjustment or is there is a new agreement for the trustees to sign.

Devan Delashmutt replied, not at this time. He has done research on the form they were asked to sign and background on why we have this particular document in place. As to whether the board should or should not sign the document, he has done research on policies and our email policy and whether the board should be included in those policies, but has not applied that specifically to this document.

Trustee Joki stated they were also interested in a review of general policy. There was some comment the general policy could be improved with the insight he would bring to it and he hoped Devan and his staff could examine and bring a policy or form revision in the near future.

Mr. Delashmutt replied had board had recommended he come forward with some recommendations to policy, he has not forgotten about that and has been working on it. The rollout of student devices and a couple of small items he has been working on behalf of the school district has taken time away from the project. He will be doing a comprehensive look over this and the cost if we change those policies.

Chairman Dean stated that student needs come first and requested Mr. Delashmutt let them know when he is ready to review the proposed changes.

School Capacity Fees Policy
Receives First Reading

Trustee Joki deferred to staff and Trustee Vuittonet in terms of expectations and asked if the policy should be read in full or if the proposer of the policy simply reviews it.

Trustee Vuittonet replied the board usually reviews as part of the board packet and sometimes they have a presentation from staff as to what the policy and intent is. In this case, Trustee Joki brought this forward for consideration and the procedure was up to the chair.

Chairman Dean asked Trustee Joki to read the proposed policy in full as a first reading tonight and they will have an update on the meeting regarding school capacity fees.

Trustee Joki stated this was a brief proposal and would be numbered Policy 100.1, titled "School Capacity Fee". The policy was then read in full.

Trustee Joki continued this isn't an unusual concept in other states. Trustee Vuittonet and others were active last year in pushing this forward in the legislature. It wasn't ready in the minds of the legislators and hopefully it is something they will be more receptive to this year. In the meantime, there is a concept that isn't clearly spelled out, policies are meant to be brought forward and then staff develops the operational piece. The board directs the superintendent to work with city, county and state governments to advance school capacity fees and as part of that the staff would be informing city and county planning and zoning as they move forward with new developments, both residential and commercial that will impact our schools. We will as a school district respond and go on the record in the earliest stages and tell them this growth cannot be served by the neighborhood schools. This growth is going to have the following impact on the neighborhood school. There are forms that exist already at the city and county levels that ask for impact. This policy would lead our staff and trustees to be more aggressive in talking to the planning and zoning commissions about the impact these decisions make on our schools. That is the hidden operational piece that he hopes is something that comes into play as well as with this policy. As trustees he thinks they are obligated to inform our sister governments their decisions are part of the reasons why we go out every two or three years to ask for new schools and to ask for operation levies.

Eric Exline reported on the meeting held September 29th with representatives from the City of Meridian, the Eagle Mayor, a Boise city council representative, Ada County, the head of the realtors association, and representatives from the Boise and West Ada school districts. The initial conversation was about what other mechanisms would, in part or whole, pay for schools or have growth contribute more to the cost of building new schools. Last year's legislation started as impact fees legislation. It was diverted into legislation that would have taken a portion of the tax revenue that cities collect as new properties come onto their rolls. In the end what stopped it was it had a technical problem in which it would have been collected and all the new revenue was coming out of our district but its distribution would have gone equally to us, Boise and Kuna. The attempt of putting this group together is worthwhile and it does go to the heart of what Trustee Joki is talking about. They are trying to come up with a plan that all stakeholders that have different interests will support and take that the legislature to say we have all come here shoulder to shoulder and we all agree with this idea. The problem has been recognized, and school districts need help, especially when they are growing like ours. The committee has been broken down into working groups. His task was to research ways other states have figured out how to pay for schools besides bonding at 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ majority. The subcommittee will meet on the 19th and the entire committee will come together on the 30th. The hope is come up with legislation they can take to the legislature. He reminded trustees that having spent a great deal of time at the legislature, not to give up in the first year, sometimes it takes time and they need to be persistent.

Chairman Dean asked if there was a broad sense of support.

Mr. Exline replied he could describe it as a broad sense of support. They recognize we have a genuine issue. The lottery money was supposed to be directed to high growth areas, not distributed equally to all school districts. Our piece is not as large as it could have been. They need to find a common solution. There are lots of examples throughout the country and the committee will look at all possibilities. It may not just be one idea, it may be several that will be brought forward as a means to at least help pay for growth. Mr. Exline suggested the last paragraph of the proposed policy read "the board supports school capacity fees to be used for the construction of, and acquisition of sites for construction".

Trustee Vuittonet stated that last year was an interesting situation. They did move forward but in the end had to pull it back because the distribution wasn't going our way. They did have some allies with IACI and the realtors were supportive. This is a good opportunity to move forward and he appreciated this group working together. Last year the cities were not happy about the legislation taking part of their budgeted revenue. Now they are talking and that is a good thing.

Trustee Madsen wondered if they could develop a form that is simple and is a good succinct response to new development. She has heard from people that go to planning and zoning meetings they never see anyone from the district. These folks are frustrated because their kids are in overcrowded schools and there is no one there saying their school is overcrowded. That form could be sent and it could accurately depict the reality. It could include hard numbers that at least start the conversation. Legislatively there has to be a change, but just the school district taking an informative role in that process would help.

Mr. Exline replied the district provides that information to all municipalities. When a plat is received, they calculate the number of students that it will produce, the schools those children will attend, and the current enrollment at that school. Those numbers are calculated provided to the county or cities who are proposing the development. The letter does not take a position, it has been revised a number of times, and does not say the district is opposed but gives them information about their development. The statutes provide that we, as a school district, play an advisory role in terms of planning and zoning decisions. We do provide the letter but it is granular regarding the calculation of kids and the schools they will be attending.

Chairman Dean asked Mr. Exline to bring the form and she will add it to an agenda. She is aware they provide a letter but has been told it doesn't provide all of the information the cities need to make a choice.

Trustee Joki was hopeful staff and trustees will make suggestions to the policy and at the next meeting they should add Mr. Exline's ideas. He requested an email of the meetings that are being held so he can attend.

Trustee Vuittonet asked for clarification this policy is talking about fees. When they talk about informing and impacting, the district will be saying yes or no to any particular subdivision. This is strictly talking about fees attributed to the cost of growth.

Trustee Joki replied that is correct, and that raises a point about needed revision because the operational piece was not included thinking the policy needed to be more general. His intent was to use the form that was described to increase our voice and describing not only the value of school capacity fees, but the impact on neighborhood schools. He will take another shot at proposing revisions for the next reading.

Trustee Vuittonet replied he was a little nervous about that statement, it was not his intent to say they would go forward and make these decisions as a board or policy making group saying we approve this one and not that one. That is a conversation they need to have in the future, maybe through ISBA but right now, with the fact this is about fees, maybe it would be a policy that would be good for us in the future. He expressed his concern with adding a real political piece to this. With all due respect to Trustee Joki, that was not where he was going.

Student Tours, Excursion
and Overnight Trip Requests
for the 2015-2016 School
Year Approved

Trustee Joki observed the amount per student on the request and asked if staff can reassure him the current policy would indicate these levels exceed what is in policy. He believed the policy states a \$400 maximum per student.

Scott Stuart, district activities director, replied that in Policy 503.7 it discusses students are not to exceed two days out of school and \$400 out-of-pocket expense. The policy addresses exceptions to the guidelines beginning on line 82 where it states "when a trip exceeds two (2) school days or \$400 of student out-of-pocket and fund raising expenses, approval must be obtained from the board of trustees at least three (3) months in advance of the expected departure." His practice has been to accumulate requests that exceed the \$400 per student or exceed the two days of missed school and those are presented to the school board for approval.

Trustee Joki replied that gives the clarification. He raised a concern that students are asked to raise a lot of money to have these experiences. Trustee Joki made a motion to approve the requests with the clarification provided. The motion was seconded by Trustee Sayles.

Chairman Dean asked if students are unable to raise the funds, is there help for them.

Mr. Stuart referred to the fund raising policy, which states no student shall be excluded because of financial requirements. Each advisor is charged with making sure every opportunity is available for every student to raise the money.

Chairman Dean asked if the fund raising is done as a collective or per student amount.

Mr. Stuart believed that both occur, there is individual fund raising and group fund raising where they may do an event and the proceeds are shared amongst those who did the work.

Chairman Dean called for the vote and the motion was passed unanimously.

Request to Reschedule
December Board Meeting
Approved

Chairman Dean spoke to the request from the clerk to reschedule the December board meeting from the 15th to the 8th. The clerk will be out of the office and is responsible for posting the agenda and attaching items online and in physical locations. She will be out of town and unable to do the pre-meeting requirements.

Trustee Joki stated his appreciation of the information, but he thinks this is a question that should have been dealt with at the board officer level and is not an appropriate item for the meeting. He continued with a motion to leave the meeting date as December 15th and ask the chair to work something out. The motion was seconded by Trustee Sayles.

Trustee Vuittonet stated that unless this is a burden to the board, he would be okay with it. They have changed dates for different reasons and this seems a reasonable request.

Chairman Dean asked if there was anyone else at the District office capable of posting the meeting agenda and attachments.

Mr. Exline replied there is staff to post online, but no one else has gathered the content that goes into the agenda. We would have to find someone to do that piece.

Chairman Dean called for the vote to keep the December board meeting on the 15th. Trustee Joki voted yes, Trustee Sayles voted yes, Trustee Madsen voted no, Trustee Vuittonet voted no and Chairman Dean voted no. The motion failed with a 2-3 vote.

Trustee Vuittonet made a motion to reschedule the December board meeting to the 8th. The motion was seconded by Trustee Madsen.

Trustee Sayles stated it was imprudent to only have one person doing a job, especially in a district this size. God forbid that she get in an accident and would be in the hospital or unavailable for other things. They need a backup plan at all times.

Trustee Joki stated again, this was a simple mechanical issue to solve, to change the schedule doesn't make sense and he asked board members to reconsider.

Trustee Madsen replied that her support for the change is largely in part for patron and trustee participation. There are so many things occurring in mid-December and she likes moving the meeting to earlier in the month. The other thing is the likelihood of no meeting in November, which appears to be the current schedule, is very low and probably imprudent. Given the amount of construction and ongoing expenses, the board will probably have to meet then as well. She likes the December 8th change because it is more likely to be available to everybody here as well as all the patrons of the district.

Chairman Dean called for the vote to move the December meeting to the 8th. Trustee Joki voted no, Trustee Sayles voted no, Trustee Madsen voted yes, Trustee Vuittonet voted yes and Chairman Dean voted yes. The motion passed with a 3-2 vote.

Request to Participate in the
2016 National Youth
Tobacco Survey Approved

Request to Survey a Sample
of the MHS Student Body as

Trustee Joki expressed his concern with both of the survey requests. They do not contribute to information that is useful to the school district. They are just part of the national data bank and have little meaning. These self-reporting surveys are an irritant to parents as well. He made a motion the district not participate in the National Youth Tobacco survey and the Green Dot survey. The motion was seconded by Trustee Sayles.

Part of the Green Dot
Program Held Over

Trustee Vuittonet realizes the information goes to a national data base but the district gets to share in that information also. In certain areas, they might see higher tobacco use and identify what might be going on. This is information we can look at and see trends. Then we can focus energy and resources to change that trend, it is an area of need. He stated his opposition to the motion and wondered if there was staff to comment on the surveys.

Jeanne Buschine, district counseling and drug ed coordinator, requested the trustees separate the two surveys. The Green Dot survey is in regards to bullying. She addressed the National Youth Tobacco survey and stated while it is true the data goes to a national data base, we are one of only 250 schools in the nation to be surveyed. It is not a big sampling and it is through a well-known entity, the Center for Disease Control. This survey is lengthy compared to the other survey and will take about half of a class block to complete. They will survey ninety students who are not forced to answer and the parents can opt them out.

Trustee Vuittonet asked if Ms. Buschine saw value in the survey.

Ms. Buschine replied the other survey is for local data, this one gives us the opportunity to do a national survey. It would be nice to participate but would not be the end of the world if we did not.

Raelynn Grant, a counselor at MHS, stated the Green Dot program is an anti-bullying program, the data is confidential and students may opt out. It is not pulling from a huge portion of the student body. The data is directed for programming at Meridian High School and would be pertinent for the program.

Chairman Dean asked if they feel confident they can take the results from the survey and use it to implement a strategy for their school.

Ms. Grant replied that was correct. It is funded by the Center for Disease Control and is a national program. They need to have a starting point as with any research that is qualitatively research based.

Chairman Dean asked if the individual student information was protected when these results are sent out.

Ms. Grant replied the information is protected, they can opt out and people who edit the program are the only ones who see the results.

Chairman Dean asked if the survey itself includes any identifying information such as the name or student ID.

Ms. Grant replied there is no way to identify individual students.

Trustee Vuittonet thinks this would be invaluable information. Bullying has gone to another level and is a growing phenomenon. It has affected students in a negative way and he would like see that information. It would help the district fight against bullying.

Trustee Joki asked to see a copy of the survey.

Ms. Grant indicated she had the information with her and she could be happy to distribute. She apologized the information the board was given did not include the questions.

Trustee Joki stated the difficulty of not knowing what kinds of questions are on these surveys. He asked if this needs to be approved tonight.

Ms. Grant replied they wanted as much of the school year as possible. It is a large program with a lot of components to it, approving it sooner would be better, but they would work with whatever the board needs are. If there are questions objectionable to the board, they can discuss amending.

Trustee Joki stated that it has been his experience that when they allow these surveys to go out and don't know what is on the survey, they begin to get blowback from the parents and kids that we are asking my child this and that. He stated his reluctance to agree to participate in a program until they have had a full opportunity to look at what these questions are.

Ms. Grant apologized the survey was not included.

Chairman Dean asked Trustee Joki if he would modify the motion to put the Green Dot survey on the next meeting following the review of the survey questions.

Trustee Joki modified his motion to place the Green Dot Prevention Strategy program on the next meeting with the proviso that staff send the survey to trustees prior to the meeting.

Chairman Dean asked about the National Youth Tobacco Survey.

Trustee Joki stated his opposition to that survey.

Trustee Joki's amended motion to table discussion on the Green Dot Prevention Strategy program was seconded by Trustee Sayles.

Trustee Madsen spoke to the National Youth Tobacco survey stating her inclination to support both surveys. She understands Trustee Joki's concern with how sensitive parents are to questions that we might think are just helping their kids, but sometimes parents believe that any questions relating to sexual behavior, for example, is not our business. She also would like to see the questions and wondered why both surveys were at Meridian High School.

Ms. Buschine replied the Green Dot program was a choice, Meridian High School was randomly chosen for the National Youth Tobacco survey.

Chairman Dean stated the physical and emotional health of our students is important and she was inclined to support both. The floor was opened for public comment.

Loraine Hand, 11818 West Daniel Drive, Boise, Idaho

Ms. Hand stated she felt Trustee Joki was presumptuous to say that students are not interested in tobacco use. There is a high use of tobacco in the youth population, particularly with vaping. This survey will bring that national information out. Medical research looks at what data is out there to make a

case how dangerous it is. She thinks students are interested, let them do a survey that will help with society in general.

Jill Wrem, 1295 North Bear Creek Place, Meridian, Idaho

Ms. Wrem stated her support of the Green Dot project. She has had kids go through the schools and she works in an elementary school. She supports the project and this is a way for children to get their feelings out in a confidential way. They don't want to come forward if they have to meet someone face to face to tell their story.

Chairman Dean called for a vote on the motion to deny the National Youth Tobacco survey. Trustee Joki voted yes, Trustee Sayles voted yes, Trustee Madsen voted no, Trustee Vuittonet voted no and Chairman Dean voted no. The motion failed on a 2-3 vote.

Trustee Vuittonet made a motion to approve the request to participate in the 2016 National Youth Tobacco Survey. The motion was seconded by Trustee Madsen. Trustee Joki voted no, Trustee Sayles voted no, Trustee Madsen voted yes, Trustee Vuittonet voted yes and Chairman Dean voted yes. The motion passed on a 3-2 vote.

Trustee Sayles seconded the motion to table the Green Dot program survey until they can review the questions at the next meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

Board Reports/Assignments

Chairman Dean stated she had received a letter from students at Meridian High School offering to share ideas on how to prepare students for college and career readiness. She will share with other trustees and if anyone would like to put some of their ideas on future agendas, just to let her know. She also attended the Verizon and Digital Promise grant rollout at Pathways, Crossroads and Meridian Middle last week and it was very exciting. Verizon and Digital Promise have made available for the three schools one-to-one devices for all the students and staff. These are generous gifts and will become effective tools. Verizon will also provide connectivity for students when they leave the school using a cell phone platform and they won't have to rely on Wi-Fi for continued learning outside the school day. A storyteller, who is part of the grant, will document the story and report to the board at a future date.

Trustee Vuittonet also attended the rollout. It was phenomenal and is part of our affiliation with the League of Innovative Schools in which Dr. Clark was an integral part. The grant is for \$3M to help kids understand technology. This is a wonderful program and makes it worthwhile to be a part of education and a trustee.

Trustee Madsen attended the Ag Expo three weeks ago which was an interesting learning experience. Students had a great opportunity to share their skills and projects. The experience gave her genuine appreciation for teachers who have done grant writing and advocated for their programs. They are innovators and maximize their funding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Trustee Sayles made a motion to adjourn and reconvene in executive session under Idaho Code Section 74-206 (1) (a) to consider hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, wherein the respective qualities of

individuals are to be evaluated in order to fill a particular vacancy or need; 74-206 (1) (b) to consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student; 74-206 (1) (f) to communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramification of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated. The mere presence of legal counsel at an executive session does not satisfy this requirement under Idaho Code. The motion was seconded by Trustee Joki and Chairman Dean took a roll call of the board for approval. Trustee Joki voted yes, Trustee Sayles voted yes, Trustee Madsen voted yes, Trustee Vuittonet voted yes and Chairman Dean voted yes. The board moved into executive session at 9:04 p.m.

The board recessed at 10:17 p.m. and reconvened in regular session. (executive session minutes are attached)

ADJOURNMENT

Trustee Sayles moved, Trustee Joki seconded and the vote was unanimous to adjourn the meeting at 10:18 p.m.

Chairman

Clerk