

**Bend-La Pine Schools
Bend, OR 97703**

The Board of Directors for Bend-La Pine Schools met in a regular meeting and retreat workshop on August 4, 2015 at
The Bridges Clubhouse, 20832 SE Sotra Loop, Bend, OR 97702.

Board Members Present

Nori Juba
Peggy Kinkade
Cheri Helt
Julie Craig
Andy High
Ron Gallinat
Stuart Young

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:01a by Chair Juba. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

Review of Agenda

Chair Juba reviewed the agenda and noted updated personnel recommendations.

Public Input

No public input.

Consent Agenda

Jay Mathisen noted the updated personnel recommendations. Peggy Kinkade asked where Deena Wegner is going and said she is sad to see her leave. Mathisen said Wegner took a Human Resources position in Crook County. Cheri Helt asked about REALMS positions being hired at 4 hrs. /day. Mathisen noted the unique transition for REALMS into the district this year and will follow up.

Ron Gallinat moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Peggy Kinkade seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.

Board Retreat Workshop

Ends/Outcomes Discussion

Chair Juba reviewed the purpose and goals for the retreat workshop. The first 90 minutes will be spent on discussing and defining the ends / outcomes, noting the recommendation from Superintendent Mikalson and the Cabinet team in the board packet. Juba asked board members to keep board goals, student achievement and community interest in mind as part of the discussion.

Cheri Helt opened the discussion, noting the work is not new, as the Comprehensive Plan has continually moved closer to what the vision of the Board really is. Helt said, with the recent Superintendent search process, the Board worked to define more of a clear focus and the goal now is to articulate those thoughts and direction into a written format. Helt shared her thoughts around many of the current outcomes being based on state measures and questioned if that information is the best reflection of the work being done in the district. She questioned how state data and assessment data translates into being world-class. Juba suggested the need to define what the board wants to measure the district against and while standardized tests are important; they are not the only element to consider.

Discussion ensued on what it means to be a world-class district and what measures best tell the story, show the growth and achievements of the district. Helt noted the excellent work being done with DART and what a valuable tool she sees it in actually being able to measure areas outside of test results. Julie Craig agreed and commented on the importance of student engagement and not losing students. The Board discussed what to measure when thinking of all the pieces of a 'thriving citizen' and how 21st Century Skills fit into what it means to be world-class. Discussion around academic and non-academic skills continued and ways to enhance and evaluate the socio-emotional elements of a student.

Linda Bradetich noted her appreciation for the discussion around 'non-academic' skills as many of the classified staff members work on these important skills each and every day with students. Superintendent Mikalson shared his excitement in hearing how the entire student/child is educated. Mathisen agreed and noted the Gallup survey might

be an excellent tool to measure things like student hope and engagement and allow us to better understand where students are at socially and emotionally. Juba added, he likes the idea of asking students what they value and wants to find ways to respect their passions. World-class is not what the district has historically defined and the future we are helping prepare them for is one that we know nothing of. Young agreed and said he would love to see a system where students have a chance to do “risk free dreaming.”

The Board continued to discuss ways to update the current Comprehensive Plan and how to incorporate student-learning experiences. Discussion around community input and looking at levels of satisfaction continued and many board members felt this would be a valuable measure to see how good of a job the board is doing vs. how well students are doing. Juba suggested continuing the ends/outcomes discussion at the August 18 board meeting and asked for volunteers to help continue in the Comprehensive Plan work. Cheri Helt and Stuart Young offered to continue to dig deeper into the document and define more precisely what it is the board wants.

The board took a break at 9:50a.

Meeting reconvened at 9:58a.

7 Principles of Policy Governance

Chair Juba reviewed the purpose of moving toward a policy governance model and noted the article by John Carver in the board packet. Juba would like the board to move forward effectively and have a clear understanding of their priorities and define the work they want to be doing. He shared his thoughts on the importance of board members being engaged with the community and operating in a less reactive manner. Kinkade agreed and feels it is important for board members to tell the story of the district and help the community understand what the district is specifically doing. Craig agreed and feels board members need to interject themselves where parents are and make better efforts to engage with community members outside of the parent population. The group discussed possible ways to participate and would like to have talking points prepared ahead of time for wherever they go.

Kinkade summarized, better board engagement is needed and in looking at the Carver article, there are seven principles she is hopeful the board can discuss and come to agreement on.

Principle 1: Primacy of owner-representative role.

All board members agreed to the described principle and Young shared he would like the district to have a strategy for the public to understand the full message of the district and would like to see the board help support sharing that information.

Principle 2: One voice from plural trustees.

Juba reviewed the elements of this principle and how it will help streamline board work. Young agreed and feels the board chair is the voice of the board that speaks on behalf of the board when four or more members are in agreement. Mikalson added individual conversations amongst board members and staff are fine, but action will only be taken when it is a collective opinion of the board. Andy High noted there will be times not all board members are in agreement, and that is sometimes difficult, but ultimately a good thing. All board members agreed to Principle 2.

Principle 3: The superintendent as a real chief executive officer.

Juba reviewed the elements of this principle, defines how board members work with other staff in making requests. High asked for clarification on the flow of communication. Mikalson said informational type of questions should happen fluidly, but when it comes to a specific request or when action is required, that should come through the board chair to the superintendent. Helt noted the concept goes back to Principle 2 and the board speaking with one voice. Mikalson encouraged board members to communicate with Cabinet members so long as they are not directing their work. High asked about board member participation on district committees. Mikalson said committee work would be defined through the executive limitation process. All board members agreed to Principle 3.

Principle 4: Authoritative prescription of “ends.”

Juba reviewed the elements of this principle, noting the previous conversation and continued board discussions planned around defining ends. All board members agreed to Principle 4.

Principle 5: Bounded freedom for “means.”

Juba reviewed the elements of this principle and said establishing executive limitation policy is essentially the board agreeing to the policy governance model. All board members agreed to Principle 5.

Principle 6: Board decisions crafted by descending size.

Juba reviewed the elements of this principle and noted the board's ability to drill down to specifics in their expectations of a superintendent. All board members agreed to Principle 6.

Principle 7: System-focused superintendent evaluation.

Juba reviewed the elements of this principle noting the idea of evaluation here is more reflective of the system as a whole, not just the superintendent. The board discussed how this principle would work with Mikalson's contract and the evaluation system established for the superintendent. Mathisen noted the importance of avoiding confusion and not having too many lists of measures. Mikalson agreed and said he likes the 7 Principles Carver describes and feels they would coordinate well with his contract and annual evaluation. He is hopeful the board will take a majority, if not all, of the seven principles into consideration.

Peggy Kinkade noted the continual monitoring of executive limitations end up being a part of the superintendent evaluation because they define what the "superintendent shall not fail" to do. The board continued to discuss ways to incorporate executive limitations and the evaluation process and agreed until the executive limitations are more clearly defined it will be difficult to know how the two go together. Discussion around key performance indicators ensued and ultimately all board members agreed to Principle 7. Juba reviewed page 18 of the board packet, which defined what it looks like for a board to operate under Carver's model.

Executive Limitation Exercise

Peggy Kinkade reviewed the executive limitation work in the board packet and suggested the board start working through samples of executive limitation from other districts to begin their work. She noted the importance of the collective bargaining agreements in her work on these two policies. The board discussed what they would like to include in executive limitations and how Carver's model would mesh into the idea.

Helt asked if board members would be able to continue to participate in bargaining contracts which led to discussion of how to accomplish Carver's theory while respecting the current processes of the district. Kinkade said a plan of how to move legally required policies will be put into place to stream line work as the board moves to the governance model. Most of the current policies will be called administrative policies and regulations the district will continue to work with legal counsel to ensure the district is meeting all legal requirements. Helt suggested some language about collective bargaining agreements in the Staff Compensation and Development limitation.

Kinkade reviewed her work for the Staff Evaluation limitation and Juba suggested some wording around termination of employees who are not performing. The board discussed how to incorporate such language into an executive limitation while taking into consideration bargaining contracts and the legal requirements. Discussion ensued on ways to include information on teacher evaluation and the measures the board would like to consider in the evaluation process.

Kinkade said she would bring back the two limitations for board members to review with updates suggested at the August 18 board meeting. Juba thanked Kinkade for her work and Kinkade noted a list of policies that will require more discussion. She suggested the board might want to consider using a consultant for the policies that are not as straight forward. The board agreed and discussed a general timeline for the policy writing work.

Board Communication Protocols

Chair Juba referenced earlier conversation on communication in relation to Carver's model. Any sort of instruction of work will go through Superintendent Mikalson. Juba suggested clarifying board member roles on district committees at a later time and asked for any input on what board members would like in terms of communication. Mikalson said he would continue a weekly update and Andrea Wilson would summarize board leadership meetings. Julianne Repman will continue to be the point of contact for media communications.

High asked what Mikalson's expectations are on being included on email communication. Mikalson said he'd like to keep this as easy as possible and Cabinet members are free to communicate with board members and there's no need to copy him on all emails, as the Cabinet team will work internally to keep each other informed. High would like knowing about things that the media will most likely call a board member about so they are prepared and have talking points if contacted. Repman agreed and said she will share factual information that links directly to a school or the district. Juba noted, as board chair, he is fine with other board members talking with the media as long as they stay on message and relay a note to him that they have done an interview and summarize what was discussed.

Superintendent Mikalson noted there will be an executive limitation to better define communication and will help answer many of these questions and grey areas. It will continue to be a work in progress as the board works to better define their role. Mikalson did ask to be the first response to a parent concern that board members receive, even when directly sent to the board. Repman asked board members to keep her informed on any great work they see in the schools that would help build the story of Bend-La Pine Schools.

Board Comments

None.

Meeting adjourned at 12:16p.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Wilson
8.4.2015