

Douglas County School District

Regular Meeting

Douglas High School

Minden, Nevada

Tuesday, November 8, 2011

3:30 p.m.

Minutes

Approved

12/13/11

MINUTES

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
Lyn Gorrindo, Assistant Superintendent, Education Services
Rich Alexander, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
Holly Luna, Chief Financial Officer

Others Present:

Rick Hsu, Legal Counsel

1. Call to Order

Mrs. Hales called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m. Ms. Luna led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Hales called for adoption of the Agenda. There were no requested changes to the Agenda.

Mrs. Chessell moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Ms. Jamin.

There was no public comment.

Motion carried, 5/0.

2. Consent Items (For Possible Action)

Mrs. Chessell inquired regarding changes offered to Item 2-C in the Board's red folder. Mr. Alexander stated typos found in the initial document were corrected. Ms. Jamin added that an inconsistency in the listing of job titles had been changed.

- A. Approve the Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of October 11, 2011.
- B. Approve payments contained in Special Run Voucher Number 1208 and Regular Run Voucher Number 1209 for FY11-12.
- C. Approve the new job descriptions for Computer Specialist 2, Computer Systems Engineer, and Network Engineer.
- D. Approve personnel actions described in Personnel Report No. 11-11.

- E. Authorize the District to continue to participate in the Class Size Reduction program using the Alternative Plan.

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

Ms. Jamin moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Mrs. Chessell.

Motion carried, 5/0.

3. Employee Recognition Special Recognition

Dr. Noonan recognized Bill Blumenthal, Custodial Supervisor, for his leadership, efficiency and success in the team cleaning process instituted following budget reductions a couple of years ago. Mr. Blumenthal and some crew members were recognized on the cover and in an article, in the June 2011, *Cleaning & Maintenance Management* magazine shared with the Board.

Mrs. Hales thanked Mr. Blumenthal for his care of students through safety efforts on the job. Mr. Blumenthal stated his appreciation for support he had received from Mr. Cullen and Ms. Luna.

4. Principal's Report – (Gardnerville Elementary School) Administrative Report/Program Review

Shannon Brown, Principal, Gardnerville Elementary School presented longitudinal Criterion Reference Test (CRT), Measurement of Academic Progress (MAP), Teach for Success (T4S), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) results. CRT results were reported to be used in identifying specific areas of need for students. MAP assessments were used additionally and cross referenced the CRT data to identify learning needs. Spring MAP testing followed in the sequence to measure ongoing student progress. Review of CRT and MAP data showed results equating to approximately 8 out of 10 students achieved at grade level.

Mrs. Trigg arrived at 3:46 p.m.

Teach for Success strands targeted for improved instruction, included student engagement and key vocabulary. Mr. Brown shared that all staff worked to improve family engagement by making parents feel welcome, at all times.

Mrs. Hales inquired regarding the use of MAP data by teachers. Mr. Brown stated MAP data was used with specialists, during Personal Education Plan reviews with parents, and in teacher coop meetings.

Board Intervention Funds (BIF), supported the hiring of a licensed teacher, 4 days a week, 3.5 hours per day, to work with classroom teachers. This equaled 70 days of additional intervention instruction. A teacher coop identified intervention needs for students using CRT data. Additionally, a reading specialist was working with a group of 4th grade students needing additional help. The reading specialist provided teachers with enrichment opportunities for high end readers; therefore, her time was available to work with groups needing additional opportunities. The ESL teacher was commended for working with families to improve literacy at reading and game nights. A new mentoring program promoted by the school counselor was implemented to improve study skills for students needing additional assistance. Teachers were offered professional development in the area of MAP, common core math and common core writing instruction. GES used Write from the Beginning for a second year and continued the use of Thinking Maps in classrooms.

Mr. Brown reported teachers continued efforts with various clubs and safe school ambassadors even though stipend funding had been lost during budget reductions.

5. Douglas High School Education Specifications Document (For Possible Action)

Ellen Hooper, SKW Derickson Architects, was introduced by Dr. Noonan. Dr. Noonan informed the Board they did not need to take action to adopt the DHS Education Specifications and that there were still some changes to be made to the document.

Ms. Hooper stated the Education Specifications document was a tool used to meld educational programming with architectural renderings. Development of the document began spring 2011 that included meetings with district and site personnel. The resulting information included an overall school configuration, classroom grouping for the incoming 9th grade class, and CTE necessities, in order to create the best learning environment. The plan would include the ability to maintain a closed campus with a large enough Commons facility that could house multiple lunches scheduling in the future. Additional classrooms, the Commons area and office space changes were on the drawing board. Flexible CTE labs were being considered, as well as the location for CTE on campus. Teachers were surveyed for their ideas. A detailed description would result upon paring down of all ideas. Various clustering models were discussed including leading designs implemented around the nation. The Site Development portion of planning was underway that would use the large ideas to drive details.

Dr. Noonan stated the Education Specifications document would be used as a guide throughout the process.

Ms. Hooper offered a variety of suggestions, coming from various departments within the high school, for informational purposes.

Mr. Moore arrived at 4:25 p.m.

Board members asked questions and commented on proposed sizing of several areas.

Ms. Hooper stated information gathered from the community open house would be presented to the Board in December. Also, landscaping and parking ideas would be forthcoming in the Site Development Phase. The Education Specifications were a result of core curriculum needs.

No action was taken.

6. CMAR Selection for PHASE 2A of the District's Facilities Master Plan (For Possible Action)

Dr. Noonan, Holly Luna, and Scott McCullough presented information regarding the process used to select the preconstruction services of the Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) for Douglas High School. The CMAR selection committee included Dr. Noonan, Holly Luna, Scott McCullough, Gary Cullen, and two external experts; Fred Drees, retired NDOT engineer; and Joe Gabica, Washoe County School District architect. The committee was reported to have followed newly legislated requirements. The original Request for Proposal (RFP) resulted in 11 participants, 9 of which remained in the scoring process. NRS dictates that 2 – 5 companies are to be interviewed. Five companies were interviewed, resulting in the final selection of Turner Construction, Richard Kasa, and the project executive.

Ms. Luna stated a change to the recommendation written in the Agenda. The contract, per legal counsel advice, would need a nominal fee listed in lieu of \$0. \$10.00 was suggested as an amount to set for the preconstruction contract fee.

Mr. Green moved to approve the request by Business Services to execute contract negotiations with the selected CMAR candidate, Turner Construction, for preconstruction services for Phase 2A Facilities Master Plan to include modernizations and capacity

expansions to Douglas High School. The preconstruction contract is set at \$10.00, and would be the only charges to the bond funds attributable to the CMAR during the preconstruction phase, seconded by Mrs. Trigg.

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

Motion carried, 7/0.

7. Third Party Administrator Renewal – DCSD Self-Insurance Plan (For Possible Action)

Holly Luna, Chief Financial Officer, reported the Health Advisory Committee voted unanimously in support of continuing the contract with Hometown Health as the Third Party Administrator (TPA) for the district for the next three years. The first year would be a fixed fee, a 0% increase with a 4.8% increase in each of the following years.

Mrs. Hales called for questions from the Board. Clarification was offered by Ms. Luna regarding the administrative fees shown.

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

Mrs. Trigg moved to allow Business Services to contract with Hometown Health for the next three years as the District's Self-Insurance Plan Third Party Administrator with the annual fees as presented, seconded by Ms. Jamin.

Motion carried, 7/0.

8. DCSD Self-Insurance Plan – Premium Rates (For Possible Action)

Mrs. Hales asked for persons in the audience who were representing the Health Advisory Committee to come before the Board at this time. Larry Lippmann, Marie Parola, and Christine Cooley came forward. Shannon Brown and Tamie Beckett, committee members, were present in the audience.

Mr. Lippmann began by explaining the reason the committee had arrived at "no decision." Historical background was provided in that the committee was formed twelve years ago when negotiations were taking place at a different time than decisions surrounding health insurance. Currently, the Health Advisory Committee is meeting during the same time as negotiations.

Appreciation was shown for information provided to the committee by Ms. Luna, with regard to the district's ending fund balance, as well as, various health plans and options. Consultants had been invited to the meetings to share information and answer questions. Mr. Lippmann stated committee members would prefer to move the decision regarding self-insurance plan premium rates to negotiations, since they felt there had not been enough time to make this important decision. Approximately 50% of the committee members were involved in negotiations, creating an overlap. Decisions surrounding the ending fund balance were noted as a part of the negotiation process.

Tami Beckett reinforced the idea of the premium rate decision being made through the negotiation process. She felt there was little time to make such a decision that impacted a large number of personnel. Budget information obtained at this Board Meeting through the FY10-11 Audit was new to the negotiation and committee team members.

Board members clarified that discussions held at the health advisory meetings included benefits and premiums and had started in August of this year. Contracts were noted to be in a rollover status due to ongoing negotiations. Additionally, it was determined committee members were asking to have

the health insurance decisions made in negotiations, only for this current year. Through discussion, it was determined that a conflict existed with employee contracts not yet signed.

Mr. Hsu, attorney, shared that NRS Chapter 288 stated salary and benefits were mandatory subjects of bargaining. Through the negotiation process of the past, a portion of the process was delegated that is not in the collective bargaining agreement. The Board was noted to be the final decision maker with regard to negotiations. Mr. Hsu explained when a health plan expires, an evergreen non-compete clause came into effect.

Mrs. Hales asked for Shannon Brown, GES Principal and committee member, to provide his opinion. Mr. Brown stated the task of the committee was to be informed regarding health costs and projected revenues, in order to keep expenses and revenues related to health insurance and benefits in balance. The current premium of \$575.00 was noted to not cover a projected 22% increase. The committee voted whether or not to make a decision. The result was a 5/3 vote to not make a decision at this time. Mr. Brown added he had preferred to make a decision, and offer minor changes that brought the plan into comparison with other public entities at no cost to employees. The result would be a minimal impact to the ending fund balance. In this scenario, the deductible would increase, shifting the cost to those who used the health care benefits, not placing a heavy burden on all participants. Mr. Brown expressed concern that all persons in negotiations did not have the wide variety of information the committee had received over the course of several months.

Christine Cooley responded to Mr. Brown's comments, noting negotiations would affect the ending fund balance that had been reduced through premium holidays, by \$1,000,000.00.

Mrs. Hales asked Dr. Noonan for her recommendation. Dr. Noonan stated the health insurance issue unique to this year, was the timeline, due to negotiations still being underway. An appropriate reason for the committee to pause would be the concern of having large changes made to the premiums that could be affected in a couple of months by decisions that might reduce the funds available. Open enrollment for health insurance would be underway soon and needed to occur prior to the start of the plan year, January 1. The timeframe for this decision could be extended to February, and Open Enrollment could occur again, in order to meet state and federal regulatory requirements if there were significant changes to the plan. Dr. Noonan advised the Board they could consider tabling this item until February allowing for establishment of the employer paid premium rate through negotiations. However, she did not think it prudent to extend a timeline for changes beyond February if negotiations are delayed, and that the Board should move forward even if the Committee does not return with recommendations at that time.

Mr. Moore asked what happens if the current contribution rate does not change. How are those costs passed on? Ms. Luna informed the Board that rates were set by brokers through actuarial analysis and estimates, matching premium revenues to claim expenses plus fixed costs for the Third Party Administrator (TPA). Currently, a 10% Northern Nevada inflationary cost is considered by brokers, along with a 12% differential, resulting from the previous 12 months rolling claims review. If the plan remained unchanged, revenues remained flat, projections of expenses with the increased claims cost show that the revenues would be deficient; therefore, the need for use of unrestricted ending fund balance – assuming no change in premiums.

Mrs. Chessell asked if there would be a hardship to employees if there was a delay in making a decision. Ms. Luna reiterated that the broker set rates based on last 12 months of claims data, and currently there is a projected 22% rate increase. There is the possibility that as you actualize monthly claims, the projected rate may not be as much. However, if indeed there is the increase, you can compound the effects of the increases by delaying premium rate increases. In general, Ms. Luna reported the district participates in approximately 80% of revenues generated through premiums; with spouses, dependents and retirees, the remaining 20%. The contract only addresses what the District pays for the employee premium; however, historically, there has been a pattern of same percentage increase to the other rates following an adjustment to the employee premium with one exception noted at the last change in employee premium as a result of negotiations. Mrs. Chessell clarified as to whether or not there would be a retro adjustment to employee pay for spouse

or dependent premiums. Ms. Luna indicated that a retroactive premium charged to employees as result from a delay of decision making is not past practice. Ms. Luna clarified for the Board, per the audit report this evening for FY10-11 that the unrestricted ending fund balance in the Health Insurance Fund was close to \$3.5 million.

Mrs. Hales called for public comment on this item.

Mrs. Lacey, DCPEA member, stated negotiations were well underway and the Association's desire was not to prolong the process. Benefits and salaries were known to offset each other in the negotiation process, using a see-saw as an analogy to the negotiations process with give and take noted.

Mr. Moore moved to defer this decision to the February Board Meeting, seconded by Mrs. Trigg.

Ms. Jamin made a Friendly Amendment to the motion to include, "no later than February" allowing the committee the ability to return earlier if possible with recommendations. Therefore, the motion read:

Mr. Moore restated the motion. He moved to defer this decision to no later than the February Board Meeting, Seconded by Mrs. Trigg.

Motion carried, 7/0.

Item 10, was heard prior to Item 9.

10. Presentation and Acceptance of Financial Audit for Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011 (For Possible Action)

Dave Silva, Zeth Macey and Jason Bullard, auditors, were introduced. Mr. Silva stated his appreciation for the District's business. The District received the highest level of opinion, an "unqualified" opinion for the annual financial audit for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2011. The Report on Internal Control over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters based on an Audit of Financial Statements, performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards, stated there were no material weaknesses, no instances of noncompliance, and no budgetary violations. The Report of federal programs also received an "unqualified" opinion with no internal control weaknesses. The single audit section over federal programs was audited in the area of Title I, Nutrition, with no findings. The new Governmental Accounting Standards Board, (GASB) 54 standard was noted to redefine classifications of fund balances and add clarity to fund balance reporting. The unrestricted fund balance should have one month or 8.3% in reserve in accordance with NRS and Board Policy. The District was reported to be on target with the regulations with 10% in reserve.

Mr. Silva offered that the audit Management Letter informing staff and the Board how to enhance internal controls would be forthcoming.

Board members congratulated Ms. Luna on the excellent audit report. Ms. Luna commended her staff on the team effort.

There was no public comment on this item.

Mrs. Trigg moved to approve the 2010-2011 Independent Audit Report and direct the Chief Financial Officer to file the report as Public Record in accordance with NRS 354.624, seconded by Mrs. Chessell.

Motion carried, 7/0.

**9. DCSD Property Located at 1900 Echo Drive in Stateline, NV
(Former Kingsbury Middle School)
(For Possible Action)**

Dr. Noonan provided a report regarding the possible sale of the KMS property. A binder of information was offered to Trustees that included the work and research to date. KMS was reported to have been chosen for closure in the Lake schools consolidation process. Enrollment history supporting the closure in 2008 was provided. Lake school enrollment dropped from 942 students in 1997 to 439 in 2011. Projections for 2020 were 316 students. Ideas for possible future use of the property gathered through community input and brainstorming were provided. Dr. Noonan stated a review of the Title Report showed the current zoning only allowed for a K-12 school or another government agency to have use of the property. Per NRS, two appraisals had been conducted. A meeting with the two appraisers, Johnson-Perkins & Associates, Inc. and Daniel A. Leck & Associates was held to discuss findings and options. Options included the possibility of sale, lease or trade. A meeting had been held with the Lake Fire Department who determined the space configuration was larger and different than they needed. Dr. Noonan reported NRS stated the property cannot be sold for less than the lowest appraisal amount. A next step would be to write a letter to expand allowable uses for the property, in that timing was perfect to work with the TRPA. Should the zone change, the appraised amount could be affected. If the Board opted to sell the property, a formal Resolution would be created for Board signatures.

Board discussion ensued and some questions were raised. Dr. Noonan offered additional information including no person could maintain an exclusive listing. Once she learned the Board's thoughts on moving forward, next steps would be created and transparency would be optimal.

Dr. Noonan inquired of counsel, whether or not a price would need to be listed in the motion. Mr. Hsu, Attorney, responded the Board only needed to authorize the District to move forward at this time.

Mrs. Chessell moved that the Board of Trustees approve the next steps in the listing for sale of the property located at 1900 Echo Drive, Stateline Nevada (formerly Kingsbury Middle School), seconded by Mr. Chichester.

There was no public comment.

Motion carried, 7/0.

Public Comment

Janae Ballingham, P.E. teacher, advocated for quality physical education in order to help students physically, mentally, and with their self-esteem. Ms. Ballingham valued preventative measures for students and asked the Board to consider the importance of P.E., taught by licensed P.E. teachers. In light of this, she asked that students not be pulled out of P.E. class for other purposes. She informed the Board State Standards were being revised to include activities that increased physical activity over previous class requirements. Board members were invited to drop in on her class. Ms. Ballingham offered to provide more information explaining quality P.E. and the resulting lower obesity rates, via email.

**11. Discussion on Student Surveys Providing Feedback to Teachers
(Information and Discussion)**

Rich Alexander, Assistant Superintendent Human Resources, provided a PowerPoint presentation that included information presented previously on a pilot survey given to students in 4th period classes at GWHS and DHS in December 2009; articles from national sources on the topic of student surveys; a list of cities using student surveys; a national support effort, the Bill and Melinda Gates

Foundation; and the possibility of online surveys with approximate costs. Mr. Alexander reported a positive correlation between effective instructors and those individuals having received high marks from students. Research supported the fact that students knew when they were receiving quality instruction. Some districts were noted to have used student survey information as 5 -10 % of a teacher's evaluation. The newly formed Teachers and Leaders Council would possibly change evaluations in the future, state wide, to include surveys. Following the presentation, Mr. Alexander provided questions as issues to consider, should the Board decide to engage in student surveys. He then asked Trustees to provide general direction to staff regarding this information that had been requested by the Board.

Mrs. Hales stated the Teachers and Leaders Council would offer their suggestions to the State Board in 2012; therefore, mandated changes to the evaluation process wouldn't take place until 2013.

With regard to possibly making changes in the teacher evaluation process, Mr. Hsu, attorney, informed the Board that in light of new legislation, the Washoe Teacher's Association had filed a case currently being heard by the Employee Management Relations Board (EMRB). This is an attempt to obtain a declaration stating changes to teacher evaluations used to return a teacher to probation status would need to be negotiated. Currently, NRS required consultation and involvement of the union if feedback was to be used for their evaluation.

Board members discussed a variety of possibilities including:

- 1) Who would determine questions to be used – staff or an outsourced company
- 2) Frequency, grade levels, use of the information gathered, including should the information be included in the evaluation process and timing
- 3) Students were noted to be the recipients of education, or user of the service provided
- 4) A variety of individuals, including administration, might be targeted for surveys, rather than just focusing on students for broader information about the District
- 5) The Board might look at both research and best practices for validity of the process, then move forward in the direction of student and/or staff surveys
- 6) A timing concern was mentioned with regard to possible budget reductions
- 7) The focus would be on the classroom and quality of instruction
- 8) The question was raised, "If not used in the evaluation process, what would be gained?"
- 9) DCSD could lead, rather than follow in this process; or wait for an established method
- 10) Surveys regarding coaches were previously instituted, but follow up was difficult

Dr. Noonan added that Strategic Plan, Goal 4 regarding school climate, might be a consideration for an online survey, and a precursor to student surveys. This question bank would address customer service and safety of the schools. Also, priorities within the Strategic Plan would need to be reviewed and possibly shifted should the Board decide to move forward with implementing the surveys.

The consensus of the Board was to hear additional feedback from staff prior to the February Board Meeting.

12. Superintendent's Report **Administrative Report**

A brief informational report was received from Dr. Noonan regarding activities of the past month and upcoming events. Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) interviews and meetings related to the Douglas High School Facilities' Master Plan were reported to have occurred. Dr. Noonan stated she had been meeting with administrators regarding their Management by Objectives (MBOs), and had attended "Sit and Listen" events at schools. Some upcoming topics for the December Board Meeting were announced. Topics included an update on the Kingsbury Middle School (KMS) sale process and a review of maps for redistricting, resulting from the census. The October 31st Common Core Workshop that was cancelled, was rescheduled to November 21st, 8:00 a.m., at PDC.

13. Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) Report

Mrs. Trigg stated her recent involvement included in a conference call regarding NASB Director, Dotty Merrill's contract. She reminded Board members of the upcoming conference in Reno, November 17-19.

14. Correspondence

There was no correspondence.

15. Possible Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings

There were no changes offered at this time to the future agenda items list.

16. Closed Session

At 7:50 p.m., Mrs. Chessell moved to recess to closed session in order to discuss matters with the Board's management representatives pursuant to NRS 288.220(4), seconded by Mr. Green.

Motion carried, 7/0.

17. Adjournment

At 8:22 p.m., Mr. Green moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Chichester.

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.