

MINUTES

Present:

Trustees:

Sharla Hales, President
Teri Jamin, Vice President
Karen Chessell, Clerk – via conference phone
Ross Chichester, Member
Neal Freitas, Member
Thomas Moore, Member
Cynthia Trigg, Member

Personnel:

Lisa Noonan, Superintendent
Rich Alexander, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
Holly Luna, Chief Financial Officer

Absent: Lyn Gorrindo, Assistant Superintendent, Education Services

Others Present:

Rick Hsu, Legal Counsel

1. Call to Order

Mrs. Chessell participated from the start of this meeting via phone.

Mrs. Hales called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Rick Hsu led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. Trigg moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by Ms. Jamin.

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

Motion carried 7/0.

2. Consent Items (For Possible Action)

Mrs. Hales asked if there were any items to be pulled from the Consent Agenda. There were none.

Mr. Chichester moved to approve the Consent Items, seconded by Mrs. Trigg.

Mrs. Hales called for public comment. There were no comments offered.

Motion carried, 7/0.

- A. Approve the Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of January 8, 2013.
- B. Approve the Minutes of the Special Board Meeting of January 25, 2013.
- C. Approve payments contained in Special Run Voucher Number 1315 and Regular Run Voucher Number 1316 for FY 12-13.
- D. Approve personnel actions described in Personnel Report No. 13-02.

- E. Approve the Budget Adjustment Voucher for February 2013.
- F. Approve the composition of the Family Life, Sex Education, AIDS (FLSEA) Advisory Council.

Mr. Moore moved to adopt the Consent Agenda with changes as noted in the red folder, seconded by Mrs. Trigg.

Motion carried, 7/0.

3. Election of Officers (For Possible Action)

Ms. Jamin began by stating she did not wish to be considered for an officer position due to large upcoming personal events.

- A. President - Mrs. Hales opened the nominations for President. Mrs. Trigg nominated Mr. Moore, seconded by Ms. Jamin. There were no other nominations.

Mrs. Hales called for public comment. There were no comments and no further discussion.

A vote was taken. Motion carried, 7/0. Mr. Moore ran the meeting from this point forward.

Dr. Noonan and the Board thanked Mrs. Hales for her commitment of two years as President of the Board. Mrs. Hales was awarded a plaque for her leadership and service.

- B. Vice President - Mr. Moore called for nominations for Vice President. Ms. Jamin nominated Mrs. Chessell, seconded by Mr. Chichester. Mrs. Chessell nominated Mrs. Trigg, seconded by Mr. Freitas.

Mr. Moore called for public comment. No comments were offered.

Mrs. Trigg stated her desire to offer the opportunity to Mrs. Chessell and that she would step back from the nomination.

A vote was taken for Mrs. Chessell to occupy the office of Vice President. Motion carried 7/0. No action was taken with regard to the motion regarding Mrs. Trigg's nomination.

- C. Clerk – Mr. Moore called for nominations for Clerk. Mrs. Hales nominated Mr. Chichester, seconded by Ms. Jamin. There was no public comment. Mr. Chichester offered that Mrs. Trigg might wish to serve as the Clerk. Mrs. Trigg stated she would did not wish to accept an officer nomination at this time.

At 3:42 p.m. a vote was taken for Mr. Chichester to hold the position of Clerk. Motion carried, 7/0.

Mr. Moore congratulated the new officers and stated the various Board Committee positions would be addressed next.

4. Appointment of Board Representatives (For Possible Action) (For Possible Action)

The following is a list of Board members who will serve during 2013 as representatives:	
A. Debt Management Commission	Ross Chichester
B. Board of Directors – Nevada Association of School Boards	Cynthia Trigg <u>Alternate:</u> <u>Karen Chessell</u>

Appointment of Board Representatives (For Possible Action) (Continued)	
The following is a list of Board members who will served during 2013 as representatives:	
C. Douglas County Parks and Recreation Board	Thomas Moore
D. Liaison between Board of Trustees, County Commission, and Douglas County Planning Commission	Neal Freitas <u>Alternate:</u> Sharla Hales
E. Liaison to Douglas County Education Foundation	Karen Chessell Teri Jamin Cynthia Trigg
F. School Safety Task Force	Neal Freitas
G. Expulsion Hearings Subcommittee	Neal Freitas Ross Chichester Thomas Moore Cindy Trigg Sharla Hales Karen Chessell Teri Jamin
H. Employee Relations Communications Committee	Cindy Trigg <u>Alternate:</u> Teri Jamin
I. Liaison to Family Involvement Team	Neal Freitas <u>Alternates:</u> Cynthia Trigg Teri Jamin
J. Liaison to Tahoe/Douglas Chamber of Commerce	Cynthia Trigg
K. Liaison to Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce	Teri Jamin
L. Career and Technical Committee	Teri Jamin Ross Chichester Thomas Moore

Board members discussed the committees listed above. Trustees are shown above as they determined the committees for which each individual would represent.

Mrs. Hales moved that the board members serve as designated on this list, seconded by Mr. Chichester.

Motion carried, 7/0.

5. Principal's Report – (Minden Elementary School) (Administrative Report/Program Review)

Ken Stoll, Principal, Minden Elementary School, thanked Brian Frazier for his assistance in compiling the data dashboard. English Language Arts (ELA) remained consistent when compared to the previous year. Math scores increased as staff embraced Common Core. Minden was reported to have been under the "needs improvement" designation for 2011-12 due to a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) subpopulation group. The staff was commended for moving ahead to see improvement and reach a 75% proficiency rate. Mr. Stoll explained that the State Bighorn, Nevada Growth Model Web Site, provided a graph with quadrants to show growth and proficiency. The

upper right portion of the quadrant was the desired place to maintain the school's Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP) within the new State reporting system. PowerPoint slides showed advancements in math and reading in the areas of growth and proficiency.

Minden worked to implement the Common Core State Standards this year, aligning School Improvement Goals with the Strategic Plan. Language Arts was the latest component added. An emphasis had been placed on writing proficiency at MES. Staff development included incorporating Write From the Beginning for writing assistance, as well as Common Core math training. Ongoing examination of data is being used to identify students for early interventions, such as reading instruction in classrooms. Board members were thanked for providing Board Intervention Funds (BIF) for targeting student assistance over three grade levels. Teachers were reported to have used across grade level collaboration in their work to incorporate Common Core Standards into the curriculum. This allowed for teachers who taught grades below and above each other to better understand grade level expectations to better align curriculum. Rigor had been increased to the point that 6th grade rubrics were now similar to previously used high school rubrics.

Board member questions were answered. Information provided included how teachers had been educated on Promethean Boards that were now used throughout the school. This technology was included in common instructional spaces such as the music room, library, and computer lab as a resource, in addition to classrooms. Kiosks containing 6 computers for students in the hallways were networked and used continuously for instructional help throughout the school day.

Enrollment at Minden Elementary was reported to have dropped from 445 students in 2009-10 to 401 in 2012-13.

Mr. Stoll and his staff were congratulated for incorporating early interventions and for maintaining a welcoming, positive, upbeat attitude to assist students in becoming successful starting at the beginning of each day.

6. First Reading Board Policy No. 318, "Positive Action Review" – Administrative Personnel (Discussion and For Possible Action)

Rich Alexander, Assistant Superintendent Human Resources, stated changes to Board Policy No. 318, "Positive Action Review," were a result of the Meet and Confer process with administrators. Two major policy revisions were stated. Administrators could request association representation and/or attorney representation during the review process (at their expense). In this case the District's attorney could also be present. Additionally, an informal step was added to resolve issues at the lowest possible level

Mr. Moore called for public comment. There was none.

Board members raised some question regarding language included in the revisions. Mr. Alexander responded changes could be incorporated; although, the administrators had assisted with revisions and any changes would need to be reviewed first by administrators. Consensus was there was no need to incorporate additional changes.

Ms. Jamin moved to approve for first reading the changes to Board Policy No. 318, "Positive Action Review – Administrative Personnel," seconded by Mrs. Trigg.

Motion carried, 7/0.

7. Closed Session

At 4:45 p.m., Mrs. Trigg moved to recess to closed session in order to discuss matters with their management representatives pursuant to NRS 288.220(4), seconded by Ms. Jamin.

Motion carried, 7/0.

The Board returned to open session at 5:30 p.m.

8. Nevada School Performance Framework 101 (Information and Discussion)

Dr. Noonan introduced Brian Frazier, Director of Assessments and Grants and provided an explanation of the origin of the Nevada School Performance Framework. States across the nation were provided an opportunity to submit a plan for a new federal accountability system to be used in the place of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The Nevada Department of Education created the new Nevada Education Performance System. Dr. Noonan referred to this new federal reporting system as the three umbrella principles. In this Board report, Mr. Frazier would be addressing the reform falling under Principle #2, Differentiated Recognition, Accountability and Support Systems; to be known as the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). The presentation would center on elementary and middle school grade levels.

Mr. Frazier stated the goal would be to familiarize Board members with the new NSPF reporting framework. Nevada Performance System is the final title for what was submitted to the federal government as the "waiver application." 2012-13 student results would be the first reported under the new system and would be designated as "classifications." Demo schools would be used at this time to explain how data would be disaggregated. Student growth would be included in the new model, as well as student proficiency results. A weighted formula would be used to assign a point based rating to schools on a 100 point scale. Categories for reporting and their percentages equaled 40% Student Growth Percentiles; 30% proficiency (reading and math each 15%); 20% Subpopulation Growth Gap Reduction; and 10% Other Indicators. The total 60% for Student Growth Percentiles and Subpopulation Growth Gap Reduction was the bulk of reporting. The system worked to support the majority of schools in the middle of the reporting group with 5% falling to the top and 5% landing at the bottom. A chart was provided showing the index points proving the 1 and 5 star designation would be the smaller group of schools, with the majority of schools falling into a range of 2-4 stars.

Mr. Frazier noted the Board backup information contained an elementary and middle school example; although, he would address only elementary reporting in the presentation at this time. More information was noted to be available on Nevadareportcard.com.

The School Improvement Grant (SIG) was reported to have used the Nevada Comprehensive Curriculum Audit Tool for Schools (NCCAT-S) form over the last few years to help identify effective teaching strategies to assist with interventions. A new NCCAT-D (for Districts) form was being developed to assist at the district level. The biggest barriers to achievement were seen as disability, poverty and language.

Mr. Frazier familiarized the Board with all aspects of the new report using demo school data. The Free and Reduced Lunch/Individual Education Plan/English Language Learner subpopulations would be reported. Demographics were reported in the area of ethnicity percentages in a new federally required category; although, not on the basis of accountability for schools. Performance indicators were explained as: 1) Growth Measure of Achievement, 2) Reductions in Achievement Gaps, 3) Test Participation, 4) Status Measures of Achievement, and 5) Other indicators of Achievement (average daily attendance). The School Performance Report was explained including the Student Growth Percentiles (SGP) and Adequate Growth Percentiles (AGP); Status measures (proficiency); Supergroups (FRL/IEP/ELL); and other indicators (Attendance). Student growth percentiles were reported using two data points (2 years of data) for grades 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Using 2 years data, a student would be compared to others with similar score histories and grouped statewide in cohorts resulting in an assigned student growth percentile. Mr. Frazier provided an example in that if a student received a SGP of 65, the student therefore achieved better than 65% in his/her cohort (students with similar score histories) and not as high as 35% of other students in the

cohort. The median SGP would be the midpoint of all student SGPs reported for each site. This would be translated to points resulting in stars earned and reported in the Nevada Performance System. The Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP) reports would be used by administration. The larger the AGP number reported, the higher the growth rate. Board members were referred to the Minden Elementary Principal Report PowerPoint. The areas of Reading and Mathematics were reported on a scale of Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP) using 2010-11 data as compared to 2011-12. These were the two necessary data points to report out in order to graph results as in the new system of quadrants equaling higher achievement and growth, compared year over year.

Reporting of student proficiency was explained next. Gap measures were in place that included Supergroup data disaggregated to show the percentage of students who met their Adequate Growth Percentile (AGP). In this report, a larger number was preferable. A larger reporting number reflected a lesser gap when comparing "at risk" students to the target number attained by the majority of other students.

The number required for a subpopulation had now been reduced to an N number of 10; therefore, more schools would reflect proficiency and growth data in the area of subpopulations. Should a subpopulation not meet the N number, students would be placed into a Supergroup allowing for more students to be reported within the system.

The last information was provided as background student achievement, based in part on previous Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) data that was strictly proficiency oriented.

Mr. Freitas requested that an individual student profile showing low, medium and high achieving students be provided for reference. Dr. Noonan stated this type of a report had not been created; although, Mr. Frazier could provide a reference based on two consecutive years data.

9. Data Dashboard Revisions (Information and Discussion)

Item 9 was tabled until March due to time constraints this evening.

Public Comment

Mr. Moore called for public comment at 6:20 p.m.

Mrs. Trigg commented on behalf of Konnie Susich, teacher, that a spring auction fundraiser would be held at Mont Bleu on Saturday, February 23th. A flyer would be available for those interested in attending.

Item 14 was heard prior to Item 10.

14. Level 3 Grievance Hearings of DCPEA (Discussion and For Possible Action)

At 6:23 p.m., Mr. Moore verified Mrs. Chessell was in fact on the phone and that she could hear clearly.

Mr. Moore asked Ms. Brennan and Mr. Alexander how much time would be needed for each of their presentations. It was determined the initial presentations would take approximately 10-15 minutes.

Ms. Brennan introduced herself as the NSEA Uniserv Director, representing DCPEA in two grievances; Robyn Mattinson and Julie Michel. This hearing was with regard to the District's decision to not hear the Level II grievances due to timeliness.

Ms. Brennan was informed that Mrs. Chessell was not physically in attendance due to illness. Ms.

Brennan stated she brought additional information for the Board. Mrs. Chessell stated she had the documents provided to her prior to the hearing. Ms. Brennan felt Mrs. Chessell's participation would be fine without having the additional information in front of her.

Mr. Moore stated he was unaware of any additional documents.

Mr. Alexander objected.

Mr. Moore responded the process was clear and the Board would only accept information ahead of the hearing as requested previously.

Ms. Brennan stated she would summarize the additional information.

Presentations

Ms. Brennan presented for the grievants. A grievance was filed in June 2010, in accordance with Article 2-C-2, wherein language stated the Superintendent would arrange for a hearing within 5 days of receipt of a grievance. The District contacted Mr. Cahill, who was the Uniserv Director, and asked to schedule the grievance. Ms. Brennan noted that Mr. Alexander informed NSEA his recommendation to Dr. Noonan (who would make the final determination) would be to not hear the grievances due to timelines not having been met. Various e-mails were referenced with datelines ranging from July 2010 to January 2011 without the grievance date having been settled. In February 2011 a petition for declaratory order was sent to the Employee Management Relations Board (EMRB). A petition filed to make a decision regarding release of information. A delay was incurred due to an EMRB extension request. The EMRB would typically hear a case within 90 days; although, an extension and briefs were requested from both parties. The EMRB hearing was then scheduled for February 2012 and a decision resulted in May 2012. Following this notification, none of the parties, neither the District nor Association were in contact with regard to these grievances; although, both sides did communicate about other matters. In January 2013, the Association requested a Level II hearing. Mr. Alexander responded it was too late in time to accept the request for a hearing and that per contract language, the grievance had been abandoned. This decision was supported by Dr. Noonan. Ms. Brennan stated the Association was asking to hear the "merits of the grievance," and that the intent was not to abandon the grievance.

Ms. Brennan called Susan Lacey as a witness for past practice in regard to Association business. Mrs. Lacey introduced herself as a multiple impairment teacher working at Scarselli Elementary School who had been active in the Association for over a decade, including having held the position of President for six years.

Through questions asked by Ms. Brennan, Mrs. Lacey stated she had been involved in at least 50 grievances – many due to the year RIF's occurred as a result of budget reductions. Some grievances were noted to be handled informally or abandoned due to various reasons. Reasons included fear of retaliation from principals, and the situation not being in the best overall interest of an individual, or sometimes teachers just wanted to be heard by their principal with no intent to go forward beyond that stage. Ms. Brennan verified that a form was signed by both parties at the end of the process allowing for agreement or disagreement among the two parties.

Mr. Alexander cross-examined Mrs. Lacey. Mr. Alexander asked if the instance had occurred wherein the Association didn't agree with the Superintendent, but had written that the decision was not agreeable with the intent being the grievance would not go forward. Mrs. Lacey responded the only option was to agree to disagree. Mr. Alexander asked if a grievance had been filed in regard to the form. Mrs. Lacey responded that a grievance had not been filed. Mr. Alexander wrapped up by asking if the Association had "attempted to negotiate a change in that language on that?" Mrs. Lacey replied, "It has been considered, but no."

Ms. Brennan stated they would like to have an opportunity to have the grievance heard. She stated

a question of timeliness should not be reason to forfeit holding the grievance hearing. The argument was that if the grievance then went to arbitration, the issue of timeliness could be decided there. Ms. Brennan requested the merits of the grievance be heard.

Mr. Alexander commended Ms. Brennan for the summary presented. Typographical errors in the District's documentation were clarified. On page A-1, 2nd paragraph, last sentence, a date of 1/25/12 was corrected to reflect 1/25/13. On page B-1 in the date listing of September 10, 2010 – NCSEA was corrected to read NSEA. The last correction was the May 12, 2012 listing also at the bottom of page B-1 should have read May 3, 2012.

Next, Mr. Alexander referred to the underlined sentence on page C-1 of the District documentation, as the basis for the grievance. "Time is of the essence in the discharge of grievances and all parties hereto shall comply strictly within the time limitations set forth above." Year over year, the District was noted to have adhered to the importance of timeliness. Should the grievant fail to adhere to the timeline, the grievance shall be considered abandoned. Emails were referenced and Mr. Alexander noted a statement from 12/14/10 stating Mr. Cahill would contact the District to schedule the grievance once the information issue had been resolved (Page D-6). On 2/4/10 the order mailed to the EMRB regarding this filing was received by the District. Mr. Alexander stated the District's position was clear through communication that among himself and the attorney's representing both parties, the burden to schedule and confirm the grievance rested on the Association. The EMRB hearing took longer than expected; although, the District made every attempt to schedule the grievance hearing in a timely manner and could not move forward until the information issue, resting with the EMRB, was resolved. The Notice of Entry of Order resolution from the EMRB was received 5/3/12, leaving the Association with the responsibility to move forward with scheduling. Mr. Alexander stated eight and a half months later the Association requested to schedule the grievance hearing. The grievance was therefore not requested to be heard in a timely manner.

Rebuttals

Ms. Brennan rebutted by stating coming to agreement on scheduling of the grievance hearing was mutual and that there was some confusion. Mr. Alexander was noted to have referenced page D-7 of the District's documentation from February 2011, and believed the issue to be resolved. Ms. Brennan argued that the Association is saying right now, "The issue is now ready to bring the grievance forward with the EMRB's ruling as it is, and they have had time to research it and get the case together." This reasoning was why there was no timeline. Ms. Brennan stated the Association did initially file the grievance within the first 20 days; the timeline was broken with regard to setting the next meeting. Two things occurred, a change of staff at NSEA, as well as additional difficulties obtaining a mutual date such as individuals being out of town. Mrs. Brennan wrapped up by stating the Association had no intent to abandon the grievance; therefore, the grievance is timely and the merits should be heard.

Mr. Alexander reviewed the timeline of events noting the grievance was submitted, a date arranged, and then the hearing was cancelled in order to allow time for an EMRB hearing. Mr. Alexander addressed the Association's claim that it was incumbent upon the District to schedule the hearing. He argued the Association changed the course of the proceedings and would then need to follow up. Eight and a half months later the Association asked to have the grievance heard – much too late.

Closing Remarks

Ms. Brennan stated she represented the moving party and they were attempting to take the next step. Attempts to arrive at mutual hearing dates were reiterated and noted to have extended the timeframe, as well as the need to have issues resolved (EMRB) with attorney's involved. The grievants were noted to have lost pay prior to the EMRB decision and desired to go forward at this time. The preference was to resolve the timeliness issue at a lower lever and not have to proceed to the more expensive process of Arbitration.

Mr. Alexander referenced the Negotiated Agreement as a contract, not a list of suggestions or recommendations. Each party was noted to be obligated to hold up their end of the agreement. He stated the language within the Agreement should be honored. In this case, timeliness of the grievance process was questioned; although, language was very clear. Additionally, Mr. Alexander stated the District has not ever asked if someone wished to abandon a grievance. Instead, it was by reasoning that the timeline was not followed, or an individual did not wish to bring their case forward.

Mr. Moore checked with Mrs. Chessell who was listening by phone to be sure she clearly heard the testimony. Mrs. Chessell verified that she was able to hear clearly.

Board Deliberation

Board members deliberated toward taking action on the timeliness of the two grievances.

A question was raised as to the process going forward should the Board determine the grievances were not timely. Mr. Hsu, attorney, responded by stating if this case went to an arbitrator in the event the Board decided the grievances were untimely, the arbitrator will determine first if the grievances were timely. A provision in the contract allowed for the grievance to be remanded to the Board should it be decided the merits of the grievance should be heard. The arbitrator might remand the Level II Hearing back to staff or the Board following the decision if it was determined the grievance had been timely.

Ms. Brennan disagreed, and stated her belief, that due to cost, she understood the arbitrator would hear the timeliness case and then the merits of the grievance in the event the timeliness portion was decided in favor of the Association.

Discussion ensued about interpretation of a Nevada Supreme Court case referenced in documentation provided by Ms. Brennan. Mr. Hsu stated the law favors arbitration and resolution of issues at the lowest level.

The timeline of events around the grievance filing was reviewed, as well as reasoning for postponement of the initial grievance hearings. The District was noted to have arranged a time for a hearing that was then postponed by Association representatives. Mrs. Hales referenced an email dated January 25, 2013 from Ms. Brennan to Mr. Alexander that stated "we are ready to present the Julie Michel and Robyn Mattinson grievances at the Step 2 level," noting the implication was the Association knew it was their responsibility to schedule a hearing. Interpretation of the message was the Association was now ready to schedule the grievance. Ms. Brennan responded that the District had not stated a timeline; therefore, the Association didn't understand a deadline was to be adhered to.

Mr. Moore stated following the EMRB determination, eight and a half months passed. It appeared to be in the best interest of the Association to communicate in order to move the grievance forward. Ms. Brennan responded their legal counsel needed time to analyze the decision and "be sure of the case before presenting it." Mr. Freitas restated the question, as to why there had been no action to move the grievance forward following the EMRB hearing. Ms. Brennan replied, "We have priorities and we're getting to those priorities now."

Ms. Trigg stated the timeline for the initial request for a grievance was met according to Article 2-C-2. Ms. Brennan reiterated that the Association had requested the extension.

At 7:25 p.m., Mr. Moore called for public comment. There were no comments offered.

Board members commented with regard to their understanding of testimony. Mrs. Trigg stated she had some concerns and favored having Dr. Noonan hear the grievances. Consensus of the other Board members was around appreciation for timeliness and maintaining that the contract be used as protocol; concerns were raised regarding the eight and a half month time lapse with no request for a

Level II hearing; matters other than these 2 grievances were stated to have been of more importance to the Association; therefore, delaying scheduling of the Level II hearing; the tone of emails reflected the Association would take the responsibility of the burden to move forward after the EMRB hearing; and the email that requested the grievances be heard sent to Mr. Alexander in January 2013 stated the Association was now ready to move forward.

Mrs. Hales moved to determine the Association's two grievances are not timely under the collective bargaining agreement, seconded by Mr. Chichester.

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

10. Superintendent's Report (Administrative Report)

Dr. Noonan reported that a full day safety and shooter training seminar was provided on February 6th by the Nevada Threat Analysis Center. Principals, teachers, counselors, supervisors and other staff members attended in order to learn the most up to date school safety information. Documentation designed to help with safety planning was provided to the district. Local agencies attended including the Nevada Highway Patrol, Douglas County Sheriff's Office, East Fork Fire and Tahoe Douglas Fire. Subsequent meetings have been planned to continue improving our school and district safety plans.

11. Nevada Association of School Boards (NASB) Report

Mrs. Trigg announced the National Association of School Boards conference would be held in San Diego, California in March and information would be provided. Mrs. Trigg provided a heads up that important dates relating to the current legislative session had been provided via email.

12. Possible Agenda Items for Future Board Meetings

Mr. Chichester suggested an additional committee wherein one or two people could represent the Board on critical issues at the Legislature, seconded by Mrs. Trigg.

Mr. Moore offered that the Bylaw regarding the Board President's duty of being the spokesman for the Board be discussed with regard to legislative representatives, seconded by Mrs. Trigg. It was suggested that the Code of Conduct could be updated per the latest workshop discussions as well.

Mr. Freitas suggested having a time on the agenda where Board members could report their participation in activities with the community and/or staff. Co-curricular and Extracurricular events might be mentioned. The idea was to tie the report to the Parents and Community Goal of the Strategic Plan, seconded by Mrs. Trigg. Consensus was the agenda might be changed to include a new heading.

13. Correspondence

Mrs. Trigg stated an email had been received from a parent who was seeking approval to carry weapons on school grounds due to the parent having a Concealed Carry Weapon permit. Dr. Noonan responded the Board would be presented with newly updated safety information in an upcoming Board Meeting.

15. Adjournment

Mr. Chichester moved to adjourn at 7:49 p.m., seconded by Mrs. Hales.

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.