

**MINUTES OF THE
Special Meeting of the
DOUGLAS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Douglas High School
March 30, 2011
3:00 p.m.**

**Minutes Approved
May 18, 2011**

Present:

Trustees:

Sharla Hales	President
Thomas Moore	Vice President
Karen Chessell	Clerk
Ross Chichester	Member
Randy Green	Member
Teri Jamin	Member
Cynthia Trigg	Member

Personnel:

Lisa Noonan, Superintendent
Rich Alexander, Assistant Superintendent
Lyn Gorrindo, Assistant Superintendent
Holly Luna, Chief Financial Officer

Others Present:

Rick Hsu, Attorney
Brian Rippet, President, Douglas County Professional
Educators Association
Tami Beckett, President, Douglas County Support Staff
Organization

1. Call to Order

Ms. Jamin, Mrs. Trigg, and Mr. Chichester were in attendance at 3:00 p.m. to begin this meeting as a subcommittee to discuss ideas for revisions to Board Bylaws. Ms. Jamin began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment

Michael Gingrich, DHS custodian, informed the Board California schools were looking at ways to implement a charge to offset transportation expenses, such as charging \$1.00 per day to families.

2. Board Bylaw Review (Information and Discussion)

Possible revisions to Bylaw No. 050, "Organization," were discussed first. Changes taken into consideration included:

- 1) Section 1 – Organization Meeting – clarification was offered that each January the Board addresses organizational matters. Section 3 addressed similar information and was combined with Section 1.
- 2) Section 2 – Officers - The meaning of the first sentence was discussed. The title was changed to "Election of Officers" to clarify the meaning of this section. Discussion surrounded continuing procedures, as performed in the past, to maintain consistency when choosing a temporary chairman. The order of electing officers was changed to reflect the order of elections typically performed at the January meeting.

Mrs. Hales arrived at 3:32 p.m.

Next, committee members discussed Bylaw No. 060, "Meetings." Items discussed for possible revision included:

- 1) The influence and process of the Board President in working with the Superintendent to prepare meeting agendas.
- 2) The method and timing for Board members to request an item to be added to the upcoming meeting list.
- 3) Roberts Rules of Order would be referenced as a guideline.

Mrs. Chessell arrived at 3:52 p.m.

Discussion surrounded the involvement of the President in working with the Superintendent to create the Board Agenda. Also discussed, was whether or not two Board members should be able to ask that an item be placed on a Board Meeting Agenda outside of the Future Agenda Item opportunity provided at monthly meetings.

Bylaw No. 070, "Code of Conduct," was the final Bylaw addressed.

The following revisions were suggested:

- 1) A description of the roles of Vice President and Clerk could be added after No. 2.
- 2) As a part of the Oath of Office or at the end of the Code of Conduct, an additional statement could include support for participation in continuous professional development by Trustees. The message to the public would be that Board members valued continuous learning. It was decided that a statement would be added to the Bylaw.

Committee members discussed verbiage to be reflected in the additional statement.

Mr. Chichester stated Board responsibilities, other than those required by law, were unenforceable. Additionally, expense to the district could be minimized by having the individual(s) who attended a conference, return and train others. Materials from the recent conference were noted to have been provided by Dr. Noonan to those who had not attended.

Suggested revisions to the three Bylaws would be brought forward for the first reading at a future Board Meeting.

Mr. Moore arrived at 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Green arrived at 4:22 p.m.

At 4:25 p.m., the start of Item 3, all Board members were present.

3. Strategic Plan Document Review (Information and Discussion)

Mrs. Hales stated the six new goals reflected reorganization of the nine goals that resulted from the 2009-2010 Strategic Planning process. Board members commented on the goal headings and listings within the six categories. Suggestions for updating the Strategic Plan document included:

- 1) The terminology previously used, “demonstrate excellence in instruction” in Goal 2, had changed to reflect a package approach, or “toolbox.” Mrs. Hales suggested this goal title include language encouraging teachers to provide “excellence in instruction.” It was also noted “excellence” was listed as measurement and results of achievement in Goal 3. Goal 3 might include the verbiage of “excellence.” The new Mission Statement was noted to include “excellence in education.”
- 2) Pages 3 & 4, “10 Steps to Strategic Plan Development,” was noted to be good information but there was uncertainty if it should remain in the Plan.
- 3) Consensus was the Board would like an easy reference for their work surrounding the Strategic Plan to share with community members. The “Strategic Plan Cycle” page would be in conjunction.
- 4) The “Cycle” might include main documents and major event timelines, such as the District Improvement Plan (DIP) and Superintendent Evaluation/contract term. The “Cycle” could be geared to the Board, as the Strategic Plan is a focus for the Board’s work, and should show the Board as part of the process.
- 5) Mrs. Chessell suggested that the Plan be a “roadmap” and the data dashboards a “travel log.” She provided two pages of written comments regarding the goals, inventory, cycle, and retreat information.
- 6) Under “Commitments,” the first bullet, “Student needs is the primary factor...” – discussion surrounded ensuring this was always the case.
- 7) The Strategic Plan would become a quick reference matrix. Dr. Noonan suggested Competencies would be “Action Steps.”
- 8) Annual Strategic Plan meeting preparation for Board members needed to be more specifically focused.
- 9) The Board’s work was to take the “High Priority Focus Areas” and prioritize the order of importance for the Superintendent.
- 10) Common Core Standards would need to be incorporated. The reference to materials/textbooks would also need to be updated.
- 11) The DIP should be referenced in the Strategic Plan.
- 12) Consensus was the staff is given free rein to restructure the Strategic Plan. Document revision suggestions included:
 - A) SpringBoard curriculum, now 7-12, needed to be added.

- B) The new "Inventory" might be shown as Superintendent steps necessary; therefore as an Appendix.
- C) Page 6, "High Priority Focus Areas," could tie into the entire document, including the competency section, with Common Core notations.
- D) Page 10 of the "Inventory," under the "Other Assessments" section, the PSAT might be changed to ALT testing.
- E) Not only college, but job readiness should be incorporated.
- F) Page 15 of the "Inventory" under the "Customer Service" section, should include "surveys for staff and students."
- G) Page 17, "Strategies" would need to be adjusted to include new goals. Are they now embedded in the goals and also reflected in the DIP?
- H) Competency Strategies could be restated in a couple of pages with new language.
- I) Possibly create a different section for each of the six goals.
- J) Color code Strategies to tie into the six goals.
- K) A single page summary could show current District priorities to allow for easy discussion between Trustees and community members.
- L) An Executive Summary could reflect current status, as well as what had been accomplished in the past.
- M) The "Glossary" could be streamlined.

Through discussion it was decided a Board subcommittee could assist in reorganizing the Strategic Plan. Consensus was the six new goals and format for the "High Priority Focus Areas" met with approval. A timeline for completion was not determined in order that the document could be refined and time allowed for pressing budget concerns.

A break was taken from 5:20 – 5:39 p.m.

4. Budget Workshop

Mrs. Hales stated although the agenda listed the budget as an action item, she did not believe action would result from this workshop.

Dr. Noonan welcomed the public, provided copies of her presentation, and stated that the PowerPoint would be available on the District Web site following this meeting. Three public meetings were scheduled for the following week to gather input, as well as a flyer was going home with students for parental feedback. Administrators had given input, although Dr. Noonan stated this was the first presentation reflecting her decisions based on all information obtained to date. Fluctuation in budget information received from the State along with the timeline necessary for employee notifications as compared to the summer schedule of final decisions from legislators, created this difficult budget cycle. Another budget update was scheduled to be provided at the April 12th Board Meeting.

The workshop focused on the process and concept of budget building incorporating a possible loss for FY2011-12 of \$6,062,200 to the General Fund. This loss equated to an 11% cut in employee pay and benefits. Two areas that were concerning that might be affected by the legislature were unknowns. They were the use of Debt Service Funds and Government Service Tax revenue.

Five tables were reviewed listing decreases to programs and positions in order to make the \$6 million funding gap. Dr. Noonan explained the fifth table listed \$2,723,637 in reductions that were beyond her recommendations. This table was provided in case the need existed to incorporate this higher percentage of cuts. One table was based on declining enrollment, a

loss of \$441,459 which equaled a decrease of 6.5 teachers and 6 hours per day of classified staffing inherent to the annual budget process.

An explanation was provided for the various line items under consideration, with a focus on student needs and minimization of job loss. Potential lay-off notices would be distributed by May 1st, prior to the FY2011-12 Final Budget Approval on Wednesday, May 18th. The Legislative Session would conclude in June following the Final Budget submission.

Mrs. Hales stated the public was best heard by expressing their views on this topic to legislators. She invited public comment at this time.

Three elementary staff members approached the Board in support of losses that might be incurred through budget cuts including:

- 1) Staff suggested elementary field trips might be paid for through Parent Teacher Organization PTO fund-raising.
- 2) The value of employing computer technicians in order that students learn adequate computer skills was noted.

Nancy Hamlett, Douglas County Support Staff Association representative, inquired about the percentage of staff cuts being presented for each category of classified, certified, and district office administration. Additionally, she asked whether or not the four day week might be beneficial in the Valley for saving money, and if the General Fund ending fund balance was taken into consideration.

Marie Parola asked to clarify if the process took into consideration the ending fund balance and whether premium holiday information included both district and employee pay in. Additionally, she asked to clarify who the 11% employee cut represented. Dr. Noonan stated she is not proposing an 11% cut, but the information she provided was only a model possibility laid out by the governor.

Ron Santi, Pinõn Hills Elementary grandparent, asked that consideration be given to changing the policy regarding PTO participation in funding student events.

A staff member asked for clarification that an 11% cut across all staff groups would create a situation where all other items wouldn't be necessary in order to make up the budget gap. Ms. Luna replied that an 11% cut would be equivalent to page 13, the Table 5 cuts listed in the presentation this evening.

Brian Rippet, President of the Douglas County Professional Educators Association (DCPEA) stated the Association looked forward to working with the district on items presented tonight and those that might be forthcoming.

Marty Swisher, Principal of Douglas High School Principal and President of the Douglas County Administrators Association recognized efforts in the beginning of this budget process and their openness to finding solutions.

A short break was taken from 7:10 – 7:16 p.m.

5. Board Resolution

The iNVEST '11 Resolution prepared by Superintendent's for submission to legislators was reviewed by the Board. iNVEST '11 supported funding of education in Nevada at the 2009 level, addressed changes within NRS Chapter 288 including collective bargaining, and offered support of extending probationary time for teachers and administrators.

Mrs. Hales called for public comment. There was none.

Through discussion, the Resolution template was changed to reflect statements accurate to the beliefs of the Douglas County School Board. The Resolution, with changes, would then be submitted to the Nevada Association of School Boards for sharing with legislators.

Mrs. Trigg stated the iNVEST initiatives of the past reflected support for funding the base in education. This Resolution varied from that approach; therefore, she did not support it.

Mrs. Chessell moved to make three changes in the Resolution template, as described, seconded by Mr. Moore.

Motion carried, 6/1, Mrs. Trigg nay.

6. Adjournment

At 7:41 p.m., Mr. Chichester moved to adjourn, seconded by Mrs. Chessell.

Motion carried, 7/0.

Submitted by,

Carolyn Moore
Secretary to the 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.