

LAMOILLE UNION DISTRICT #18 BOARD
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2008

Committee members present: D. Osborn, P. Ingvoldstad, W. Sander. Others: B. Schaffer, J. Teegarden, D. Taylor, J. Laithe, C. Hindes.

The meeting started at 5:30.

The committee discussed the hiring practices policy. D. Osborn said S. Reber sent a letter to John Nelson to clarify what the board is responsible for. The phrase in question in the draft policy was "The Board of Directors delegates authority . . ." but J. Nelson's opinion has come back that we cannot do that. K. Roberts has proposed alternate phrasing, changing to "The board of directors shall be responsible for hiring all recommended personnel in accordance with budget and hiring procedures." (*C. Hindes arrived at 5:32.*) P. Ingvoldstad asked if W. Sander would feel ok about not having the chance to ask questions about proposed new hires, if their approval were part of the consent agenda. W. Sander said he thinks the board needs to review hiring of professional staff. D. Osborn said she thought it would not be appropriate if board members had no knowledge about the person they were signing off on. She said she would like input into the process that led to the selection. She would like to know if no one else applied, or if this person had the best background of several applicants. C. Hindes said B. Schaffer has a good, rigorous process for interviewing. D. Taylor said those procedures could be shared with the board to make them feel more comfortable. A summary of credentials could be shared at the time the appointment is voted on. The superintendent actually has the power to recommend hiring or firing, though the policy leaves that out. D. Osborn thought a summary of credentials might be good. She said it is unclear from the state what the mandate is when the statutes say superintendent. Do they mean only the superintendent, or can it be the superintendent's designee? J. Teegarden said the idea of delegating the board's hiring authority got started because the board might not meet for a month, so waiting for board approval takes longer. W. Sander said the board doesn't want to micromanage, but he thinks it is appropriate to get a resume and transcript. P. Ingvoldstad asks, can we put hiring under the consent agenda? If they hire anyone who is inadequate, they can deal with it. D. Osborn said we are not supposed to be delegating firing either, according to John Nelson. J. Teegarden said the question that has come up in the past was about whether termination of support staff needs to come to the board. D. Osborn said we need to be involved with hiring and firing any employee. W. Sander said he thought the hiring of custodians, etc. could be on the consent agenda to meet the requirements of the law. It was agreed to make K. Roberts' suggested change, then submit the draft to the full board for approval.

J. Teegarden asked, if someone writes a procedure that will exclude the board from the decision making process, would that be okay? P. Ingvoldstad suggested the principals write up their hiring procedures. They said the procedures are already written up. P. Ingvoldstad said if they want to make changes to the procedures saying approval of hiring

will be in the consent agenda, that's okay with him. D. Osborn said a procedure couldn't be directly opposed to policy. J. Teegarden said if the board is going to be restrictive about procedures, the restrictions might as well be in policy. D. Taylor agreed that procedure has to support policy. She suggested procedures be brought to the committee for review and to ensure they are in line with policy.

D. Osborn asked the principals if they feel they need procedures in place before warning of the policy. They thought it would be fine to go ahead and warn it. They feel the procedure already in place supports the policy. W. Sander said he would like hiring approval to be on the consent agenda except for professional staff. He would like professional staff brought to the board with information including a transcript. Administrators and D. Taylor will work on procedures.

D. Taylor encouraged everyone to come to the LNSU policy committee meeting on Monday.

The committee discussed the mandatory animal dissection policy. VSBA has a model policy. The student medication policy is also referred to as being required by law, but VSBA has interpreted the law differently. They came up with a model policy, but it doesn't actually seem to be mandatory. D. Osborn asked, can we adopt the model policy animal dissection policy as presented by VSBA? B. Schaffer said he opposes this policy, but we have to follow it. It requires schools to come up with alternative to dissection. It could pose major cost factors for instructors. B. Schaffer said if there is a medical or philosophical reason why a student cannot participate in dissection, he is willing to make exceptions, but under this policy, students don't even have to give a reason for opting out. D. Taylor wondered if a statement could be added to the policy giving teachers some latitude in deciding who can get out of the class. P. Ingvoldstad said we should make it so the alternative option won't be a way to do less work. B. Schaffer suggested just going with the first sentence of the model policy saying we will comply with the law, and not going into details. It was agreed to bring forward that abbreviated version of the policy for the next full board meeting.

D. Osborn read the model student medication policy. The principals said we already allow what this policy allows. B. Schaffer asked about the sample parental authorization form. D. Osborn said the footnotes are for reference only, and should not be included in the policy.

D. Osborn said a draft driver's ed policy was created based on motor vehicle guidelines but it didn't address all concerns. Various other drafts have been prepared. B. Schaffer met with B. Penberthy and came up with a new proposal. B. Schaffer said he needs more time with B. Penberthy to work on it. The big question is, what are the channels by which the school gets information about violations, and what are the implications within the educational realm? D. Taylor asked, is a student required to get a learner's permit before enrolling in driver's ed. D. Osborn said yes. It was agreed that the committee will start its next meeting at 5:00 and devote the whole meeting to this policy. Before then, any additional drafts will be shared with all by email.

B. Schaffer talked about a problem with the transportation policy. He said some students tuition in from elsewhere. Some tuitioned students were riding our transportation, but their tuition doesn't cover that. He spoke with M. Frederick and S. Cano about it. We can determine an annual cost based on a pickup point. Our insurance doesn't cover non-residents. W. Sander asked, couldn't the insurance be modified to cover them? D. Osborn asked, what needs to be changed? B. Schaffer said the transportation policy. W. Sander and P. Ingvaldstad thought transportation costs were built into tuition. D. Osborn asked, does this involve students enrolled in any school choice agreements? B. Schaffer said under school choice agreements, students have to transport themselves. They can come here, but they have to provide their own transportation, and we lost a couple of kids because of that. The policy says we provide transportation to students who live with parents or guardians who reside in our towns. B. Schaffer will work with M. Frederick and email a draft policy revision. D. Taylor said the statute says each legal pupil may be furnished with total or partial transportation. We have authority to determine who we will transport, according to statute.

The meeting ended at 6:28.