

LAMOILLE UNION DISTRICT #18 BOARD MEETING MINUTES
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER
TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2008

Board members present: B. Bailey, D. Baker, J. Eisenhardt, S. Hamlyn-Prescott, P. Ingvoldstad, T. O'Hear, D. Osborn, B. Penberthy, S. Reber, K. Roberts, W. Sander, D. Whitcomb. Others: T. Bailey, B. Schaffer, C. Hindes, J. Teegarden, M. Spaulding.

Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.

1. Call to Order, Introductions, Adopt the Agenda, Announcements and Public Input

A. Call to Order – 6:30

B. Announcements

P. Ingvoldstad thanked J. Teegarden for providing a clock in the meeting room.

2. Discussion of Core Beliefs / Mission

P. Ingvoldstad said that in 2002, the board developed some core beliefs (listed on the back of the agenda) that have since languished. Working to make sure every student had a consistent learning advocate was going to be a major effort, and some strides have been made in that direction, but we are not anywhere near all the way there. P. Ingvoldstad would like a discussion about these core beliefs and about whether the board should adopt them. There was discussion about whether the core beliefs were originally developed by the LNSU board or the LU board, and more people seemed to think it was the LNSU board.

B. Schaffer asked for a definition of a “consistent learning advocate.” P. Ingvoldstad said it would be someone who would be involved with a child for more than one year, hopefully through the whole school experience. S. Hamlyn-Prescott said it is different from a guidance counselor. B. Penberthy said it would be someone the student could identify. T. Bailey said he uses the term “caring adult,” but a learning advocate may be something more than that. B. Schaffer and P. Ingvoldstad agreed that the whole high school model makes it difficult to provide a consistent learning advocate.

P. Ingvoldstad noted that he had forgotten to ask the board to adopt the agenda.

ACTION: J. Eisenhardt moved to adopt the agenda, with corrections to the times shown for the last two agenda items, and the motion was seconded and passed.

S. Reber asked for background on how the board came up with these core beliefs. P. Ingvoldstad said there was a whole list of action items desired by various people, which were discussed. The group tried to bring it down to a shorter, focused list. B. Penberthy said that at that time the board was focused on graduation rates. W. Sander said those were troubled times for the whole SU. This was largely a team-building effort – an attempt to get people cooperating, not fighting. C. Hindes asked, did knowing the middle school would be built play a role in these discussions? T. O'Hear didn't think so, and others agreed.

K. Roberts said she's still not clear on what a consistent learning advocate is, or what a learning plan is. The core beliefs don't use clearly defined terms. If we are going to adopt them, do we have commonality on what we mean by the things listed? W. Sander said having a consistent learning advocate doesn't just mean having the guidance counselor available, or a kind teacher. There needs to be someone who will bond with the child all the way through. S. Hamlyn-Prescott said a few years ago there was a suggestion that at the high school, the position of 9th grade counselor could be rotated, so the person who was the 9th grade advisor for one group of kids could be advisor for that same group of kids for the next 3 years. But it never went any further than that. B. Schaffer said the same stumbling blocks that were in place then are still in place today. We can't force a relationship on anyone. Making someone available is a good concept, but we can't be sure they will bond. He doesn't want what the guidance counselors do now to be overshadowed. He doesn't philosophically argue that it is a bad idea for kids to have more than one connection at school, and he doesn't think there is a lack of relationships now, but it is not possible to say someone will be with a group of kids for 4 years.

B. Penberthy said the idea of a learning advocate was based around high school completion; it was prevention-based. The board talked to kids who didn't graduate, and they typically said they didn't have a "go-to person" in high school. In her court diversion program, she asks all the kids who they can go to at school for help. She finds some kids don't have anyone, so she has them pick someone, and they call that person together. T. Bailey talked about a book with a chapter on the importance of caring adults. The recommendations in that book are not hypothetical, but based on a real life plan. C. Hindes said part of the whole middle school philosophy is relationship building. It is discussed often at both the middle school and high school.

P. Ingvaldstad asked about the ratio of guidance counselors to students. B. Schaffer said we will be adding another person, so it will increase, but now it is about 1:150 at the high school and about 1:280 at the middle school. P. Ingvaldstad asked, how can B. Schaffer even bring up guidance counselors as advocates? How can one person have that kind of relationship with 150 kids? B. Schaffer said the counselors do a fantastic job. He's not arguing the philosophy of having more than one contact for each kid, but how do we plan it out so we can consistently have one person there for each kid? And what will the advocates be expected to do – go to juvenile justice meetings, go to parents' houses? How can we practically program this? W. Sander asked, how are guidance counselors assigned to students? B. Schaffer said by grade level. W. Sander asked, it changes from year to year? B. Schaffer said yes, counselors don't move with the class. Of the 3 counselors there now, one is new. J. Eisenhardt asked, how do we involve parents? He encouraged P. Ingvaldstad to contact a superintendent in Miami who developed a very successful program involving parents. S. Reber said he doesn't think we all need to agree what a consistent learning advocate is. P. Ingvaldstad said he thought B. Schaffer could figure out how to schedule teachers to act as advocates. Some schools do this. The relationships aren't always perfect, but they can be switched. There are models of how this can be worked on that go beyond where we are now.

S. Reber said he thinks how to implement the idea is the second part of the discussion. B. Schaffer asked, is the board saying the school should provide for learning advocates as needed, or is it saying every student needs one? Some students desperately need advocates. Some students may not necessarily need the same level of support. D. Osborn said she sees these as beliefs or ideals, not policy. We can't work together effectively unless we have some agreed upon beliefs or ideals, even if we don't have the steps to carry them out. W. Sander said every student could have an advocate, but their needs are not all equal. He envisions the advocate being like a faculty advisor at a college, who needs to devote much more time to certain students than to others. P. Ingvaldstad said he doesn't see this as a requirement that everyone has to have a mentor even if they have great parents and are successful. K. Roberts said we know that there are kids who don't have advocates. She liked what D. Osborn said about having principles or ideals, but if we're going to move forward as a board we need to agree on what we mean; we need to be careful about language and about really being in consensus. D. Baker we're not saying every student has to have an advocate, we're saying we believe they *need* one.

S. Reber said some of the core beliefs on the list don't seem to him to fit as well as others. "Learning should be the constant and place and time the variable not time and place the constant and learning the variable" – that doesn't give him a feeling of what's intended. "We should search for and use every possible resource and modality to ensure every student experiences progressions of successes" – he doesn't see that as a guide. W. Sander said the latter one is referring to modalities such as Job Corp, etc., not just what we offer on campus. P. Ingvaldstad said Policy 6.4 was written because of that core belief. Before that, if it didn't happen within these walls it wasn't accepted as education. S. Reber suggested some more specific wording. P. Ingvaldstad said the "learning should be the constant" one was written mainly to address the problem of graduation rate calculations counting only kids who graduate in 4 years, and providing more learning time for kids through summer school, etc. D. Osborn said she thought S. Reber was not arguing with the concept, just the phrasing. S. Reber said his general impression is that some of these core beliefs seem concrete, and some don't. P. Ingvaldstad will put further discussion on the next agenda, and board members and administrators should come back with wordsmithing proposals. P. Ingvaldstad will look up the minutes from the meeting when this was first discussed.

3. ***Consent Agenda Items (Approval of Minutes of the May 20th Meeting and Acceptance of Administration Reports)***

ACTION: W. Sander moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by J. Eisenhardt. D. Osborn noted a typo in the directors' orders breakdown – a \$ instead of an & in "Laraway Youth & Family Services". **The motion to approve the consent agenda with that correction to the minutes was passed, with S. Hamlyn-Prescott abstaining.**

4. ***Directors' Orders***

ACTION: D. Osborn moved to approve directors' orders in the amount of \$179,579.51, and the motion was seconded. The breakdown was as follows: GMTCC Bldg. Project \$6,932.08; VOC Bldg. Trades \$2,886.04; District #18

\$169,761.39 (major expenditures - \$10,013.85 NCS Pearson - Powerschool;
\$13,043.93 CDW Government - Epson projectors; \$19,649.19 First Student;
\$12,491.93 Cambridge Town School Dist.; \$16,315.00 Augmentative Learning;
\$12,272.62 Burlington Food Service. **The motion was passed.**

5. **Administrative Action Items**

A. **Middle School**

C. Hindes distributed information about the All Awards Assembly, which will be held Tuesday, June 17 in the high school auditorium starting at 8:30 AM.

B. **High School**

Graduation will be on June 14, at 11 am. The senior award evening will be Thursday, June 12, at 7 PM.

B. Schaffer presented a recommendation for the .5 Spanish position. This position has been advertised since April through School Spring, and we have received 2 applications. One of the applicants ended up taking another position. The applicant he recommends, Caroline Friedrich, will be under a provisional teaching certificate the first couple of years

ACTION: It was moved and seconded to authorize offering a contract for the .5 Spanish teacher position to Caroline Friedrich.

P. Ingvoldstad asked if she was qualified to teach music, too. B. Schaffer said he hasn't talked to her about that, but he thinks she might be a strong applicant for a .5 secretary position he wants to fill. D. Osborn asked B. Schaffer to review what he had said about her licensure. He said she would be coming in under a provisional license because she doesn't have the teaching credits. She has experience teaching, but not in the public sector. **The motion was passed.**

C. **GMTCC**

J. Teegarden said the pre-tech dinner will be on Friday, June 13, at 6 PM, at the Charlmont, and board members are invited to attend. Graduation will be Tuesday, June 17, at 6:30, on the outfield of the softball diamond, unless it rains, in which case it will be in the HS gym. It will last about an hour and a half.

J. Teegarden gave a presentation on the Perkins IV Grant. The government recently rewrote the plan, and the new focus has ramifications for us. There is a statewide plan based on where the federal government wants us to focus that tech center directors are supposed to implement. We are supposed to have distinct career clusters, a secondary/post secondary connection, a 9-14 program of study, technical skills assessments (a valid and reliable test for each program - this will be difficult to accomplish), training for high skill/high wage/high demand fields, training to meet skill standards in all aspects of the industry, and professional development for staff.

S. Reber asked, what are the stakes if students don't do well on assessments?

J. Teegarden said he suspects the stakes will become higher in the future. He discussed what he is going to work on this year. He has to write a plan about how he's going to use the money. Some of it will be used to start the new elec-

trical technology program. He showed GMTCC revenue budget figures for FY09. Of the \$3 million + budget, \$145,343 is the Perkins allocation. It takes a lot of his time to get that money. He showed the breakdown of the Perkins plan allocation. Some goes to a mentor program, and some for CTSO. The \$145,343 is what is left over. We will spend 20% on adult ed, 40% on pre-tech, and 40% on the electrical technology program.

One troubling rule is that tech center directors are supposed to hold collaborative coordination meetings with high schools, and a written agreement regarding collaborative 9/10 CTE courses with at least 2 high schools in our region will be required by FY2010. But he doesn't control what happens at the high schools. Commissioner Cate wanted the tech centers and high schools to collaborate. The RAB sent a letter to DOE about this, expressing concern, but it still ended up in the plan. P. Ingvoldstad asked, are the 3 superintendents on the RAB supportive of this? J. Teegarden said it will shake out in this coming year whether they agree. It actually makes sense, and he hopes some high school principals will work with him on it.

ACTION: D. Osborn moved to approve the Perkins IV plan as presented and authorize P. Ingvoldstad to sign it, and the motion was seconded and passed.

J. Teegarden said there will be no way to pay for adult ed if that part of the plan is not accepted. He believes he was just approved for a \$45K adult ed grant from the Dept. of Labor to pay for coursework in Serve Safe (a food industry standard), a course in OSHA safety, and a course on using Springer Miller restaurant and hotel management software. Springer Miller is providing the tech center with software for students to learn on, and adults will also be offered the opportunity. P. Ingvoldstad asked what is happening with the Workforce Investment Board. J. Teegarden said the WIB will not be part of GMTCC now, but they will serve as advisory to us.

D. Central Office

T. Bailey encouraged everyone to read the minutes from the most recent LNSU meeting when they come out. Actions were taken regarding the 403(b) program, there was a special report made by S. Cano related to the report card on students with disabilities, and B. Scheffert provided the second part of an assessment presentation. Some LNSU policies were voted to be warned at the next meeting.

6. Committee Reports and Action Items

A. Policy Committee

S. Reber said the committee has a couple of policies ready to recommend to board, and he distributed them. The committee is working on a systematic re-look at the whole policy manual, and they started with personnel. There is one revised personnel policy, and also a revision of the games of chance policy.

ACTION: S. Reber moved that the board warn Policy 5.5 (Educator Evaluation) and Policy 4.4 (Games of Chance), K. Roberts seconded, and

the motion was passed. S. Reber said the committee just tried to tighten up the policies and get rid of obsolete parts.

B. Curriculum Committee

W. Sander said the committee met today and had an extensive discussion about embedded credits, which was useful. The committee will probably come out with some recommendations eventually.

C. Staff and Community Relations Committee

J. Eisenhardt said there would be a 5 minute meeting of the committee after this meeting. The staff appreciation luncheon the board puts on will be June 19. S. Hamlyn-Prescott said multiple board members needed to help with the luncheon.

D. Cricket Hill Building Committee

The committee met earlier in the day. They discussed relocating the trail off the Sweeney lawn, upgrading the parking lot, and getting a site plan to finish determining where we might put a building to serve the Cricket Hill ski program and Sprocket kids, with a maintenance bay for heavy equipment serving the trails. At that meeting, P. Ingvaldstad made a motion about getting the site map done. He thinks he knows someone who can do it relatively inexpensively. Friends of Cricket Hill brought an estimate to get the trail moved, and the building committee tentatively approved that. There are 2 piles of dirt left over from construction that need to be moved. The committee asks that this board authorize expenditure of \$2500 of the funds previously approved for Cricket Hill projects, in order to fund projects that will be done over the next few months – mapping, trail movement, moving dirt.

ACTION: K Roberts moved to authorize the Cricket Hill Building Committee to spend up to \$2500 of the funds previously approved for Cricket Hill projects, seconded by D. Baker.

W. Sander said the leftover dirt is valuable. K. Roberts said they are just moving it, so maintenance will still have access to it. P. Ingvaldstad said the plan was to build 2 more bays onto the 3 bay garage that had leaking problems. The committee walked over there and discussed the possibility of not connecting the 2 new bays to 3 existing ones, but building a separate 2-bay garage for the athletic dept. (including the Cricket Hill group) to use, set up higher – then the flooding and insulation issues would go away. M. Spaulding said the building committee talked about that possibility, but there are restraints on fitting in that area, so the recommendation of the engineer was to just add onto the garage rather than trying to find space. W. Sander said space is so limited and the drainage problems are such that it might not be feasible. There are issues around stepping it up also, but that has been exhaustively discussed in the other committee.

D. Osborn said the Cricket Hill Building Committee can't be involved in everything to do with the ski program. She asked, is the \$2500 coming out of funds from the Sweeney House sale that were set aside for building a shed? K. Roberts said \$100K was set aside for maintenance of the trails and a building, and this \$2500 to be taken from that has to do with maintenance of trails. P. Ingvaldstad said this is the same as what the board did with the GMTCC

Building Committee – we gave them permission to make spending decisions up to \$10K. This would be the same kind of permission, but involving only \$2500. S. Reber asked, at some point the committee will come and tell the board how much will be spent on a building and maintenance? P. Ingvaldstad said yes, but the committee doesn't know enough yet. M. Spaulding said it is important to relocate the ski trail now. We have to move off the current owner's property.

D. Osborn asked, is there any way to use any of the surveying work from the subdivision and sale that has already been paid for? M. Spaulding said this particular area was not surveyed. D. Osborn said when the trails were originally put in, there must have been surveying. P. Ingvaldstad said no, the trails were just mapped with a GPS. W. Sander asked, didn't we get a survey when we bought the property? M. Spaulding said no, only a plot plan. M. Spaulding said the committee wants to spend up to around \$1000 to relocate the trail, probably a few hundred to move the dirt piles, and around \$400 for the site map. They want to have authority to make spending decisions up to \$2500, then come back to board for anything over that. D. Osborn asked, what body will be responsible for future expenditures? P. Ingvaldstad said this body for the \$100K. D. Osborn said the board wanted to accept responsibility for taking care of Cricket Hill, and she doesn't want this committee to make all decisions about Cricket Hill. K. Roberts and P. Ingvaldstad said the committee wants to disband soon. **The motion was passed.**

W. Sander questioned the need for 2 additional bays, and it was suggested he should discuss that with the building committee.

7. ***Review of Full Board Annual Calendar, Request for Future Agenda Items, and Adjourn***

A. Review of Full Board Annual Calendar

D. Baker said the GMTCC Annual Retreat should be taken off the calendar for this year, since J. Teegarden said it would not be happening. J. Teegarden said he thought it should probably be every 2 years, so it could be on the calendar for next June.

B. Adjourn

ACTION: It was moved and seconded to adjourn at 8:08, and the motion was passed.

Respectfully submitted by,
Donna E. Griffiths

Actions taken at the LU District #18 Board Meeting 6/3/08:

2. *Discussion of Core Beliefs / Mission*

ACTION: J. Eisenhardt moved to adopt the agenda, with corrections to the times shown for the last two agenda items, and the motion was seconded and passed.

3. *Consent Agenda Items (Approval of Minutes of the May 20th Meeting and Acceptance of Administration Reports)*

ACTION: W. Sander moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by J. Eisenhardt. D. Osborn noted a typo in the directors' orders breakdown – a \$ instead of an & in "Laraway Youth & Family Services". **The motion to approve the consent agenda with that correction to the minutes was passed, with S. Hamlyn-Prescott abstaining.**

4. *Directors' Orders*

ACTION: D. Osborn moved to approve directors' orders in the amount of \$179,579.51, and the motion was seconded. The breakdown was as follows: GMTCC Bldg. Project \$6,932.08; VOC Bldg. Trades \$2,886.04; District #18 \$169,761.39 (major expenditures - \$10,013.85 NCS Pearson - Powerschool; \$13,043.93 CDW Government - Epson projectors; \$19,649.19 First Student; \$12,491.93 Cambridge Town School Dist.; \$16,315.00 Augmentative Learning; \$12,272.62 Burlington Food Service. **The motion was passed.**

5. *Administrative Action Items*

B. **High School**

ACTION: It was moved and seconded to authorize offering a contract for the .5 Spanish teacher position to Caroline Friedrich. The motion was passed.

C. **GMTCC**

ACTION: D. Osborn moved to approve the Perkins IV plan as presented and authorize P. Ingvaldstad to sign it, and the motion was seconded and passed.

6. *Committee Reports and Action Items*

A. **Policy Committee**

ACTION: S. Reber moved that the board warn Policy 5.5 (Educator Evaluation) and Policy 4.4 (Games of Chance), K. Roberts seconded, and the motion was passed.

D. **Cricket Hill Building Committee**

ACTION: K Roberts moved to authorize the Cricket Hill Building Committee to spend up to \$2500 of the funds previously approved for Cricket Hill projects, seconded by D. Baker. The motion was passed.

7. *Review of Full Board Annual Calendar, Request for Future Agenda Items, and Adjourn*

B. **Adjourn**

ACTION: It was moved and seconded to adjourn at 8:08, and the motion was passed.