

Bend-La Pine Schools
Bend, OR 97703
July 17, 2017

Regular Meeting 12:30 p.m.
Executive Session Immediately Following

The Board of Directors of Bend-La Pine Schools will meet in a regular meeting on July 17, 2017 at 12:30 p.m. followed by an executive session under ORS 192.660(2)(e) in room 312 of the Education Center, 520 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR.

Agenda

Call to Order	Chair Kinkade
Pledge of Allegiance	Ron Gallinat
Review of Agenda	Chair Kinkade
Public Input <i>This is the time provided for individuals to address the Board. Visitors who wish to speak must sign up prior to the beginning of the meeting on the sign-up sheet provided. Please state your name and topic when you address the Board.</i>	Chair Kinkade

Consent Agenda

Approval of Minutes – June 13, 2017 & June 22, 2017 Reference: ORS 192.650 and ORS 332.057	Chair Kinkade
Approval of Personnel Recommendations Reference: ORS 332.505	Jay Mathisen

Action Items

Election of Board Officers	Chair Kinkade
Approval of Yearly Business & Board Operations for the 2017-18 School Year Resolutions 1885 - 1860	Chair

Reports

Executive Limitation 1 – Global Executive Restraint	Superintendent Mikalson
Executive Limitation 2 – Emergency Superintendent Succession	Superintendent Mikalson

Board Comments
Adjourn

Accessible Meeting / Alternate Format Notification

This meeting location is accessible. Please contact Bend-La Pine Schools at 541-355-1001 if you need accommodation to participate in the board meeting. Please call at least three days prior to the scheduled meeting date. Thank you.

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

The Board of Directors for Bend-La Pine Schools met in a regular session on June 13, 2017 in room 314 at the Education Center, 520 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR 97703.

Board Members Present

Peggy Kinkade
Andy High
Stuart Young
Julie Craig
Ron Gallinat
Cheri Helt
Carrie Douglass

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:19 p.m. by Chair Kinkade. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

Review of the Agenda

Chair Kinkade reviewed the agenda. There were no changes.

Public Input

Marilyn Burwell, community member, addressed the board and congratulated the district on the passage of the recent bond measure. She shared concern about a recent internet bullying incident that ended up with the police. She believes if a Restorative Justice circle had been used after the first bullying incident between these particular students, the bullying may have stopped and the bully would be on their way to becoming a better person.

Krista Zweers, parent, thanked the board for their time and shared it was her child who was bullied in the incident described by Burwell. She shared her concern around bullying, the impacts of social media and that while this particular situation did happen outside of school, it did eventually impact the learning environment for her child and become a school matter. She expressed her concerns around discipline at the school level and lack of information provided to staff from administration that could have possibly helped her student.

Beth Hoover, community member, also addressed the board about bullying, adding the end of the school year is an especially difficult time for students and staff. She agreed with Burwell that a Restorative Justice approach would have helped prevent the situation from getting to a criminal point.

Chair Kinkade thanked Burwell, Zweers and Hoover for sharing their concerns. She said she will follow up with district administration on the issue.

Reports

Policy Monitoring – Executive Limitation 8 : Academic Programs

Jay Mathisen introduced Kevin Gehrig, Principal at Pine Ridge Elementary; Brian Crook, Principal at High Desert Middle School; Wendy McCulloch, Assistant Principal at High Desert Middle School; and Katie Legace, Principal at Mt. View High School who he invited to share about their school design work within their buildings in an effort to shift and to focus on Student B. Mathisen reviewed the school design process work that has been taking place over the past couple of years and explained principals serve as design leaders in their respective schools and lead their team in work to create a successful academic program at their school.

Mathisen said each of the schools have a unique approach to school design to serve their students and tap into the strengths of staff members. He asked each principal to share about the design work in their building and data to reflect the results of their work.

Three key areas in school design are: Academic Excellence, Future Ready, and Thriving Citizens. Gehrig shared about Pine Ridge's work focusing on academic excellence. He highlighted the work of curriculum leaders and design team members who have worked hard to make sure all Pine Ridge stakeholders are invested in the schools' goals. Professional development, data points, reflection meetings and future planning are key components to reaching their goals. Gehrig said he is proud of the efforts Pine Ridge is making toward individualized learning opportunities and how motivated his staff members are to continue to refine their work and focus on ways to improve.

Crook and McCulloch shared about High Desert Middle School's work focusing on thriving citizens. High Desert has increased program offerings to all students, like art, culinary, CTE, dual immersion, and psychology of success amongst others. Students are involved in school decisions and site council and parent organizations are extremely active and working together more than ever before. McCulloch highlighted the strategies used to improve school culture and what their design team has learned over the course of the year. High Desert's goals are to continue to improve student involvement, school culture and have identified ways to refine their initial strategies to continue to make a positive impact for all students.

Legace shared about Mt. View High School's work focusing on future ready. Mt. View has worked to define a signature program, and she is extremely proud of the work done for their college dual credit program, which now allows a student to graduate from high school with an AAOT degree. Legace also shared about the work done to develop course offerings in AP and CTE. Legace noted that it is hard to separate each area of school design, as they intertwine in the overall vision of Student B. What she appreciates most is that the school design process has allowed for her staff to redefine what they want to offer students. Character development skills, a dual credit program, etc. Legace shared how she has utilized feedback from student focus groups to help make positive changes in recent years. Parent involvement, Site Council members and teacher leadership teams have been vital in supporting future ready efforts. She added, in order for school design to work, it needs to be a process with all stakeholders collaborating and working together with the ultimate goal of improving the experience for students at school.

Superintendent Mikalson highlighted initial data results for each school, adding this is the type of information schools and the district will continue to track and monitor. He thanked Gehrig, Crook, McCulloch and Legace for sharing the important work going on at each of their buildings.

Cheri Helt asked how the design process has helped connect islands of excellence across schools in the district. Mikalson said part of the design work this year with building administrators has included principals visiting and working at other buildings to learn about what is working well and share ideas with one another. This will continue in future years in an effort to help build capacity across the district.

Stuart Young thanked all for their presentations and is encouraged about the engagement and conversations happening in schools. He appreciates the leadership efforts in the school design process. Chair Kinkade thanked all presenters and asked board members if they had any questions specific to the policy monitoring report in the board packet.

Carrie Douglass asked if there was more specific information that could be provided for #6 – encourage and support viable innovative practices and programs. Mathisen said yes, he would provide more specific information to expand and explain more about practices and programs. Kinkade noted information on special programs and services seemed to be missing. She would like to know what is offered and how the district is

addressing those student's needs. Mathisen said he would follow up with more specific information to board members.

Public Hearing

2017-18 Budget

Chair Kinkade recessed the regular meeting at 6:47 p.m. and called the 2017-18 Budget Hearing to order. There was no public testimony. Kinkade closed the hearing at 6:48 p.m. and resumed the regular meeting.

Consent Agenda

Chair Kinkade noted the updated personnel report and that approval of ALO contracts are part of the Consent Agenda. Kinkade commented on the hiring of John Rexford as Chief of Staff and clarified that position (.30 FTE) will be paid for through the HDESD Local Service Plan. Cheri Helt asked for further information about an Education Assistant hired to work 4.08 hours. Sean Reinhart explained that employee is also working in a certified position and the 4.08 hours add up to make 1.0 FTE. **Andy High moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Ron Gallinat seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.**

Action Items

Science Instructional Materials Adoption

Superintendent Mikalson introduced Stephen DuVal, Assistant Principal at Cascade Middle School, who lead the science instructional materials adoption process. Mikalson noted the materials in the board packet that include: selection committee members, review timeline, core beliefs and curriculum recommendations for elementary, middle and high school levels.

DuVal shared about the process and commented that all recommendations align with new science standards. The focus for the next year will be on professional development for elementary level teachers and understanding how the curriculum can align with reading, writing and math programs. Elementary level classrooms will begin using the curriculum in 2018-19. High school teachers will go through a similar process with some teachers beginning to work with the curriculum in their classrooms during the 2017-18 school year. Middle school teachers will all be using the curriculum for the 2017-18 school year.

Carrie Douglass asked, with keeping school design in mind, what is the expectation and how will selected curriculum(s) be used across the district. Lora Nordquist shared that materials are not the curriculum and there is flexibility in how a teacher conveys information, however, the consistency amongst materials helps create continuity from classroom to classroom. Mikalson added, the district has done extensive work over recent years to establish guiding principles for curriculum adoption while respecting teacher autonomy. Chair Kinkade thanked DuVal and Nordquist for their work and entertained a motion. **Julie Craig moved to adopt the curriculum recommendations at the elementary, middle and high school levels as presented. Stuart Young seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.**

Chair Kinkade recessed the meeting at 7:05 p.m.
The meeting resumed at 7:11 p.m.

Resolution 1852 : 2017-18 Budget Appropriations

Chair Kinkade noted Resolution 1852 in the board packet and said in a previous meeting, she had asked for information on what a scaled effort to restore the ending fund balance would look like, specifically using 4.5% and 4.75%. She ultimately does want to bring the ending fund balance back to 5% but would like to consider that build up being spread out over a few years so as not to negatively impact this 2017-18 budget. Brad Henry said the budget presented in the board packet is based upon a 5% ending fund balance and a \$8.2 million funding figure which has been updated since the budget committee last met. The budget committee approved a budget based on \$7.8 million, however, the budget presented in the packet is well within the

allowable limits to change without budget committee approval. He noted Measure 98 funds are still unknown. Henry shared budget documents prepared at an \$8.2 million funding level with a 4.5% and 4.75% ending fund balance as requested. Discussion ensued on ending fund balance percentages with board members expressing their opinions in favor or opposition. **Andy High moved to approve Resolution 1852 with a 4.5% ending fund balance. Ron Gallinat seconded the motion. Julie Craig and Cheri Helt opposed the motion. Motion carried 5 to 2.**

Resolution 1853 : 2017-18 Impose Tax

Brad Henry reviewed the resolution and offered to answer any questions. There were no questions.

Ron Gallinat moved to approve Resolution 1853 as presented. Carrie Douglass seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.

Resolution 1854 : Sell Bonds

Brad Henry reviewed the resolution and offered to answer any questions. There were no questions.

Andy High moved to approve Resolution 1854 as presented. Julie Craig seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.

Report

Financial Report

Brad Henry introduced Roy Burling, Business Manager, who reviewed the financial report which provides an estimation of year end funds. Andy High asked where dollars in the line item intermediate sources of funding come from. Burling said they are from the HDESD Local Service Plan.

Policy Monitoring – Executive Limitation 7 : Facilities

Chair Kinkade noted the policy monitoring report in the board packet and thanked Brad Henry and Mike Tiller for their work. She asked if board members had any comments or questions.

Andy High asked how the new RFP process is working. Tiller said the process was used in the selection of 2017 summer projects and seemed to work well. Currently RFP teams are in place and had their first orientation meeting today on how the process will work for the 2017 bond projects.

Kinkade asked about #4 and if the district has evaluated the design of Silver Rail Elementary resulting in any recommendations. Tiller said a lessons-learned summary has been completed and included staff, architects, some contractors, etc. in the process. Some of the areas he would suggest for improvement include: site design efficiency, lowering the height of ceilings and reducing square footage in some areas of the building.

Cheri Helt asked about the status of the Jewell Elementary roof. Tiller said the city has issued permits and the district is moving forward with truss repair rather than truss replacement. He explained the load testing that will be done throughout the repair process and said that Rolf Armstrong will provide independent structural engineering evaluations throughout the repair process.

High asked about #7 and the status of the naming of facilities process. Mikalson noted page 58 in the board packet which is a recommendation to update the language of EL 7. If the board approves the suggested updates, the district will then move forward with appropriate action. High asked fellow board members if they would agree to the district putting an RFP out for evaluation during the actual building process for facilities funded by the 2017 bond. He noted PlanB as an option to carry out the evaluation and if the collective board is interested he would like to see this idea move forward. Kinkade said she is supportive of evaluating a project during rather than after the fact. Helt agreed. Mikalson said board action was not necessary to move forward, and the district will begin to work on noticing the RFP.

Julie Craig asked when the next Sites and Facilities Committee review would be. Henry said the district tries to review every five years, which would put the next review during 2020 unless excessive growth causes the need sooner.

Chair Kinkade noted the board packet contains an updated version of EL 7. Suggested updates in #4 include the district letting the board members know when renderings are available, rather than present renderings and wait for board approval. The reason for this suggestion is efficiency. Suggested updates in #7 include the board would approve the name of new schools/facilities rather than approve the process. The reason for this suggestion is clarification of roles for district staff and board members. Chair Kinkade entertained a motion to adopt the suggested changes to EL 7 – Facilities. **Stuart Young moved to approve the changes as presented. Cheri Helt seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.**

High commented that the district owns a variety of vacant land throughout Bend that may not be used for several years and often times the district hears from various parties who are interested in using the vacant land. At this point, there is not clear direction for how such requests are considered. High asked fellow board members for thoughts on use of vacant district land. Mikalson added this is one area he is not clear on the desire of the collective board nor the parameters the board would like him to use in considering requests and asked if this is something the board would consider adding to EL 7.

Douglass said it makes sense to consider all possible methods of generating revenue, but added it could be extremely difficult to take the land away when the district has a need to develop the property. Helt agreed, but noted it could also be a great way to support students and the community; for example, creating fields on vacant properties would help numerous groups in Bend and Central Oregon who often share that field space is extremely difficult to find. Kinkade suggested the district identify vacant properties and determine some sort of timeline to define a period of possible use. She suggested a proposal time period to make it equitable for all community members and interested groups. Helt shared reservations in the amount of staff time it could take to and manage vacant properties. Douglass agreed and would like to have a better understanding of the time and impact on staff.

Mikalson suggested district staff start to investigate samples of this concept with other districts, bring an inventory of land with a time of potential use and an idea of time needed to manage properties. All board members agreed this would be a good start and help with making their decision on how to move forward. Henry said he will also look into how each of the properties were purchased, what type of designation the property has, how property taxes might impact users who are not government and how to address proposals to alter the land.

Discussion

Summer Board Meeting

The board agreed to the following calendar changes:

- June 27, 2017 regular board meeting: cancelled
- July 17, 2017: hold a regular meeting at 12:30 p.m. at the Education Center
- August 2, 2017: hold the board retreat followed by regular meeting from 8:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., location TBD

Superintendent Mikalson invited all board members to attend the Summer Leadership Academy on August 10.

Evaluation

Chair Kinkade reviewed a summary of Superintendent Mikalson's evaluation for 2015-16 with board members. She explained the summary also includes a composite score for each of the 8 Ends, and noted #8 was eliminated from the overall score because the data reflected work done prior to Mikalson. There will be

further discussion at the board retreat on ways to refine the superintendent evaluation process and scoring method. Cheri Helt appreciates working with Mikalson and is happy he is serving as superintendent. She hopes to keep Mikalson at Bend-La Pine Schools for the long term. Kinkade agreed and added there is positive momentum and the board believes in Mikalson's vision and are pleased to see evidence of positive changes happening already. **Ron Gallinat moved to accept Superintendent Mikalson's evaluation as presented. Cheri Helt seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.**

Andy High moved to have the Board Chair begin negotiations to extend Mikalson's contract as a show of confidence, he would like to see a 3-year extension offered. Stuart Young seconded the motion. Helt voiced her support of the extension. Carrie Douglass also supported the extension and asked if there is a method for Mikalson to provide feedback to the board about his working conditions. Kinkade suggested that could be a part of the evaluation conversation at the upcoming board retreat, and that it could possibly be addressed through the board self-evaluation process. Mikalson said he appreciates the board's scores and agrees with their assessment of where the district is at. He is humbled and grateful to be a part of Bend-La Pine Schools and sincerely appreciates the extension. **Chair Kinkade called for a vote. Unanimous approval.**

Board Comments

Stuart Young complimented Mikalson on his work in just two years as Superintendent. He appreciates that the District is moving forward in the right direction.

Andy High thanked voters for supporting the recent bond measure. He also thanked Neil Bryant and Michele Emery for co-chairing the bond campaign and appreciates their time and effort. He thanked all volunteers for their time and support in helping with a successful campaign.

Ron Gallinat attended three graduations and they were all wonderful.

Cheri Helt thanked voters and included Christy McLeod with the list that Andy High noted for her work on the campaign. Helt also thanked Bend Chamber for hiring a mentor whose work will be focused on placing students in internships from Bend-La Pine, COCC and OSU. Helt expressed her appreciation in the team approach from the police, county, school district, hospital, and others took as they all talked about mental health at the Hope and Help meeting last night. Helt thanked her opponent in the recent election for challenging her and running a great campaign, she also thanked voters for their support.

Chair Kinkade appreciates the efforts to coordinate mental health support in the community seen at the Hope and Help event. She asked that Mikalson help follow up with the situation mentioned in public comments. Kinkade also shared her youngest son just graduated from Summit High School.

Chair Kinkade recessed the regular meeting at 8:30 p.m. and the board to moved into executive session. Chair Kinkade resumed and adjourned the regular meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Wilson
6.13.2017

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

The Board of Directors for Bend-La Pine Schools met in a regular session on June 22, 2017 in room 312 at the Education Center, 520 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR 97703.

Board Members Present

Peggy Kinkade
Andy High
Ron Gallinat
Stuart Young
Julie Craig

Board Members Absent

Cheri Helt
Carrie Douglass

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 12:00 noon by Chair Kinkade. The pledge of allegiance followed.

Review of the Agenda

Chair Kinkade reviewed the agenda. There were no changes.

Public Input

Don Stearns, BEA President, shared comments on the recent BEA bargaining session and said this most recent session was the most collaborative bargaining process he has ever been a part of. He appreciates the district and BEA membership who worked together to come to an agreement. Just this afternoon, he received news that BEA membership gave a 99% approval to the proposed contract language. He thanked the district staff and board members who were part of the bargaining team. Chair Kinkade thanked Stearns and agreed with his sentiments. She also thanked Stearns for his service to the district as a teacher and union leader and wished him well in his retirement.

Action

Approval of BEA Contract

Superintendent Mikalson noted the summary of proposed contract language changes at each board members seat. He clarified these are the changes that the bargaining teams came to agreement upon and if approved, the current BEA contract would be updated to reflect the language presented. Mikalson offered to answer any questions on the proposed contract language and ratification. There were no questions.

Julie Craig moved to approve the proposed BEA contract language and ratification of the contract. Stuart Young seconded the motion. Andy High expressed his appreciation to Chair Kinkade and Ron Gallinat for serving on the bargaining committee and their work to come to a successful agreement. He wished Stearns well and thanked him for his service. Gallinat added the bargaining process was an interest based bargaining format and he appreciated the focus of both bargaining teams being how to best serve students.

Kinkade noted a motion and seconded had been made and called for a vote. Unanimous approval.

Board Comments

There were no board comments.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Wilson
6.22.2017

DATE: July 13, 2017

TO: Shay Mikalson, Superintendent
Board of Directors for Bend-La Pine Schools

FROM: Jay Mathisen, Deputy Superintendent
Jon Lindsay, Director of Human Resources – Certified

RE: Administrative and Licensed Recommended Hires, Resignations, and Retirees

The Human Resource Department recommends approval of the following hires, resignations and retirees at the school board meeting on July 17, 2017. All Hires are subject to successful drug testing, background check, and Oregon licensure.

CERTIFIED HIRES

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	STATUS	HIRE DATE
Becker, Benjamin	Intermediate Teacher PS106663	La Pine Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Bozich, Scott	Physical Science PS106746	La Pine HS	Regular Part Time .84 FTE	08/28/2017
Burkhart, Kristina	Primary Teacher PS106632	Juniper Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Colburn, Jessica	Language Arts Teacher PS106742	La Pine MS	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Cornish, Mark	Primary Teacher PS106689TMP	La Pine Elementary	Temporary Full Time	08/28/2017
Dawson, Ashley	Primary Teacher PS106632	Juniper Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Dove, Michael	Biology Teacher PS106747	La Pine HS	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Dziurzynski, Cindy	Math Teacher PS106780	Pacific Crest MS	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Eby, Kent	Language Arts Teacher PS106771TMP	La Pine MS	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Ekstrom, Janna	Middle School Advisory PS106700TMP	Realms	Temporary Part Time .20 FTE	08/28/2017
Ekstrom, Janna	Language Arts Teacher PS106739TMP	Realms	Temporary Part Time .29 FTE	08/28/2017
Gylling, Matthew	Advance Math Teacher .167 FTE PS106778TMP	Mountain View HS	Temporary Part Time to Temporary Full Time	08/28/2017
Hayes, Kelli	Primary Teacher PS106633	Silver Rail Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Honea, Molly	Science Teacher PS106770	La Pine MS	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Hulin, Amanda	Advanced Math Teacher PS106741	Bend Senior HS	Temporary Part Time .50 FTE	08/28/2017

Johnson, Andrew	Language Arts Teacher PS106751	STRIVE	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Johnson, Shauna	Social Studies Teacher PS106681	Mountain View HS	Regular Part Time .667 FTE	08/28/2017
Jones, Heather	Primary Teacher PS106664	Rosland Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Kennedy, Joseph	Math Teacher PS106695	Sky View MS	Regular Part Time .667 FTE	08/2//2017
King, Amber	Life Skills Teacher PS106593TMP	Ponderosa Elementary	Temporary Full Time	08/28/2017
LaFrenz, Jackie	Intermediate Teacher PS106775TMP	Bear Creek Elementary	Temporary Full Time	08/28/2017
Mathieu, Lea	Language Arts Intervention PS106636	Cascade MS	Regular Part Time .50 FTE	08/28/2017
McCabe, Julie	Biology Teacher .167 FTE PS106735	Mountain View Hs	Regular Part Time to Full Time	08/28/2017
Merritt, Melissa	Primary Teacher PS106664	La Pine Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Mithoff, Gail	Intermediate Teacher PS106785TMP	Bear Creek Elementary	Temporary Part Time .50 FTE	08/28/2017
Montoya, Breanna	Behavior Therapist PS106745	Special Programs	Regular Part Time .60 FTE	08/28/2017
Robeck, Alyssa	Primary Teacher PS106632	Silver Rail Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Rowe, Judy	Spanish Teacher .167 FTE PS106671	Cascade MS	Regular Part Time to Full Time	08/28/2017
Seemann, Eli	Math Teacher PS106738TMP	Realms	Temporary Part Time .40 FTE	08/28/2017
Seidel, Christine	Science Teacher PS106684TMP	High Lakes Elementary	Temporary Part Time .50 FTE	08/28/2017
Simmons, Gardner	Intermediate Teacher PS106633	Silver Rail Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
South, Mark	Spanish Teacher PS106647	Bend Senior HS	Temporary Part Time .333 FTE	08/28/2017
Timm, Sheryl	Intermediate Teacher PS106775	Silver Rail Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Walker, Crystal	Intervention Teacher PS106685TMP	High Lakes Elementary	Temporary Part Time .20 FTE	08/28/2017
White, Ross	Intermediate Teacher PS106663	La Pine Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Wilhelmsen, Stacy	Primary Teacher PS106632	Juniper Elementary	Regular Full Time	08/28/2017
Zywicke, Jacob	Science Teacher PS106699TMP	Realms	Temporary Part Time .80 FTE	08/28/2017
Lenz, Ryan Declined position	Intervention Teacher PS106692	Summit HS	Regular Part Time .50 FTE	08/28/2017

CERTIFIED RESIGNATIONS

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	HIRE/RESIGNED DATES
Davidson, Elyse	Primary Teacher	Silver Rail Elementary	08/29/2016 06/30/2017
Grove, Molly	Intermediate Teacher	Realms	08/30/2004 06/30/2017
Kunkler, Jon	Intermediate Teacher	Pacific Crest MS	08/25/2008 06/30/2017

ADMINISTRATIVE HIRES

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	STATUS	HIRE DATE

ADMINISTRATIVE RESIGNATIONS

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	HIRE/RESIGNED DATES



HUMAN RESOURCES

Education Center

520 N.W. Wall Street

Bend, Oregon 97703-2699

(541) 355-1100

Fax: (541) 355-1109

July 12, 2017

TO: Shay Mikalson, Superintendent
Bend-La Pine School Board of Directors

FROM: Jon Lindsay, Director of Human Resources – Licensed Staff
Debbie Watkins, Director of Human Resources – Classified Staff

RE: Classified Recommended Hires, Resignations and Retirements

The Human Resources Department recommends approval of the following hires and resignations at the School Board meeting on July 17, 2017

Classified Hiring

Name	Position/Posting No.	Location	Temp/Regular Position	Hire Date
Aamodt, Karen	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Transition Co-op	Temp 7 hrs / day	6/26/17
Alayan, Deborah	#106617 EA – Inclusion	Pilot Butte	Reg 7 hrs / day	6/8/17
Beck, Kelly	#106757 School Office Secretary II	REALMS	Temp 5 hrs / day	6/26/17
Berry, Desiree	#106721 Youth Transition Specialist II	Special Programs	Reg 7 hrs / day	6/9/17
Brown, Joshua	#106584 IT Technician	Technology	Reg 8 hrs / day	5/2/17
Carpenter, Lisa	#106276 Nutrition Server I	Rosland	Reg 2.5 hrs / day	6/21/17
Chapin, Jeri	#106767 EA – Student Instruction	Pine Ridge	Reg 3.25 hrs / day	6/27/17
Dooley, Brandi	#106646 Attendance Office Secretary II	Bend High	Reg 8 hrs / day	6/6/17
Dunning, Lisa	#106617 EA – Inclusion	Pacific Crest	Reg 7 hrs / day	6/1/17
Finley, Heather	#106579 Office Manager II	Pilot Butte	Reg 8 hrs / day	4/20/17
Galvin, Suzanne	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Lava Ridge	Temp 6.5 hrs / day	6/2/17
Gibbon, Stephanie	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Special Programs	Temp 6.5 hrs / day	6/7/17
Gordon, Tonya	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Mountain View	Temp 7 hrs / day	6/6/17
Gregg, Carisa	#106716 Office Manager I	Marshall	Reg 8 hrs / day	7/7/17
Grosh, Leslie	EA – Inclusion #106617	Juniper	Reg 6.5 hrs / day	6/7/17
Henshaw, Graceanne	#106707 School Office Secretary I	Bend High	Temp 7.75 hrs / day	6/7/17



HUMAN RESOURCES

Education Center

*520 N.W. Wall Street
Bend, Oregon 97703-2699
(541) 355-1100
Fax: (541) 355-1109*

Hooper, John	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Summit	Temp 7 hrs / day	6/7/17
Light, Heather	#106617 EA – Inclusion	Buckingham	Reg 6.5 hrs / day	6/7/17
Low-Johnson, Sondee	#106662 School-to-Career Manager	Summit	Reg 6 hrs / day	6/14/17
Marino, Sara	#106777 Counseling Secretary II	Cascade	Reg 7.5 hrs / day	7/10/17
Mitchell, Sara	#106779 School Office Secretary II	Pacific Crest	Reg 8 hrs / day	6/28/17
Mitsch, Melissa	#106758 Data/Curriculum Secretary II	Bend High	Temp 8 hrs / day	6/15/17
Moffenbeier, Cathi	#106768 EA – Student Instruction	Pine Ridge	Reg 6 hrs / day	6/27/17
Navez, Luis	#106709 Family and Community Liaison	Teaching and Learning	Reg 6.4 hrs / day	6/7/17
Orton, Pamela	#106732 Consulting Registered Nurse	Special Programs	Reg 6.4 hrs / day	6/13/17
Parazoo, Paxton	#106588 Summer Mowing Crew	Maintenance	Temp 8 hrs / day	6/26/17
Ramos, Katie	#106797 Speech Language Pathology Assistant	Special Programs	Reg 6 hrs / day	7/5/17
Sanchez-Miller, Jessica	#106709 Family and Community Liaison	Teaching and Learning	Reg 6.4 hrs / day	6/7/17
Scheafer, Matthew	#106617 EA – Inclusion	Special Programs	Reg 7 hrs / day	6/22/17
Sherrell, Rachel	#106648 Attendance Office Secretary II	Bend High	Reg 3 hrs / day	6/7/17
Smith, Hallie	#106641 Accounts Payable Tech	Business Office	Reg 8 hrs / day	6/9/17
Smith-Blockley, Stuart	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Juniper	Temp 6.5 hrs / day	6/7/17
Thompson, Kristi	#106736 School Office Secretary II	Sky View	Reg 4 hrs / day	6/29/17
Vargas, Elizabeth	#106709 Family and Community Liaison	Teaching and Learning	Reg 6.4 hrs / day	6/15/17
Willhite, Tyler	#106588 Summer Mowing Crew	Maintenance	Temp 8 hrs / day	6/28/17
Williams, Ara	#106731 EA – Lunch and Learn	Teaching and Learning	Temp 3 hrs / day	6/22/17
Young, Zoe	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Special Programs	Temp 6.5 hrs / day	6/8/17



HUMAN RESOURCES

Education Center

520 N.W. Wall Street

Bend, Oregon 97703-2699

(541) 355-1100

Fax: (541) 355-1109

Classified Resignations

Name	Position	Location	Resign Date
Brinkley-Widmer, Patricia	EA – Student Instruction	Highland	1/23/14 – 6/22/17
Cady, Joshua	EA- Inclusion	Bear Creek	3/30/15 – 6/22/17
Crakes, Kristen	EA – Student Instruction	Bear Creek	10/5/15 – 6/22/17
Freeman, Jamie	Attendance Secretary II	Cascade	8/19/13 – 7/15/17
Henry, Anne	EA – Inclusion	Bear Creek	1/22/14 – 7/10/17
Jay-Maleski, Jaclyn	Counseling Secretary II	Cascade	8/17/15 – 6/26/17
Steele, Anthony	Bus Driver	Transportation	8/30/11 – 6/22/17

Classified Retirements

Name	Position	Location	Termination Date
Kauffman, David	Bus Driver	Transportation	7/15/13 – 6/22/17
Roberts, Michael	Bus Driver	Transportation	10/11/06 – 6/22/17
Wear, Anne	EA – Student Instruction	Bear Creek	9/24/97 – 6/30/17

**Administrative School District No. 1
Bend-La Pine Schools**

Resolution No. 1855

Board Meeting Schedule

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Administrative School District No. 1, Deschutes County, shall conduct its Regular Board meetings on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month, with exceptions, as presented in the attached Board meeting calendar for 2017-18.

BE IT RESOLVED that Regular Board meetings shall be held at 5:15 p.m. unless otherwise specified.

BE IT RESOLVED that this Board may change meeting dates, time, and locations by majority vote of this body, and subject to proper notice, pursuant to ORS 192.640.

Moved by _____

Second by _____

Yes votes _____

No votes _____

Dated this 17th day of July 2017.

Chair

Vice Chair

Board Secretary

Board Meeting Calendar 2017-18

The Board of Directors for Bend-La Pine Schools will meet on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month at 5:15 p.m. in room 314 of the Education Center, 520 NW Wall Street, Bend. (unless otherwise noted)

July 17, 2017	12:30 p.m.	Room 314
August 2, 2017 Board Retreat & Regular Meeting	8:00 a.m.	TBD
September 12, 2017	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
September 26, 2017	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
October 10, 2017	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
October 24, 2017	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
November 14, 2017	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
November 28, 2017	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
December 12, 2017	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
January 9, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
January 23, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
February 13, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
February 27, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
March 13, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
April 10, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
April 24, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
May 8, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
May 22, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
June 12, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314
June 26, 2018	5:15 p.m.	Room 314

**Administrative School District No. 1
Bend-La Pine Schools**

Resolution No. 1856

Parliamentary Procedure

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Administrative School District No. 1, Deschutes County, adopts Robert's Rules of Order, current edition, as the parliamentary law governing the procedure of this Board in the conduct of its meetings.

Moved by _____

Second by _____

Yes votes _____

No votes _____

Dated this 17th day of July 2017.

Chair

Vice Chair

Board Secretary

**Administrative School District No. 1
Bend-La Pine Schools**

Resolution No. 1857

Designation of Authority

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Administrative School District No. 1, Deschutes County, hereby designates the Superintendent, Shay Mikalson, as the Chief Administrative Officer, Clerk and Budget Officer of the school district and hereby ratifies the adoption of all legally required policies.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Administrative School District No. 1, Deschutes County, hereby designates the Chief Operations and Financial Officer, Bradley J. Henry as Deputy Clerk and Chief Financial Officer.

Moved by _____

Second by _____

Yes votes _____

No votes _____

Dated this 17th day of July 2017.

Chair

Vice Chair

Board Secretary

**Administrative School District No. 1
Bend-La Pine Schools**

Resolution No. 1858

Depositories and Authorized Signatures

BE IT RESOLVED that deposit accounts up to deposit insurance limits may be held at any insured financial institution with a head office or branch in Oregon.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that deposit accounts in excess of deposit insurance limits may only be maintained at financial institutions designated as “qualified depositories for public funds” by the Oregon State Treasurer’s Office.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Administrative School District No. 1, Deschutes County, hereby directs that all District accounts with depositories shall have four authorized signors.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following persons are designated as Custodian of Funds and authorized to execute financial instruments: Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Chief Operations and Financial Officer, and Business Manager.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the persons designated as Custodian of Funds will be bonded in the amount of at least \$100,000. This is in compliance with ORS 332.525.

Moved by _____

Second by _____

Yes votes _____

No votes _____

Dated this 17th day of July 2017.

Chair

Vice Chair

Board Secretary

**Administrative School District No. 1
Bend-La Pine Schools**

Resolution No. 1859

Salary and Insurance Payments

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of Administrative School District No. 1, Deschutes County, hereby authorizes the District Clerk and / or designees to make salary payments, as well as workers' compensation, health, liability, and other insurance payments according to the provisions of the District Budget, Board Executive Limitations and State Law.

Moved by _____

Second by _____

Yes votes _____

No votes _____

Dated this 17th day of July 2017.

Chair

Vice Chair

Board Secretary

**Administrative School District No. 1
Bend-La Pine Schools**

Resolution No. 1860

Public Contracting Rules and Procedures Including Class Special Procurements and Exemptions

WHEREAS, Bend-La Pine School District No. 1 ("District") is an Oregon school district which is subject to Oregon's public contracting laws; and

WHEREAS, the District's Board of Directors (the "Board"), serves as the District's Local Contract Review Board ("LCRB"); and

WHEREAS, ORS 279A.065(5) provides that a local contracting agency may adopt its own rules of procedure for public contracting that:

- (A) Specifically state that the model rules adopted by the Attorney General do not apply to the contracting agency; and
- (B) Prescribe the rules of procedure that the contracting agency will use for public contracts, which may include portions of the model rules adopted by the Attorney General; and

WHEREAS, the Board, with required notice, did on July 9, 2013 adopt with Resolution No. 1784 public contracting rules and procurement guidelines including certain exemptions and class special procurements described in administrative regulation DJ-AR; now therefore

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors appoints the Superintendent, Chief Operations and Financial Officer, Business Manager, or District Buyer to determine whether or not a particular contract or purchase is exempt by virtue of meeting criteria in the adopted public contracting rules and procurement guidelines.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors appoints the Superintendent or Superintendent's designee to approve contracts and purchases on behalf of the District unless otherwise restricted by law or in the Board's Executive Limitations.

Moved by _____

Second by _____

YES votes _____

NO votes _____

Dated this 17th day of July 2017.

Chair

Board Secretary

Vice Chair

Bend-La Pine Schools
Superintendent Monitoring Report to Board of Directors

Executive Limitation 1 – Global Executive Restraint
July 17, 2017

Background/Discussion

The School Board has created a set of policies that are used to help govern Bend-La Pine Schools. Each year, District staff will report to the Board regarding one group of these policies, the Executive Limitations. These reports are designed to provide the School Board with information regarding how the Superintendent is meeting the criteria established within the adopted Executive Limitations.

Executive Summary

This monitoring report provides the Board with information to evaluate the Superintendent's compliance with the directives of Executive Limitation 1 – Global Executive Constraint for the time period from July 2016 to present.

Monitoring Report

The Superintendent shall not cause or allow any practice, activity, decision or organizational condition which is unlawful, unethical, unsafe, imprudent, or in violation of commonly accepted business and professional ethic and practices, collective bargaining agreements, and Board policy.

Evidence of Compliance:

The District continues to comply with all legal compliance for fiscal management and accountability of its resources at the District level and with all state financial requirements. Independent financial audits for the 2015-16 school year performed by SGA CPAs and Consultants, found the District to be in compliance with no findings and/or exceptions. The district also complies with all legal requirements for financial management and accountability of its resources at the building level. Internal audits and controls are conducted and reviewed in all buildings and departments annually. No major problems have been identified and minor corrections were implemented as appropriate. Both internal and external independent audits verify that actions are appropriate, lawful and prudent.

During the 2015-16 school year, the Board of Directors for Bend-La Pine Schools hired PlanB Consultancy Inc. (PlanB), in conjunction with Talbot, Korvola & Warwick, LLP (TKW) to provide an independent evaluation of two of the District's capital construction projects; the construction of Pacific Crest Middle School and the addition and remodel of Bend Senior High. The review found that industry practices appeared to be largely applied. PlanB recommendations for improvement included items such as project controls, key capital construction performance indicators, knowledge management, value engineering, risk assessment, change order management, 3D visualization for project design, award scoring process and its treatment of errors and omissions. The District has reviewed all recommendations from the evaluation, has revised and implemented an updated RFP process and have made adjustments to other processes based on the recommendations. The District continues to follow the language and expectations set forth in [Executive Limitation 7 – Facilities](#).

Supervision of staff continues to be conducted by the Human Resources Department and Offices of School Support and Design. Protocols are in place along with training and support offered through the Human Resources Department in the prevention, investigation and remediation of unacceptable staff conduct. All known concerns related to employee conduct are currently, or have been addressed. Complaints and grievances have also been addressed within compliance as stated in policy and/or collective bargaining agreements.

The District continues to maintain positive working relationships with both BEA and OSEA leaders, evidenced most recently with a successful spring bargaining session for both union groups. The BEA group was able to come to a contractual agreement effective July 1, 2017, and the OSEA group came to a tentative agreement effective July 1, 2017. The District looks forward to working with new leadership for each association in 2017. The Superintendent, Deputy Superintendent and Human Resources Department Supervisors work together throughout the year to ensure matters pertaining to BEA and OSEA members are dealt with in compliance to legal and contract language. All matters have been or are currently being addressed and are within compliance.

During the 2016-17 school year, the District implemented a review and calendar system to ensure legal compliance and accurate reflections of District practice with state and federal laws, Oregon Administrative Rules, Administrative Policies and Administrative Regulations. As seen in the May 2017 EL 12 – Legally Required Policies monitoring [report](#), significant progress was made with more than 120 policies and regulations being reviewed and updated. The work will always be ongoing as new policy guidance emerges, laws change and issues arise. The District will continue to review, update and implement new policies and regulations as required by law or to effectively run and manage the District.

The District is committed to implementing a district-wide external review and initial plans were to do such in partnership with AdvancED's Performance Accreditation. Rather than enter into contract with AdvancED, the District has tasked John Rexford, Chief of Staff, to lead the external-review process. Rexford was hired as of July 1, 2017 through the HDESD Local Service Plan to serve as Chief of Staff for Bend-La Pine Schools. Rexford's extensive knowledge of K-12 education and operations will provide a strong basis for a review process. The District will continue to keep the School Board apprised of this work and process throughout the 2017-18 school year.

As seen in the September 2016 EL 3 – Treatment of Students, Parents / Guardians and the Public [report](#), a comprehensive school safety program and protocols are in place and continue to improve. Mental and behavior health, bullying prevention, wellness, risk screening, safe and secure facilities, visitor and volunteer management systems, regional partnerships, increased staffing and extensive staff training opportunities help to support a healthy and safe learning and working environment.

Areas of Improvement:

The District will continue to strengthen its capital construction practices based on recommendations from PlanB.

Addendum:

[2015-16 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report](#)

[PlanB – Performance Review Report](#)

Request for Proposals (RFP) Process Summary and Evaluators Guide

Bend-La Pine Schools Request for Proposals Process

1. Request for Proposals Advertised and Issued per ORS 279 Requirements, which includes evaluation criteria taken directly from the Attorney General Rules.
2. Supervisor of Facilities Development shall identify a selection committee per the “Bend-La Pine Schools Evaluators Guide for Scoring Competitive Proposals”. The committee shall consist of the Supervisor for Facilities Development, 1 professional from the Facilities Development Office, 1 Administrative Team member, 1 School Principal or designee, 1 Technical Advisor from the community. Each committee member will be required to sign a Non-conflict of interest and Confidentiality statement.
3. Once proposal's are received the evaluation process shall begin per the evaluators guide consisting of the following:
 - Kick off Meeting – Just prior to the committee beginning its evaluations, the SFD or designee will conduct a kick-off meeting. During this meeting the SFD or designee will review the project requirements, proposers percentage of staff time dedicated to the project(s) verses proposed fees, the evaluation criteria and weighting, and discuss the process and timeline for completing the evaluations, using the Evaluators Guide as a reference tool.
 - Evaluation – Evaluation of proposals is the process of reviewing and scoring proposals against the evaluation criteria specified within the solicitation document(s); proposals are **not** directly compared to each other or to any criteria not specifically stated in the solicitation. Each proposal must be read, evaluated, and scored by the evaluator on an individual basis in accordance with the numerical scoring system specified in the solicitation document using the scoring sheet provided.
 - Scoring Guidelines – Points shall be awarded by the evaluators for the evaluation criteria as follows: 5 Points Excellent proposal, 4 Points Above Average proposal, 3 Average Proposal, 2 Below Average Proposal, 1 Poor Proposal, 0 Unacceptable proposal. The above scores will then be subjected to a weighted percentage based on the value of each criteria calculated by their relative importance in the selection process. The advantage of this reduces the subjectivity of solely using point system
 - First Deliberations Meeting - After every committee member has completed the written portion of their scoring of the proposals, the SFD or designee will reconvene the committee for the first deliberations meeting to discuss the evaluations and allow for any questions and clarifications. After the review is completed and any adjustments are made, the total scores will be tabulated, and a determination will be made by the committee to proceed with a Notice of Intent to Award (“NOI”) to the highest scoring proposer, or if needed will proceed with an interview process.
 - Interviews - Interviews will be optional, as indicated in the solicitation document. If interviews are conducted, up to the top three ranked firms will be interviewed. If held only the interview and the resulting ranking will be considered in the final selection.
 - Reference Checks - Second Deliberation Meeting - After the interviews and/or presentations, it is recommended that the SFD or designee reconvene the committee for a second deliberations meeting to discuss the interviews and presentations and allow for any final questions and clarifications. After the review is completed a determination will be made by the committee to proceed with a Notice of Intent to Award (“NOI”) to the highest scoring proposer.

Bend-La Pine Schools

EVALUATORS GUIDE

Scoring Competitive Proposals



November 6, 2015

Evaluation Committee Members:

Thank you for your willingness to serve as a member of an evaluation committee. Your time and effort are appreciated as you and the other members of the evaluation committee work to reach a final recommendation.

Contracting professional services by Bend-La Pine Schools is made in accordance with State law, City Code, and established policies and procedures. The underlying premise of the procurement process is that the public trust is best served and public funds are best spent only after being subjected to an open and competitive process. This Evaluator's Guide has been specifically designed to assist you with the evaluation of competitive proposals as well as answer some of the frequently asked questions. Adherence to the process will ensure objectivity and fairness in the selection of contractors.

Many thanks to the City of Portland for which this guide is modeled.

Section 1 INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

This Guide is intended to assist members of an evaluation committee in carrying out their responsibility of evaluating and scoring proposals. The role of the evaluation committee is public, and as a member you are accountable for everything you say, write, and do throughout the evaluation process regarding each proposal evaluated.

B. COMMITMENT

The evaluation process, from review through oral interviews must be completed by each of the committee members. It is essential to the progress of the committee's work that committee members attend all scheduled meetings, provide any required documentation, and adhere to any set timelines. Committee efforts are generally short-term, concentrated, highly focused, and often under a time-constraint. It is hard to predict how long it will take to complete the evaluations of the proposals, as that is dependent on how many proposals are received, the technical aspects being reviewed, and the corresponding quality and depth of the proposals. It is important that all committee members clearly understand the level of commitment and follow-through required for serving on the committee. After reading this guide, please carefully consider what you have read and let the Supervisor of Facilities Development (SFD) or designee know if you have any questions or reservations before you start. If an evaluation committee member determines that he or she is unable to complete the evaluation process, it is best for that member to request to be replaced at the onset.

C. CONFIDENTIALITY

From receipt of the proposals through the issuance of the Notice of Intent to Award, every aspect of the committee's actions is considered confidential. Therefore, nothing should be discussed outside the confines of the committee meetings. This serves to ensure that the process remains objective, is not subject to external influences, and that no unfair advantages or hindrances will be afforded to any Proposer. Evaluators should feel secure that they can objectively evaluate proposals and ask pertinent questions without concern for criticism or sanction from outside the committee process. This will also ensure that any contract negotiating leverage is neither lost nor compromised due to leaks to potential awardees.

All proposals are considered confidential until a Notice of Intent to Award is issued. Committee members will not have contact with any of the Proposers outside of formal committee communications during the evaluation process; conversely, the committee members are not to be contacted by any of the Proposers during or following the evaluation process prior to contract award. At the Districts sole discretion, communications with members of the evaluation committee outside of formal committee communications (i.e., clarification of proposals and/or interviews), or other District staff for the purpose of unfairly influencing the outcome of an RFP may be cause for a Proposer's proposal to be rejected and disqualified from further consideration.

The names of the committee members are normally not released to Proposers. For the purpose of confidentiality of the committee, it is recommended that an alpha or numerical identifier be assigned to each member to use on the scoring sheets.

D. NON-CONFLICT OF INTEREST INFORMATION

Each evaluator will be provided with a list of the Proposers to the solicitation. A **Non-Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statement** must be signed by each member of the committee prior to beginning his or her evaluation of the proposals. A conflict of interest is defined as a situation in which an evaluation committee member **has**, or **appears to have**, a financial or familial relationship with a Proposer. In the event an evaluator feels he or she has a conflict of interest with any firm or organization submitting a proposal and cannot sign the statement, they must recuse themselves from serving as an evaluator for that project.

Awareness of a potential conflict of interest may not arise until well into the evaluation process. If this should occur, immediately notify the SFD or designee. If you stay throughout the process either knowing or suspecting you have a conflict of interest, the process could be called into question and the project along with the many hours of time invested in it by the evaluation committee members and Proposers could be jeopardized. It is best to err on the side of caution and avoid the appearance of impropriety. It is far better to disclose any issues at the earliest possible time, thereby allowing the District the opportunity to make any adjustments in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety and keep the process fair and objective to all Proposers.

E. INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT

Committee members will exercise independent judgment in evaluating and scoring proposals. Questions may be directed to the SFD or designee in order to increase your knowledge or to better understand pertinent information before awarding points. However, ensure your actions are not dependent on another person's wishes.

The exercise of independent judgment applies not only to possible influences from outside the evaluation committee, but also to influences from within the committee. During deliberations, it is normal and acceptable for there to be a discussion within the committee about how well a proposal meets the evaluation criteria. As an independent evaluator you may be swayed by the discourse to alter your scoring, and that is acceptable. However, evaluators may not act in a concerted way to either favor or disfavor a particular proposal or group of proposals, or attempt to coerce an Evaluator to change his/her scores, as the resulting evaluation score(s) would not be based upon the independent judgment of the individual evaluators. Determining a successful proposer does not require a unanimous decision from all members of the committee.

F. SELECTION COMMITTEE

Members of the evaluation committee will be chosen by the SFD or designee based on the District project. Voting members of the Committee will include, SFD, 1 professional from the Facilities Development Office, 1 Administrative Team member, 1 School Principal or designee, 1 Technical Advisor from the community.

Section 2 EVALUATION PROCESS

A. KICK OFF MEETING

Just prior to the committee beginning its evaluations, the SFD or designee will conduct a kick-off meeting. During this meeting the SFD or designee will review the project requirements, proposers percentage of staff time dedicated to the project(s) verses proposed fees, the evaluation criteria and weighting, and discuss the process and timeline for completing the evaluations, using the Evaluators Guide as a reference tool. It is important that each committee member have a clear understanding of the evaluation process, how points will be assigned, and what is expected of them. All evaluators should be strongly encouraged to read the Evaluators Guide and the solicitation document (RFP) and any addenda before beginning their evaluation scoring.

B. EVALUATION

Evaluation of proposals is the process of reviewing and scoring proposals against the evaluation criteria specified within the solicitation document(s); proposals are **not** directly compared to each other or to any criteria not specifically stated in the solicitation. While it is true that a certain amount of comparison of proposals naturally occurs during the evaluation process, proposals must be evaluated and scored only in relation to the evaluation criteria set out in the solicitation document. It is very important that all committee members read the solicitation document, and any addenda, and have a clear understanding of the requirements and evaluation criteria before attempting to evaluate the proposals. Each evaluator must evaluate all proposals and comply with the guidelines provided in this Guide.

Each proposal must be read, evaluated, and scored by the evaluator on an individual basis in accordance with the numerical scoring system specified in the solicitation document using the scoring sheet provided. **Unless otherwise directed, all criteria must be scored.** If an evaluator chooses to evaluate and score only some of the proposals or criteria, the evaluation will be considered incomplete and not counted in the overall scoring in order to eliminate any skewing of the final scores.

Scoring should be both qualitative and quantitative in comparison to the evaluation criteria outlined in the solicitation document, and should be looked upon as a whole for the entire category. Unusual strengths and weaknesses or questions should be noted on the scoring sheet. Keep in mind that **all scores and comments** become a part of the solicitation file, and following the Notice of Intent to Award are considered **public information**. Committee members should always have a reasonable, rational, and consistent basis for their scores, and be prepared to explain them in the event of a protest.

The overriding rule in evaluating proposals is to read and score all proposals fairly. The objective of the evaluation process is to determine which Proposer(s) has submitted the best proposal, when its proposal is compared to the information requested in the RFP. This process provides a mathematical score based upon the evaluation criteria and weighted available points, as specified in the solicitation document.

During the course of the evaluation, evaluators shall use caution to not disclose information contained in the proposals, or have any discussion between evaluation committee members outside of the evaluation committee meetings. Upon completion of the evaluation of proposals, evaluators will return the completed scoring sheets and proposals to the SFD or designee within the established timeline.

C. SCORING GUIDELINES

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the committee members may consider the following guidelines:

- 5 **Excellent Proposal** = A highly comprehensive, superior proposal that meets all of the requirements of the solicitation. All major issues/criteria were fully addressed; answers were exemplary.
- 4 **Above Average Proposal** = All major issues were addressed; no deficiencies exist in the areas assessed. Demonstrated a consistently better than average level of expertise.
- 3 **Average Proposal** = Most major and minor issues were addressed, some deficiencies, some problems. Demonstrated an acceptable level of expertise.
- 2 **Below Average Proposal** = Some issues were addressed, some major deficiencies, some problems. Demonstrated expertise below an acceptable level.
- 1 **Poor Proposal** = Few or no issues addressed, many deficiencies, a major problem exists.
- 0 **Unacceptable Proposal** = Incomplete and unsuitable proposal.

Evaluation committee members will not be required to provide a written explanation of the individual numerical scores, unless an evaluator wishes to award a score of less than 30 percent of the total available points for any individual criteria. In the case of awarding such a score, the evaluator will be required to provide a short written explanation that addresses how that score was determined.

D. CLARIFICATION OF PROPOSALS

During the evaluation process an evaluator may have questions concerning a proposal that may require clarification by the Proposer. Questions must be given to the SFD or designee who must then address them in writing to the Proposer; all contact with Proposers must be through this designated individual. Written clarification returned by the Proposer, will be shared with all of the committee members. It is important to note that all questions posed by evaluators should only address clarification of items in the proposal and must not be an opportunity for a Proposer to materially change or add to their original proposal.

E. FIRST DELIBERATIONS MEETING

After every committee member has completed the written portion of their scoring of the proposals, the SFD or designee will reconvene the committee for the first deliberations meeting to discuss the evaluations and allow for any questions and clarifications.

During the discussion, the individual scores will be reviewed and if any scores appear unusual, the SFD or designee will ask the evaluator to explain their scores to ensure an error has not been made. Evaluators may modify their scores during the discussion and clarification period as needed, based only on their **independent judgment**. After the review is completed and any adjustments are made, the total scores will be tabulated, and a determination will be made by the committee to proceed with a Notice of Intent to Award ("NOI") to the highest scoring proposer, or if needed will proceed with an interview process.

F. INTERVIEWS

Interviews will be conducted only if and only as indicated in the solicitation document. Even though one or more members of the committee may not feel that the highest scored proposer is the best candidate for the project, contract awards or continuation to another evaluation phase will be based on the total score alone. Evaluation committee members should be sensitive concerning the time and costs to the vendor community, and only move to a second round of evaluations if the scores are close enough among the top proposers that any of them could move to the highest scored position upon completion of a second evaluation.

When determining if interviews are necessary it is important to discuss what additional information or clarification could be gathered in an interview that could have such a significant effect on the scores that the top scored proposer may change.

Formal questions and an agenda for the interviews should be created in advance, and provided at least 72 hours prior notice to Proposers invited to the next evaluation phase. Proposers will be allowed an equal amount of time for their interviews and will be conducted in a consistent format.

In preparation for the Oral Interview, instructions should be provided, including the following:

- ① Logistical information: date, time, location, the total amount of time allotted for the interview
- ① Proposer's key personnel required to participate, and any limitations on the participation of additional Proposer representatives
- ① Description of the format and content
- ① The anticipated number of attendees

All committee members will participate in and evaluate/score all interviews as specified within the solicitation document. It is possible to utilize one committee for the evaluation of the submitted written proposals and an entirely different committee for the interviews only if the scores from the interviews are to **stand alone** and the Proposer is to be selected solely on the basis of the interview scores; however, the solicitation document must stipulate this as the selection process.

This interview process presents the project in an organized fashion, makes sure all proposers are asked questions relevant to their proposal, and no questions are forgotten. These interviews are not intended to be marketing presentations by the consulting firms, nor are they to be used to "trip up" a proposer. Rather, they are to be a structured and controlled presentation that will clarify proposals or elicit additional relevant information from each of the proposers.

G. REFERENCE CHECKS

Most solicitation documents require Proposers to provide references and such supporting documentation as previous work history, information on projects that are similar to the one proposed, and the names and phone numbers of contact people. References will be checked as outlined in the solicitation, and will be contacted by a committee member(s) designated to check references. The committee's designee(s) will pose the same questions to each, document their responses, and share them with the committee. It is important that the committee members develop a standard list of questions to be used. Some sample questions may include:

- ① Describe the projects they've worked on for you.
- ① Was performance satisfactory?
- ① Would you contract with them again?
- ① Was there a frequency and rationale for change orders?
- ① Were their preliminary estimates accurate throughout the project?
- ① Any problems with accuracy of their work product?
- ① Did they provide any special services?
- ① Did they provide all of the closeout documentation?
- ① Is there anything else you care to share?

The District is not restricted to using only those references provided by the Proposers, but may also check other references as they become available through the original reference checks. Comments and information provided by the reference checks will be documented and shared with the committee members.

H. SECOND DELIBERATIONS MEETING

After the interviews and/or presentations, it is recommended that the SFD or designee reconvene the committee for a second deliberations meeting to discuss the interviews and presentations and allow for any final questions and clarifications. After the review is completed a determination will be made by the committee to proceed with a Notice of Intent to Award ("NOI") to the highest scoring proposer.

Section 3 REVIEWS AND PROTESTS

A. REVIEWS

Following the Notice of Intent to Award, the proposals and procurement file become subject to State Public Records law; the public may view the proposals, as well as all evaluation committee scores and comments. At this time, Proposers not awarded the contract may seek additional clarification or debriefing, request time to review the selection procedures, or discuss the scoring methods used by the evaluation committee. The SFD or designee will facilitate this process and the individual committee members will normally not be involved.

B. PROTESTS

Proposers shall have seven (7) calendar days, unless otherwise noted, from the issuance of the Notice of Intent to file a protest. The protest must be filed in writing to the Chief Procurement Officer and must specify the grounds upon which the protest is based.

C. DEBRIEFS

In some circumstances, proposers may ask to see the scoring summary but may also want to discuss or debrief other information with the SFD or designee. Debriefing is a good educational tool used by proposers to review the score sheets and successful proposals as submitted by other proposers to better understand how they might construct a better proposal in the future.

Section 4 EVALUATION FORMS

This Section contains the following forms that are used in the evaluation process:

- ① Evaluator Non-Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statement
- ① Sample Scoring Sheet

EVALUATOR NON-CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

I, _____, an evaluation committee member

for _____, do hereby certify that:

(Project Name)

NON-CONFLICT OF INTEREST

To the best of my knowledge, I do not have a conflict of interest¹, as a result of any financial or other interest on my part or that of any member of my immediate family, nor of my partner(s). Further, I certify that I am not employed by nor do I have any arrangement for future employment with any organization under consideration, nor will I solicit or accept gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value from any company or organization associated with this solicitation. I will independently score each proposal and have no conversation or contact with any proposers regarding their proposals, except as allowable as part of the solicitation process.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Also, this certifies that I fully understand the confidential nature of the competitive procurement process and the obligations as imposed by Oregon laws to ensure this competitive process is conducted in a fair and equitable manner. Therefore, I agree to maintain the confidences necessary to prevent unfair advantages to any Offeror engaged in a competition for Bend-La Pine Schools contracts, and to further abide by all rules and prohibitions set forth by the Bend-La Pine Schools as they relate to conflict of interest and confidentiality. I understand these prohibitions include the discussion or disclosing of the evaluation, scoring, or status of any proposal action(s) affecting any proposal(s), or of any information designated by the Bend-La Pine Schools as confidential to any person, firm, corporation, or other business entity, at any time prior to the execution of the contract.

(Evaluator's Name)

(Signature)

(Date)

¹A conflict of interest is identified as a situation, in which an Evaluation Committee Member has, or appears to have, a financial relationship with a responding proposer, or has a family relationship with any responding proposer.

A family relationship with a responding proposer means that the evaluator is related to that proposer by marriage, or domestic partnership, and includes relationships such as children, stepchildren, parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brothers, sisters, fathers-in-law, mothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, and brothers-in-law.

Financial relationships include involvement of the evaluator and the proposer in a current partnership, joint venture, company, or corporation, and any other relationship that could make it appear that the evaluator would obtain a monetary benefit if a favorable evaluation was given.

Architect Scoresheet – Project Name

Firm: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

		Score*	Weight**	Total
	Background - 15%			
1	Firm History		3	0
	Experience 25%			
2	Performance History		2.5	0
3	Time & Budget Successfulness		2.5	0
	Staffing - 25%			
4	Proposed Staff		2	0
5	Workload of Proposed Staff		2	0
6	Time on Project		1	0
	Approach - 25%			
7	Firms Approach		2.5	0
8	Design Philosophy		2.5	0
	Local Knowledge/Conditions - 10%			
9	Local Knowledge/Conditions		2	0
	TOTAL SCORE			0

*Scoring System

0 - Unacceptable

1 - Poor

2 - Below Average

3 - Average

4 - Above Average

5 - Excellent

**Weight system based on criteria importance

Bend-La Pine Schools
Superintendent Monitoring Report to Board of Directors

Executive Limitation 2 – Emergency Superintendent Succession
July 17, 2017

Background/Discussion

The School Board has created a set of policies that are used to help govern Bend-La Pine Schools. Each year, District staff will report to the Board regarding one group of these policies, the Executive Limitations. These reports are designed to provide the School Board with information regarding how the Superintendent is meeting the criteria established within the adopted Executive Limitations.

Executive Summary

This monitoring report provides the Board with information to evaluate the Superintendent's compliance with the directives of Executive Limitation 2 – Emergency Superintendent Succession for the time period from July 2016 to present.

Monitoring Report

In order to protect the Board from sudden loss of Superintendent services, the Superintendent shall not allow a situation where at least one other administrator is not familiar with Board and Superintendent issues and processes. The Superintendent shall not fail to:

- 1. Appoint a successor in the advent the Superintendent is not capable of carrying out duties on a short term basis due to an emergency.**

Evidence of Compliance:

The Superintendent has assured that Deputy Superintendent, Jay Mathisen; Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning, Lora Nordquist; and Chief Operations and Fiscal Officer, Brad Henry are familiar with and capable of assuming the responsibilities of the Superintendent on an emergency basis if the need should arise. These individuals are present at all crucial meetings, including Board meetings and are informed on key district issues.

As of July 1, 2017, John Rexford has joined the district as Chief of Staff. While working on a less than half-time basis, Rexford will also be apprised of key district issues and participate in crucial meetings, board meetings and discussions.

Areas of Improvement:

None.

- 2. Inform the Board and/or the Board Chair of any planned absence from the district.**

Evidence of Compliance:

Through weekly Board Leadership meetings and email communication, the Superintendent has notified Board members of all planned absences during the 2016-17 school year.

Areas of Improvement:

None.

- 3. Be available by electronic communication whenever absent from the district or appoint an acting successor.**

Evidence of Compliance:

The Superintendent checks emails regularly when away from the office, often responding within the same day. Use of cell phone and traveling with a laptop has ensured electronic communication can occur.

Areas for Improvement:

None.

Addendum:

Please see attached 2017-18 district organizational chart.

