

LAMOILLE UNION DISTRICT #18 BOARD
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
GMTCC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CENTER
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2009

Committee members present: D. Osborn, P. Ingvaldstad, S. Reber, K. Roberts.
Others: J. Teegarden, C. Hindes, B. Schaffer.

The meeting started at 5:37

D. Osborn handed out a description of her proposed reorganization of policies. The committee discussed whether to number the subcategories using the same numbers as the equivalent VSBA policy, which could mean some numbers would be missing in our set of policies, since we don't have all the VSBA-recommended ones. S. Reber suggested trying the VSBA approach and seeing how many blanks there are.

D. Osborn said VSBA says a policy is supposed to be a broad statement of intent. If that is so, should we leave in obvious philosophical statements even though they might seem unnecessary? K. Roberts said she thinks a policy should be a directive that steers toward intent, not a broad statement of intent. She said the philosophy of some board members in the future may be different from the philosophy of the creators of a policy. We should direct only what we really care about, and be very directed about what we want to accomplish. Policies shouldn't be prescriptive.

D. Osborn said she was hearing that the committee wanted to examine philosophical statements on a case-by-case basis. She asked, is there anything we can always leave out, to streamline things in a blanket way? S. Reber suggested the committee might want to come up with standardized questions to ask about each policy, rather than standards for what will or will not be in each policy – questions about whether things like statements of philosophy or procedures need to be included.

The committee discussed procedures associated with policies. C. Hindes asked, do procedures need to be approved by the board? S. Reber said no, but the board should verify that procedures that should exist do exist. K. Roberts said maybe procedures should be attached to the policy manual so people can look them up online. D. Osborn said Title Sixteen says a board may approve procedures, but doesn't have to. K. Roberts said she thinks procedures should be no less public than policy. D. Osborn said she had come across the recommendation that procedures should go in the teacher or student handbook. C. Hindes said there are too many for that, but the handbook could say that procedures are available by contacting the principal's office. B. Schaffer said procedures associated with each policy could be put into the student or faculty handbook. Each school may have different procedures for the same policy. But he thinks a procedural manual could be produced. J. Teegarden said there are some policies we would want to have written on the Internet, and others that don't need to be in writing. If the board wants to have certain procedures written, it should decide which ones. S. Reber said he thinks it should say in a policy if the board expects procedure to be written for it.

K. Roberts brought up the idea of using a policy that just says we will comply with state statute for required policies. S. Reber said some statutes dictate what must be written into policy.

D. Osborn said she will keep working on policy reorganization.

D. Osborn said she learned that we are supposed to reach agreement about what should be in a policy before we review a policy draft. She thought maybe we should back up a step and have a more generalized discussion about financial policy. She pointed out that there are substantial differences between the VSBA organization of financial policies and ours. We have 3 subcategories, and VSBA has 3 quite different ones. Their model is more accountability-focused. D. Osborn said maybe some of M. Frederick's needs could be handled in procedure. S. Reber said he thought it might be useful to have M. Frederick look at the VSBA financial policies in terms of what she wants our policy to be. We need her input on whether the VSBA approach is better. She probably just took the old ones and thought about what she needed to change to meet her needs. K. Roberts and S. Reber said we should make sure the LU financial policies align with current LNSU policies, but don't duplicate them. S. Reber said we should identify whether there are any things we don't want central office to do. He doesn't think there are. K. Roberts agreed that we need to sort out which are central office functions and which are school functions. S. Reber said he thinks we need to talk to M. Frederick about how much time she has for this. D. Osborn said M. Frederick's new versions of financial policies are much better and more in line with what we need than the old ones. M. Frederick made many deletions of things we weren't doing anyway. D. Osborn asked who else we need input from. S. Reber said he would like M. Frederick to comment on the VSBA model and verify that it dovetails with LNSU policy.

D. Osborn said at the next meeting, she envisions continued fine-tuning of financial policies. B. Schaffer suggested maybe we could get an update on whether there is anything new required from the last legislative session. K. Roberts said VSBA sends something out in May about new policies, then the Superintendents' Association usually sends something out to superintendents about what is needed in policy. S. Reber will check whether there are any new policies we're required to have.

D. Osborn said she thinks we need a HIPA and student privacy policy. J. Teegarden volunteered to come up with a proposed policy.

The meeting ended at 6:22.

Minutes submitted by Donna Griffiths