

**Minutes Approved
on November 8, 2005**

Douglas County School District
Regular Meeting
Douglas High School
Minden, Nevada
Tuesday, October 11, 2005
3:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Present were:

Trustees:

Sharla Hales, President
Connie Wennhold, Vice President
Teri Jamin, Clerk
John Louritt, Member
Ron Beck, Member
Cynthia Trigg, Member

Absent: Keith Roman, Member

Personnel:

John Soderman, Superintendent
Rick Kester, Director of Business Services
Rich Alexander, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
Nancy Bryant, Assistant Superintendent, Education Services
Dr. Janice Florey, Director of Grants and Assessments
Dr. Lisa Fontana, Director of Curriculum and Instruction
Susan Lacey, DCPEA President

Others Present:

Mike Nivinskus, Legal Counsel

1. Call to Order

Mrs. Hales called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

A. Ms. Trigg led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Ms. Wennhold made a motion to adopt the agenda, seconded by Ms. Trigg.

Motion carried by a unanimous vote of 6/0.

2. Board Training

Ms. Cheryl Bricker of the Partnership of Community Resources led a Board training titled "The Partnership's Role in Douglas County." She presented highlights on the history and direction of the non-profit partnership developed to create a strong, viable substance abuse prevention and community wellness program. Ms. Bricker explained that the program is based on surveys, data collected, community input and information gathered from across the state and nation. Upon their conclusions they write grants to fulfill needs to be sustained from that effort. She mentioned they recently received a large amount of money. Plans have been implemented to provide a variety of written materials and to assist schools with tutoring, core teacher training, and software purchases as applied for. Several community presentations are being funded including oral cancer prevention and gang resistance.

Mr. Soderman thanked Ms. Bricker for having her eye to the community and shared his appreciation for all that the Partnership contributes.

3. Consent Items (Action)

Ms. Jamin made a motion to approve the following consent items, seconded by Mrs. Wennhold:

- A. Approve the Minutes of the Regular Board meeting held on September 13, 2005.
- B. Approve the Minutes of the Special Board meeting held on September 20, 2005.
- C. Approve personnel actions described in Personnel Report No. 05-10.
- D. Approve payments contained in Voucher No. 1063 for 2005-2006.
- E. Excuse from compulsory attendance the students described in the Home School Report for October 2005.
- F. Approve the final corrective action implemented by the Director of Special Services for the AB 280 incident.
- G. Approve the Amendment of limit language within the District's Early Retirement Incentive Plan, Board Policy No. 332 and No. 425.

Mrs. Hales asked for any discussion or public comment on the Consent agenda.

Motion carried by a unanimous vote.

4. Administrative Reports and Program Reviews

4-A. Principal's Report (Jacks Valley Elementary School)

Mrs. Hales welcomed Jacks Valley Elementary School. Principal Pam Gilmartin, and several of her School Improvement Plan committee members presented their current School Improvement Plan. Ms. Gilmartin shared their three goals, methods of analysis, and implementation of the plan. The group addressed the goals of increasing student achievement in math, creating a more

enriched climate, and improving literacy.

Several teachers presented the Math Action Plan to the Board that will be hung in the lounge, explaining that geometry, measurement, data analysis and algebra were their weakest areas. The team is looking at grade level tracking and providing workshops on-site including teaching data analysis. This goal includes student usage of Plato software if not at grade level. JVES will be reorganizing instruction to present key elements earlier in the year. Ms. Gilmartin has also constructed a resource center for teachers and is currently adding items in order to achieve the math goal.

Next, the goal of improving school climate was addressed including the elimination of sarcasm, implementation of consistent enforcement of the rules, and training on community building in the classrooms. These improvements toward caring and sharing are to include proper lunchroom etiquette.

Literacy is being addressed through collaboration and interventions such as an after school book club, the teaching of students to create class newsletters, and vocabulary fun time, presented by the custodian. Volunteers trained in literacy are another intervention; resources and materials are part of the plan. The committee is researching Reading Camp to see if it is the best way to deliver interventions to students. Training will be forthcoming to teachers on creating well-written and functional PEP plans. They continue to implement Cell and Excel strategies.

Ms. Gilmartin added that they will incorporate math-writing journals in order to have instruction cross over both the literacy and math goals and noted that announcements are now at lunch to increase instructional time.

Mrs. Hales asked for any questions. Board members clarified strategies to be taken for improvement including checking with other schools as part of their research on most effective methods for improvement.

Mr. Soderman thanked the committee for their hard work and noted their interest in finding data driven solutions.

4-B. Report on the Results of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)

Dr. Janice Florey reported information substantial to the changing of the SAT exam and results recently received. She began by saying it was originally designed to predict student's success in the first year of college and that next year the test will be changed significantly moving from an aptitude test to an achievement test. Dr. Florey noted that data collected over time will not be lost as the new test will have a section that can be equated and information pulled for comparison and use as a predictor. She added that new tests would have more emphasis on grammar and English with sections on reading, essay, and informational text. It was noted that analogies and antonyms would no longer be included.

The discussion began with Dr. Florey indicating that the test range is between 200 and 800 points, with an average score being 500. In Douglas County, 176 students took the test, with a four-point increase over last year. In regards to Whittell's verbal results the designation of

“significant” increase was not applied to the results, but it was a notable increase as she analyzed the figures and concluded they are off of the chart received. Dr. Florey stated that due to the number of students at the Lake the chart is not showing all data, but conceptually, it is in fact notable for Douglas.

Dr. Florey reported that the math problems on the SAT would also be changing next year. In the past, Algebra I and Geometry were emphasized; next year Algebra II will also be emphasized. Students will be allowed to use graphing calculators, and they will eliminate quantitative comparison, wherein two problems are compared side by side. She affirmed the exam would include more problem solving and word problems. The report concluded that in the area of math, Douglas gained eleven points, with seven points being significant, indicating this was clearly a significant gain.

Board members asked questions and clarified that the data was for the class of 2005, but that students could have taken the test either in the 2003 – 2004, or the 2004 – 2005 school year.

Dr. Florey stated there might be greater participation with the new alignment of the test. She attested that the College Board trend data reported a twelve-point gain over time.

4-C. Annual Staffing Report

Mr. Alexander and Mrs. Villaseñor informed the Board through a PowerPoint presentation of the Classified and Certified staff report for the 2004 –2005 school year as compared to 2003 – 2004.

Mrs. Villaseñor reviewed the highlights of the breakdown in turnover for the 2004 – 2005 year and the primary reasons for resignations. She stated that currently there are about 400 Classified employees. Data showed that we had a 1.1% increase, or 5 more employees were lost than the previous year. She reported that the highest number of resignations occurred due to personal reasons and new career choices. Her conclusion was that the aging workforce is equating to an increase in retirements and that it is a national trend.

Mr. Alexander followed with a report on the Certified staff turnover, pointing out a slight increase, moving from 8.5% to 11.3%. He elaborated that the majority of teachers who left gave no reason, with the next highest reason for changing positions being due to teachers leaving the area, or for family related reasons. He indicated that teachers hired were mainly from in state, with fourteen of forty-seven hires being from within the District moving from a variety of capacities, with seven having been DHS graduates. He reiterated that the aging population is an issue.

Mr. Alexander concluded the presentation with top demographic trends, including disclosing an increase in unskilled workforce, changing family patterns, with childcare and eldercare responsibilities also being current factors for employees and new hires.

Mrs. Hales thanked Mr. Alexander and noted it was a very thorough report. She then welcomed Mr. Kester to approach the Board at 4:55 p.m.

4-D. Enrollment Report for 2005-06

Mr. Kester referred the Board to a packet of historical information. He identified trends and factors, stating that enrollment is down 172 students, this being the largest decline in twenty-eight years. The Board learned that figures reflect the same enrollment as eleven years ago and that some elementary schools are seeing severe shifts. Some are due to attendance boundary changes that were instituted. He believed this decline was most likely related to high housing costs within the individual attendance areas. He analyzed that Valley student enrollment is down 2.5% with total enrollment down from 7,210 to 7,038 this year. Currently, kindergarten is the 2nd lowest in the last decade, down 52 students from last year. Elementary schools are down 60 students, which is more than projected. The two middle schools are down 106 students, equating to projections, while high school grades 9 – 12, stayed about the same. He showed a 28- year history and explained that in 2005 - 2006 we have virtually the same enrollment as in 1994 - 1995. Consequently, over the past 11 years we have gained no students.

Mr. Kester stated that at Lake Tahoe the lessening of enrollment continues and when compared over nine years, results are that we lost 315 students, 33% of the student population, a significant drop, with continuance of the trend in the elementary level this year.

Addressing the Alpine high school enrollment, he added that they decreased in number from 68 to 57 high school age students, and that funds therefore also decrease that are received for them in the form of tuition from Alpine County.

Mr. Kester continued with a particular concern of how enrollment is used to determine school staffing and facility needs, all of which drive operating expenses. He imparted that Nevada has a two-year hold harmless policy and that nothing would happen in terms of dropping revenue next year, but in the year after, 2007 – 2008, if enrollment doesn't recover we would have a significant drop in revenue. Data and information collected prove that this occurrence relates to an older population moving in, cost of housing, and jobs available. He wrapped up by noting Carson, Washoe and Clark Counties are encountering a lack of enrollment as well.

5-A. Superintendent's Report

Mr. Soderman reported to the Board regarding activities of the past month and upcoming District events that might be of interest to them. He began by explaining that Interest Based Bargaining is scheduled for January 20th and 21st. A Federal Mediation and Conciliatory Services individual from Las Vegas is scheduled to conduct the training at that time. DCSD bus drivers are attending and he hoped DCAA, the Classified Association, as well as the Teachers Association, would join in. He indicated that possibly sheriff and fire personnel will also be present.

Next, Mr. Soderman informed the Board that the ROTC application had been filed for Douglas High School.

A listing of prior and upcoming events followed, including noting he addressed the Lyons Club. He reminded everyone that they collect glasses to recycle for students and others who need them. Continuing, he mentioned attending the NASA High School Improvement Summit that had implications for education and comparisons to world status. He introduced Teach for

Success training strategies for administrators and reported middle and high school administrators attended training on that protocol. Dates were announced for upcoming Teach for Success Observations, Communication meetings, as well as the Family Involvement Team meeting.

Mr. Soderman reported attending the Drug Abuse is Life Abuse meeting with Ms. Bricker, the Washoe Tribe, and a Carson City Sheriff. Seeing this as a community effort, he stated no new curriculum would be instituted, but support is offered in the schools.

5-B. NASB Directors Report

Mrs. Hales followed up about the concern on the Distributive School Account. She said Curt Chapman, President of NASB has written a letter regarding concerns with DSA that went to several newspapers. Next, she invited principals and other Board members to call or e-mail any best practices they know of, as we are invited, as are all school Districts, to share best practices at the upcoming conference.

6. Items Requiring Discussion and Action (Action)

6-A. Alternative P.E. (SCPE)

Mrs. Bryant and Dr. Fontana gave an overview of the first reading of Policy 518 and Policy 504. Parent inquiries began last March as to student releases for extra activities. At that time the Board directed Mr. Casey, Assistant Superintendent, to obtain an Attorney General's opinion in regard to the District providing this type of program. Correspondence from the Attorney General directed inquiries to the State Superintendent, Dr. Rheault. Mrs. Bryant provided copies of Dr. Rheault's response to the Board.

They declared that the idea is to allow students to achieve Physical Education goals outside of the District, while supervised, and obtain credits both in middle and in high school for students pursuing pre-professional goals, regional, or national competitions.

Mrs. Bryant and Dr. Fontana made recommendations in reviewing Policy 518 and Policy 504 as they relate to the issue as follows:

- 1) Grade levels 7 -12 to be considered.
- 2) An approval process is to be included in Administrative Regulation 518(g), including number of days prior to a semester that it would need to be submitted so as not to impact the secondary scheduling process.
- 3) Various regulations are being proposed for specifics of implementation.
- 4) Maximum of two credits are proposed that could be earned in both middle and in high school.
- 5) Semester credit to be aligned with the number of hours of participation outlined.
- 6) The period would be designated as either the first or last period of the day.
- 7) Criteria to be added for instructor qualifications including training and coaching

- experience.
- 8) Specific content principles and skills are to be provided in order to compare each activity to the Nevada Physical Education standards.
 - 9) Class attendance will be scrutinized.

Mrs. Bryant noted that time missed from other classes, per Mr. Rheault would fall under attendance laws.

The Board questioned the desirability and practicality of many issues related to the points listed. While there was general agreement, particulars such as issues involved with the application, attendance reporting, grading criteria, how determination of a pre-professional physical education student would be arrived at, and concerns of developing master schedules were discussed.

Mrs. Bryant added that a follow up would be presented to the Board a year after implementation.

Mrs. Hales stated that this would be brought for another reading in subsequent sessions and asked for public comment on this issue at 6:35 p.m.

Ms. Gardner, a parent of a student skier came forward to comment that the ski season starts in November and ends in March. Her concerns were of how missed class time would be treated.

Mrs. Wennhold made a motion, seconded by Ms. Trigg for approval of the first reading with suggested modifications by the Board, Board Policy 518, Graduation Requirements and Administrative Regulation 518(g) Supervised Curriculum in Physical Education.

After some discussion of amending the motion, it was noted that the Administrative Regulation was the concern and that could be changed without Board approval.

Motion carried by a unanimous vote of 6/0.

Public Comment

Mrs. Ferris voiced her concern regarding the Whittell Focus Group and work environment. She previously addressed the Board in May, and feels that the intensive atmosphere has not changed. She noted experiencing this as a volunteer.

Mrs. Hales reminded the group that Public Comment is limited to three minutes.

Kelly Ferris summed up and noted that Congressman Jim Gibbon's office has offered to look into the matter.

Lisa Voss addressed the Board regarding field trip budget cuts as a parent of two students. Her concerns were that funds were not allowed to be donated to cover expenses. She asked that the Board review the Policy to allow for funding to ensure that children are provided such

educational opportunities.

Laura Fillmore stated her concerns of military recruitment of high school students, relating to No Child Left Behind, Section 9528. She complimented the DCSD for the newly created opt out form. Her main concern was that she received a call from a recruiter, and wanted to be sure that the law had been looked at thoroughly, due to being a newer issue. She didn't believe sophomore information should be included when recruiters ask for it.

Mrs. Hales noted a good job done by Mrs. Bryant in working with the recruitment issue.

Debra Lang spoke about the Conserve Carson River workday, extending an invitation to the Board to the watershed event, mentioning educational seminars are being provided, including water quality monitoring. She would like to have consideration given to incorporating this day as part of a science curriculum inclusion.

Mrs. Hales asked for any other public comment at 6:49 p.m. and then called for a three-minute break at 6:55 p.m.

6-B. Level III Grievance: Alleged Violations of the Negotiated Agreement

Mrs. Hales prefaced the audience that public comment would be taken prior to the Board discussion and that the Board would not accept any more comment if comments became repetitive. She asked Board members to write down questions that would be addressed after the presentation from the Association and Administration.

Mr. Louritt reminded presenters that we were in open session and that no statements of competency and character of any school district employees could be made.

Both the DCPEA and the District provided documentation binders to the Board.

Mrs. Hales welcomed Susan Lacey, President of the Douglas County Educators Association.

Mrs. Lacey, DCPEA President, and Mrs. Vaughn, grievant, presented. Mrs. Lacey addressed the District packet, stating irrelevancy of items, believing items were included to confuse and hide the main issue and to intimidate the Board. She referred to a past grievance that was referred to and noted that contract language was changed subsequent to that event to include the date of a transfer request. She reviewed an e-mail sent by Ms. Vaughn asking about consideration for a math/science position in 2001 stating Mrs. Vaughn was asking for consideration with only a math credential. Also, Mrs. Lacey disputed a written statement that DCPEA believes administrators must grant transfers, claiming they only request that procedures are followed. She refuted the written claim that the DCPEA stated no reason would be acceptable for denial of the grievance. Her last objection was that obtainable objectives such as training, experience and ability were incorrectly considered.

Mrs. Lacey stated that e-mails referred to in documentation were not relevant, were not about job description changes, and reference to the DCPEA in regards to the Superintendent Search was an intimidation ploy, stating DCPEA represents teachers only.

Mrs. Vaughn introduced herself as a 21-year veteran of DCSD, with over two decades of math teaching experience. She read Section 4.3 in the Negotiated Agreement that states requests for transfer would be considered prior to considering applicants from outside the District. Next, she referred to Section 10.6.2 declaring these three statements were violated:

- 1) The Assistant Superintendent in conjunction with the administrator is authorized to make appointments of employees to vacant positions based upon the needs of the District.
- 2) If the teacher's request for a transfer is not granted, the District will provide a written explanation as to why the request was denied.
- 3) The District shall attempt to honor transfers when the training, experience and abilities match the vacant job specifications.

She imparted that a delay in opening a math position at GWHS occurred in 2003 – 2004. She inquired about it with Mr. Alexander and that what followed was the presentation of a demonstration lesson and observance by Mrs. Gray at KMS. The resulting transfer rejection letter expressed that although she was qualified, she did not meet the vision for Whittell High School. She proclaimed additionally, that a month later a second opening became available, upon which she was not given consideration due to it being beyond the transfer deadline.

Ms. Vaughn went on to state that being a witness in the Whittell Seven hearings led her to believe this transfer was being blocked at a higher level.

Protesting that the rejection letter she received in the spring of 2005 did not clearly state she did not get the job, although it was implied, she reviewed conversations with teachers and parents in an effort to defend the allegation of not having enough "zeal," as the letter indicated.

Next, Ms. Vaughn discussed an e-mail she sent on June 13, 2005 requesting specific reasons for denial. Not having received a response by her last workday of June 21st, she called the Association and filed a grievance on June 23rd. She noted a reason was given for denial at the Level I hearing in July, that she did not have the zeal to be at GWHS. She avowed that the notification claimed other candidates had science certification, but felt that was irrelevant due to the position being posted as a math position. At the Level II hearing, August 30th, she asked Mr. Alexander if he made any recommendation to Ms. Gray regarding her transfer request and questioned the interpretation of language including "consideration" and proper "fit" for a school and noted that he replied, he did not take part in the decision and that past practice is as binding as the contract itself.

Ms. Vaughn mentioned that in Section 10.6.2 she was told that paragraph one trumps paragraph two. Level II finding states that she is clearly a qualified math teacher. She noted four people were hired over the last two years for the math positions, and understood some did not have full math certifications and some were no longer there, failing to see that they were hired in the best interest of the students. Ultimately, she stated the contract was violated to the extent that employees need to be given a reason that would allow them to improve according to recommendations made.

Mrs. Lacey then emphasized that the contract should be read as a whole while maintaining that Section 10.6.2 should be followed in its entirety including the criteria. She said that DCPEA does not dispute the appointment of personnel based on the needs of the District. Reiterating that this posting was for a math position only, that Ms. Vaughn is licensed as such and that if not granted, the teacher transferring must be provided a written explanation without obscurity. Finally, Mrs. Lacey reiterated that she does have the experience, training and abilities necessary and continued with statements to prove that transfers should be considered first.

Next, Mrs. Lacey reviewed the experience and qualifications of the teachers that were recently hired, commenting that the DCPEA does not believe "past practice" comes into play, but only applies when there is unclear language in the contract.

Mrs. Lacey concluded that the remedy would be to make the transfer at the semester break of this school year.

Mr. Alexander began at 7:32 p.m. directing the Board to the packet provided and to an overhead presentation. He began by stating the District acknowledges that Mrs. Vaughn is a highly qualified math teacher, and that the grievance is about more than her request for transfer, Whittell, or Mrs. Gray.

He supported the fact that the system had been in place for years and if the grievance was approved, it would effectively remove the ability of the principals to select transfers that fit their schools, maintaining that it would force them to accept transfers solely based on the licensing of teachers. Mr. Alexander defended the District by showing that the language of the agreement supports the abilities of the principals to base transfer decisions on more than just licensing and qualifications, but also using the particular needs of their schools as a basis for hiring.

He discussed the language in the Negotiated Agreement, and set out to prove that the claims, and reprisals of discrimination are not substantiated.

Mr. Alexander looked at the original transfer language in Section 4.3, discussed deadlines and posting procedures for principals. He noted the language said "consider prior to," "not interview or observe prior to," for this process due to the fact that interviews and observations are calendared when principals and candidates are available, in order to not lose potential candidates, making the point that transfers are considered prior to outside candidates even when they are not interviewed in that order.

Next, Mr. Alexander looked at Section 10.6.2, wherein the two points are written; the Assistant Superintendent in conjunction with the principal is authorized to make appointments, and a written explanation will be provided for rejection. Mr. Alexander explained this requires an explanation, but not necessarily in any specified form. He proclaimed that determination is made by the principal using their specific site needs, and gave examples for Board consideration.

Next, Mr. Alexander referred to examples in the documentation of transfer denial notices sent out by principals in the District, such as a principal believing that the training, experience and ability does not fit the direction of the school, or a need for enthusiasm and desire was not met, all determined by the principal.

He noted that Ms. Vaughn is asking for some sort of an improvement plan, but that Section 10.6.2 does not state that is required and that in an issue of personality, it could not be addressed.

Mr. Alexander stated that Ms. Vaughn was given two reasons for denial. The first was lack of enthusiasm for the position, as she did not appear so, to the principal. He stated the principal believed Ms. Vaughn's basis for the transfer was her concern of location, i.e., wanting to remain at the Lake. He noted the principal had one candidate who could teach Physics and one that could teach Chemistry, in addition to math. He ventured that as Whittell is getting smaller the future needs would be greater for teachers with core subject endorsements as determined by the principal, and that Ms. Vaughn's extra endorsements currently are in Psychology and Sociology, which are not core subject areas and were not taken as highest needs by the principal at Whittell.

Mr. Alexander referred to the overhead presentation and reviewed "past practice" including the DCPEA's exhibit. He read that if there is a difference in interpretation of language, that well established "past practice" does come in to play.

Mr. Alexander noted that a number of principals were in attendance to support the District and introduced two District Administrators, Brian Frazier and Pam Gilmartin.

Mrs. Gilmartin said it is very important that they hire staff agreeing with their philosophy, such as curriculum mapping, Cell and Excell, concluding that, overall, it is important that staff are collaborative and work as a team in order to be a good fit for her school.

Mr. Frazier stated that in addition to reviewing the job descriptions many other considerations are critical and that his school has had a lot of challenges, such as low SES and a change in scheduling from multi-track that impacts staffing needs. In that light, they have worked to develop a vision, bring in people that are a good fit in order to meet specific school needs, and to create a balance including experience, climate, and culture.

Mr. Frazier asked that their ability not be undermined to make accurate determinations in staffing.

Mr. Alexander wrapped up by reviewing the issues of discrimination and reprisal, stating that Mrs. Vaughn had not filed any previous grievances and the transfer denial took place prior to this grievance, stating Section 2.E.1. does not apply. He made note that the language refers to reprisal if someone has filed a grievance previously or has incurred an injury after filing the grievance.

Next, he reviewed Section 3.2, discrimination language, stating that no document, nexus, or explanation was given for any of these violations. He said the only claim made is that a series of unsubstantiated statements show a pattern of discrimination and that the persons named were checked with and both denied the statements as interpreted or claimed.

Mr. Alexander's conclusion was that the District recommends the grievance be denied.

Beginning at 8:00 p.m. rebuttals were given by both sides.

Mrs. Lacey reiterated the points brought forth by the DCPEA.

Mr. Alexander stated that approval would allow for a grievance to be heard on every transfer denial and that he did not believe the Board should be approached every time a transfer is denied.

At this time Mrs. Hales invited questions from the Board.

Members questioned both Mrs. Lacey and Mr. Alexander, clarifying comments and statements made.

Mrs. Hales called for public comment on this issue at 8:35 p.m. She opened by stating that speaking for the Board, everyone believes Ms. Vaughn is an excellent teacher.

Students, Rebecca Gardner and Ashley Boulet, spoke in high regard of Ms. Vaughn, having had her as a teacher.

Kelly Gardner spoke next, relaying that she didn't believe the District always hires the best "fit," using an example of a former employee. She believed that this was a case where the District should have forced the hire and that Ms. Vaughn was the right person for the job.

Leslie Shaw, GWHS parent, noted that he is currently a lawyer, and believed there were two elements to the grievance, 1) the procedural aspect, and 2) substance of the aspect. He talked about the discretion used, and felt the laws of contractual interpretation had been violated. However, he admitted he had not read the contract. He stated looking at what the limits of discretion are for the District is defined by the contract and is governed by what is reasonable. He urged the Board not to deny the grievance.

Mike Ashton, math teacher at GWHS noted staff was in attendance to support Ms. Vaughn. His point was that he did not know the "vision" for the math department, and has had no conversation regarding any hiring for the department. Mr. Ashton expressed that he supported her and that there was a need for an Integrated math teacher.

Alan Gosselin, teacher of thirteen years, expressed his view that the Association is only looking for enforcement of the contract and felt the language is clear, feeling contract language should be followed.

Mr. Nivinskus stated that Mr. Gosselin's comments sounded more like a rebuttal and felt it was procedurally inappropriate, given Mr. Gosselin is Vice President of DCPEA and DCPEA already had its opportunity to comment on this issue.

Mr. Gosselin clarified his statement by asserting it is not about conspiracy, but about criteria, as he felt she was well qualified and should have been transferred.

Sue Sharer supported Ms. Vaughn and supported Ms. Gray in that she felt Ms. Gray was attempting to get staff to work together at her site. Ms. Sharer expressed that working at the Lake is complicated with the commute and other factors, and shared that she felt Ms. Vaughn would be a good fit.

At 8:57 Mrs. Hales took a short recess, reconvening at 9:06.

Intensive deliberation and discussion ensued, including verification of notifications, timelines, contract language, and principal's inclusion of staff in the hiring process.

Mr. Louritt stated a motion to deny the grievance in part and affirm the grievance in part. Ms. Jamin seconded the motion for the sake of discussion.

Discussion among the Board continued.

Mr. Nivinskus stated that a motion doesn't have to deny a right in its entirety and that the specific basis of the violation would need to be stated so it couldn't be misconstrued.

Ms. Jamin withdrew her support of seconding the motion.

The motion died due to no other Board members seconding Mr. Louritt's initial statement.

At 9:40 p.m., Mr. Beck made the motion to deny the grievance, seconded by Mrs. Wennhold.

Motion carried by 4/2 vote (Ms. Jamin and Ms. Trigg voted no.)

7. Correspondence

Mrs. Hales asked if any correspondence needed to be discussed. There was none at this time.

8. Possible Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings

Mrs. Wennhold announced that she would like to see a policy developed for AP classes consistent with Washoe County that clarifies taking of AP tests and weighted grades, expressing that currently there is not a policy in place. Ms. Jamin suggested this be placed on the agenda.

9. Executive Session

There was no executive session.

10. Adjournment

At 9:44 p.m., Mrs. Hales made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Beck.

Motion carried by a unanimous vote of 6/0.

Submitted by:

Carolyn Moore
Secretary to the Superintendent and Board of
Trustees

Approved:

Clerk of the Board

Note: Upon approval by the Board of Trustees in a public meeting, these minutes become the official minutes of the meeting held on the above date. Board minutes are kept on a permanent basis and are available for public review in the office of the Superintendent.