

Douglas County School District
Lake Schools' Study Group Board Advisory Committee
Whittell High School
Monday, January 12, 2015
3:30 p.m.

Minutes Approved
February 19, 2014

Minutes

Present:

Facilitator:

Dr. McMillan

Committee Members:

Greg Felton (Not Present)
Cathy Johnson
Kathy Kixmiller
Stacy Noyes
Brian Rippet
Phil Sorensen (Not Present)
Konnie Susich

Committee Support:

Ross Chichester
Cindy Trigg (Not Present)
Nancy Cauley
Rommy Cronin
Crespin Esquivel

CALL TO ORDER

Dr. McMillan called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Rippet moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by Ms. Susich.

Motion carried 5/0.

MINUTES OF MEETING ON DECEMBER 15, 2014

Ms. Johnson moved to adopt the minutes, seconded by Ms. Susich, with Ms. Noyes and Ms. Kixmiller abstaining due to leaving the Dec 15 meeting early.

Motion carried 3/0.

WORK SESSION REPORTS AND DISCUSSION

Dr. McMillan gave three handouts to the Committee for discussion.

Board Recommendation Question #2 Discussions:

Discussion was held on mentorship/internship opportunities via a formalized Mentorship Program. Research was done on the Telluride school. One additional staff member could run the mentorship/internship program and possibly combine them with the community based learning/distance learning programs. That staff member would possibly be able to teach more electives and programs. Students would have the opportunity to go into the community for internships giving them different pathways for learning. Students would have a mentorship class at Whittell every day for academics.

Students have commented that they have interests in fields other than what is taught at GWHS but do not know how to get involved. At this time there is no commitment for staffing for next year and further staffing should not be asked for until there are firm projections.

Pros mentioned were offering a wider range of electives, pleasing all three stakeholders [students, parents, and teachers] to the question of not enough classes, drawing new students to GWHS, involving the community, GWHS will have the tools (Chromebooks), and the internships could be done after school or as an early out or online. Grant money could possibly be used for an additional teacher. Cons mentioned were the possibility of repurposing an existing teacher position or losing a position because of the distance learning program.

Ms. Cronin added that distance learning funding is a different allocation than direct instruction allocation from the State Board of Education. At this time there is no application for distance learning on file with the state. The application was not completed in the empowerment process earlier. It was discovered that the state gives money differently based on distance learning than they do on direct instruction teachers. The district may, for a variety of reasons, be applying for distance learning funding in the future. The District will do what they can to protect staffing.

A need mentioned was an additional teacher. Constraints mentioned were distance learning funding would be based on a different funding allocation from the State Board of Education, transportation to and from schools and the cost of a teacher.

Mr. Chichester mentioned that there will be more determination after putting costs to the constraints.

Ms. Susich moved to change this item of mentorship/internship from Question #2 to be included in Questions #1, #2 and #3 to offer students E-learning, distance learning and community based learning programs regardless of the enrollment size of Whittell, seconded by Ms. Kixmiller.

Motion carried 5/0.

Dr. McMillan mentioned that this item will be moved to a lower position in Question #1.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No Public Comment was offered.

Board Recommendation Question #2 Discussion:

Discussion was held on acquiring an additional instructional coach and/or assistant principal. ZCES did not see a need for an assistant principal, but would welcome an instructional coach. GWHS would like both an assistant principal and an instructional coach, but if there are money constraints, would at least welcome an instructional coach. GWHS has a full-time Dean who also serves as the athletic director for the middle and high school. There will be a new technology trainer who will have a desk at PDC in the valley, but will be housed at GWHS temporarily on a day-to-day basis, but could not be used as a full-time instructional coach since his/her duties will be exclusively technology implementation. The Committee would like to ask for an instructional coach, if resources become available from the state. Pros mentioned were the position could be shared between GWHS and ZCES, could relieve the principal

of some of the teacher coaching to focus time on the new evaluations system , and Professional Learning Communities could be implemented and facilitated in each department. No cons were mentioned. A need mentioned was requirement of a new teaching position. A constraint mentioned was restructuring (but not eliminating) the district's Professional Development Center model at GWHS and ZCES.

Board Recommendation Question #3 Discussion:

Discussion was held about drafting a K-12 instruction program like the Silverton (Colorado) model . No pros were mentioned. A con mentioned was the cost to tear down a wing and retrofit GWHS to accommodate younger students.

The Committee chose to revisit Question #3 later in the meeting.

Board Recommendation Question #1 Discussion:

Discussion was held on retaining the current level of staffing for the high school and look at increasing the middle school staffing because of the larger 6th grade class that will be moving into GWHS next year. The Committee would like a guarantee that younger students will not be placed with older students.

A pro mentioned was maintaining current high school and elementary school staffing and courses. A con mentioned was having younger students placed in courses with older students if the staffing was not increased. Needs mentioned were staffing to cover middle school courses because of increased enrollment and available teaching rooms without impacting the high school staffing. Constraints mentioned were staffing and available teaching rooms.

Mr. Rippet left meeting at 4:53 PM.

Discussion was held about offering GWHS high interest courses via a MOU. GWHS could investigate high interest courses such as Engineering & Design and introduce the program to model the DHS program, which is grant funded and may take a year to put together. There is a question that AP Computer Science A, which is JAVA based, may not be a realistic direction our students want to follow. A MOU could contain attendance, academic and behavioral clauses. Clarification needs to be made about full-time students versus one or two classes, would students switch both ways? Calendars of the two districts would need to match. Pros mentioned were new courses could be provided with more students attending GWHS via a MOU, GWHS students could go to STHS for a few classes and STHS students could come to GWHS for all classes, if GWHS and STHS would have matching calendars. No cons were mentioned. Needs mentioned were teacher, materials, credentials, the calendars and bell schedules for both GWHS and LTUSD would have to match up for full-time or half-time students. Constraints mentioned were additional training for staff, additional staff, and additional tools.

Dr. McMillan handed out incentives to Ms. Noyes for being the first Committee member to respond to attending the meeting and to Ms. Kixmiller for being the first Committee member to respond with suggestions for the meeting.

Discussion was held about 7th-8th grades maintaining their current format of classes. Pros mentioned were that a new "wheel" of elective classes could be introduced to students and 7th and 8th graders would stay with their age group. No cons were mentioned. A need mentioned was additional

technology training for students and staff. A constraint mentioned was keeping staff levels the same at the high school.

Discussion was held about dual credit options with WNC and removing limitations of LTCC credits. The Committee would like to continue to pursue this issue. Pros mentioned were an opportunity to have a Jump Start Program and distance ed programs with WNC and LTCC. There were no cons mentioned. There were no needs mentioned. Constraints mentioned were issues with the limitation of state credits with LTCC, staffing, and issues with the differences in school calendars.

Discussion was held to continue to give global experience opportunities to students via exchange programs. The Committee felt the school could continue with the program as it is and decided to move this to no the recommendations section.

Discussion was held about creating an "Autonomy" status for DCSD high performing schools such as GWHS and CVMS rather than an "empowerment" status, because it is now associated with under-performing schools. The Committee would like assurances from the Board to have the creativity to do things differently, if they are brought to the Board with good rationale.

Mr. Chichester mentioned that he believes many of the things that the Committee is proposing are doable and there are others that may not be doable right now. There is hope that the legislature will back the Governor and allocate more money into education. Many programs are being funded through grants which are in their third year. The grants would need to be renewed or the money will not be there. The legislature will be looking at a bill that will redistribute funds throughout the state and hopefully that will not affect the District in a negative way. Property taxes are at the 75 cents maximum and the 10 cents maximum that were allowed by the taxpayers for capital construction. The only thing that will help the District is increased enrollment. It is a very positive thing that GWHS is a 5 star school. It is a two-edged sword being a 5 star school. How much more money do you put into a school because they are a 5 star school, but it is also known that certain things need to be done to continue to be a 5 star school. The Board is not against anything that is wanted, but there are money constraints. Some programs were taken away last year, but were replaced for a year to go through this process. A suggestion would be that when recommendations are made to the Board, make the recommendations first of what is needed the most.

Pros mentioned were the State may be bringing the "autonomy" status into being and bringing discussions between the Board and the schools/parents to work together. Cons mentioned were that a 5 star school may be perceived as having no needs because they are performing so well. No needs were noted. No constraints were mentioned.

Discussion was held on offering teachers an incentive to acquire additional licenses. Ms. Cronin stated that an alternative ed endorsement does not require a teacher to be highly qualified to teach some classes. To acquire an alternative ed endorsement would take just a few more credits. If funds were provided by alternative means to help acquire licenses, teachers would benefit by moving over on the salary schedule and more teachers would be able to teach more content areas. A suggestion was made to bring up this information with the contract negotiation team to support the school. Pros mentioned were more courses could be taught. Cons mentioned were if enrollment decreased, the alternative ed

licensed teacher may be moved from his/her regular teaching assignment to other areas. No constraints were mentioned.

Discussion was held on using a Peer Teaching Program to partner GWHS and ZCES. The pros mentioned were that teacher's aides might be used. This program could be added to the mentorship and community based learning items as a pathway for students and have courses added at the school level and would not have to be recommended to the Board. The Committee discussed that this item would not need permission from the Board and decided to state that they researched this item but would make no recommendation at this time.

Discussion was held about the Intensive Study Periods [ISP]. The ISP program would be enrichment in areas of interests held during the school year, include field trips, but would not be eligible for credit. A constraint mentioned was money would be needed for supplies, teacher planning and alternative team building programs, but could be provided for by grant funding. The Committee discussed that this item would not need permission from the Board and decided to state that they researched this item but would make no recommendation at this time.

Mr. Chichester left the meeting at 5:55 PM.

Discussion was held about an IB Program. Pros mentioned were that GWHS would no longer be a traditional school which could attract more students. Cons mentioned were all students may not be served, more investigation would need to be done, and all stakeholders would need to be supportive. Constraints mentioned were more research would need to be done, which could take a lot of time and work. The Committee decided to move this item to Question 2 and not ready to commit at this time.

Discussion was held about which Committee members would be presenting this information to the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No Public Comment was offered.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Noyes moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Susich at 6:12 PM.
Motion carried 4/0.

Submitted by,

Dr. Nancy McMillan, Facilitator
Lake Schools' Study Group