Bend-La Pine Schools
Bend, OR 97703
August 2, 2017

Regular Meeting & Board Retreat

The Board of Directors of Bend-La Pine Schools will meet in a regular meeting on August 2, 2017 at
9:00 a.m. followed by a retreat workshop in Room GRC 110 at OSU Graduate and Research Center;
533 SW Columbia Drive; Bend, OR 97702

Agenda

Call to Order	Chair High
Pledge of Allegiance	Carrie Douglass
Review of Agenda	Chair High
Public Input *This is the time provided for individuals to address the Board. Visitors who wish to speak are asked to 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.*	Chair High
Superintendent's Spotlight of Success: Construction Update	Superintendent Mikalson

Consent Agenda

Approval of Minutes – July 17, 2017 *Reference: ORS 192.650 and ORS 332.057*	Chair High
Approval of Personnel Recommendations *Reference: ORS 332.505*	Jay Mathisen

Board Retreat Workshop

Bend-La Pine Schools Strategic Priority Discussion • Board Ends Discussion • High School Programs / Measure 98 Update • High School Configuration Discussion • Culture of Innovation Discussion • Budget Discussion • Board / Community Linkage *(i.e.: mental health, start times, high school programing, restorative practices, etc.)*	Superintendent Mikalson & Chair High
Board Work Plan Discussion • Reaffirm 7 Principles of Policy Governance • Monitor and Refine Executive Limitation Discussion • OSBA and NSBA Discussion • Board Calendar Discussion	Chair High
Superintendent Evaluation Discussion	Peggy Kinkade

Board Comments
Adjourn

Bend-La Pine Schools
Bend, OR 97703

The Board of Directors for Bend-La Pine Schools met in a regular session on July 17, 2017 in room 314 of the Education Center, 520 NW Wall Street, Bend, OR.

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

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 12:38 p.m. by Chair Kinkade. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

Review of Agenda
Chair Kinkade reviewed the agenda and said she would like to add ideas for the board retreat as a discussion topic at the end of the meeting.

Public Input
There was no public input.

Consent Agenda
Ron Gallinat moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Carrie Douglass seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.

Action Items
Election of Board Officers
Chair Kinkade noted the copy of Governance Policy 5 : Board Member Roles at each board member's seat. She provided the copy as a reminder of the duties the board agreed to and asked if the board would like to reaffirm or possibly add or amend any portion of the policy. Kinkade commented on the numerous invitations that are sent to the chair for events throughout the community during the year. She would like to see future chairs continue to attend community events and if the chair is unavailable, seek out another board member who can attend.

Carrie Douglass commented on the importance of developing board meeting agendas and that she would like to see more of the collective board involved in developing agendas. Douglass also suggested more distributed leadership duties amongst board members.

Cheri Helt said the board chair often loses their personal opinion because their duty is to help bring the collective board to a consensus, adding, it is the job of the chair to convey the will of the board even when they may not personally agree. The agenda the chair helps write should meet the needs of fellow board members. Stuart Young added that agenda planning is almost always a discussion at board leadership meetings and provides other board members an opportunity to help in planning.

Julie Craig said she would like to have more public discussions or updates, as appropriate, on board leadership discussions. Helt suggested adding 'board leadership update' to board agendas as a standing item.

Douglass asked how the chair currently follows up with those who make public comments. Mikalson said often times the chair asks he or district leadership to follow up with the person(s) about their statement, questions or concerns. High suggested this might be an area to look further into and possibly outline a method or expectations for follow up. Kinkade thanked all for their feedback and thoughts and will bring an updated version of GP 5 to the board retreat.

Kinkade asked board members if they would like to move forward and vote to elect leadership positions. All board members agreed to move forward. Kinkade explained the nomination and voting process and opened the floor for nominations.

Julie Craig nominated Andy High for Board Chair. No other nominations were made. Kinkade closed nominations for Chair and called for a vote. The board voted unanimously to elect Andy High as Board Chair. Superintendent Mikalson thanked Kinkade for an incredible year and said it was a pleasure to work together. Julie Craig agreed and noted the tremendous amount of effort and time Kinkade devoted to the transition to policy governance.

Andy High nominated Julie Craig for Vice Chair. No other nominations were made. Kinkade closed nominations for Vice Chair and called for a vote. The board voted unanimously to elect Julie Craig as Vice Chair.

Chair High thanked fellow board members for their support and Kinkade for her leadership and said he has appreciated working with her this past year in his role as vice chair. He gave Kinkade a gift card on behalf of the collective board. High gave each board member a Kenwood brick, engraved with each of their names and the district's mission. High said he is excited to continue to build upon the solid foundation that has been laid and shared his hope that each of these bricks symbolize the strong foundation that will allow the district to continue to build into the future.

Approval of Yearly Business & Board Operations for the 2017-18 School Year : Resolutions 1885 - 1860
Superintendent Mikalson reviewed the resolutions in the board packet and noted each of the resolutions are in line with the policy governance model and are similar to what the board sees each year at this time.
Cheri Helt suggested cancelling the last meeting in June. **Julie Craig moved to approve Resolutions 1885 – 1860 with the amendment to remove the June 26th meeting from the board meeting calendar. Peggy Kinkade seconded the motion. Unanimous approval.**

Reports
Executive Limitation 1 – Global Executive Restraint
Superintendent Mikalson reviewed Executive Limitation 1 provided in the board packet. He noted the evidences of compliance and the addition of John Rexford as Chief of Staff. Part of Rexford's work will include an internal operations review which is a change from the proposed work with AdvancED as seen in last year's report.

Executive Limitation 2 – Emergency Superintendent Succession
Superintendent Mikalson reviewed Executive Limitation 2 provided in the board packet. He noted the evidences of compliance and, again, the addition of John Rexford as Chief of Staff. Rexford's position will be paid through the HDESD Local Service Plan.

Discussion
Board Retreat Agenda
Chair High reviewed a list of suggested retreat topics and asked if there were other items board members would like to add or discuss further. Cheri Helt would like to add a discussion around mental health support and then also continue the conversation as part of a regular board meeting agenda. Julie Craig agreed, noting it is a complex topic with many community partners.

Stuart Young suggested a review of the Board Ends and noted his specific interest in the integration of learning and areas of success that can mature throughout the system. He would like to focus on Ends 2, 3, 4, and 5 at the retreat. Kinkade agreed and suggested clarification or qualifiers as being a helpful way to dig down further without changing the Ends.

Superintendent Mikalson said he would like to look at the Comprehensive Plan and suggested the why, how and what of the plan could be a good foundation for other retreat topics and conversations.

Helt would also like the board to review the superintendent evaluation and identify proven areas that help predict student success. She suggested using data points to help the board target areas of focus and help narrow down the overall evaluation. High thanked all for the feedback and will start to work on an agenda for the retreat. He also noted that he and Kinkade will be meeting with Mikalson about his contract and will update the board.

Board Comments
Stuart Young thanked Peggy Kinkade for her leadership and said he has a great deal of respect for the time and energy she devoted to being chair and moving the district forward in the right direction. He is excited to continue to work with a great team.

Ron Gallinat also thanked Kinkade for her leadership.

Chair High recessed the regular meeting at 1:26 p.m. for the board to go into executive session. Chair High resumed and adjourned the regular meeting at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Wilson
7.17.2017

DATE: July 27, 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 August 2, 2017. All Hires are subject to successful drug testing, background check, and Oregon licensure.

CERTIFIED HIRES

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	STATUS	HIRE DATE
Haines, Skylar	Biology Teacher PS106784	Summit HS	Temporary Part Time .75 FTE	08/02/2017
Larwin, Kirsten	French Teacher PS106682	Mountain View HS	Temporary Part Time .50 FTE	08/02/2017
Lyons, Greg	Business Teacher PS106734	Mountain View HS	Temporary Part Time to Regular Full Time	08/02/2017
Notari, Debora	Language Arts / Drama PS106793	Mountain View HS	Temporary Part Time .50 FTE	08/02/2017
Stringer, Amy	Social Emotional Learning PS106754	Buckingham ES	Temporary Part Time .90 FTE	08/02/2017
Withers, Victoria	Humanities PS106798	Pacific Crest MS	Regular Full Time	08/02/2017

CERTIFIED RESIGNATIONS

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	HIRE/RESIGNED DATES
Vrbata, Margey	Transition Co Op Teacher	Special Programs	02/02/1998 06/30/2017

ADMINISTRATIVE HIRES

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	STATUS	HIRE DATE
Powell, Eric	Assistant Principal PS106803	Cascade MS	Regular Full Time	08/02/2017

ADMINISTRATIVE RESIGNATIONS

NAME	POSITION	LOCATION	HIRE/RESIGNED DATES

July 28, 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

The Human Resources Department recommends approval of the following hires and resignations at the School Board meeting on August 2, 2017

Classified Hiring

Name	Position/Posting No.	Location	Temp/Regular Position	Hire Date
Dowler, Deena	#106748 Bus Monitor	La Pine Transportation	Reg 4.5 hrs / day	7/20/17
Renwick, Cheryl	#106609 EA – Inclusion	Pilot Butte	Temp 7 hrs / day	7/17/17
Wilson, Killian	#106791 Outside Services Crew I	Maintenance	Reg 8 hrs / day	7/25/17

Classified Resignations

Name	Position	Location	Resign Date
Hooper, John	EA – Inclusion	Summit	6//7/17 – 7/19/17
Snyder, Christina	Nutrition Server I	WE Miller	9/7/16 – 7/16/17
Swartz, Debra	Bus Driver	Transportation	8/26/05 – 7/20/17
Williams, Scott	Custodial Crew I	Mountain View	10/28/16 – 7/13/17

BEND-LA PINE SCHOOLS
Administrative School District No. 1
Deschutes County, Oregon
GOVERNANCE POLICY

Name: Purpose, Mission & Goals
Section: Governance Policies
Code: Ends/Results

PURPOSE STATEMENT

"Educating each student to be a thriving citizen"

MISSION STATEMENT

Bend-La Pine Schools, in partnership with our community, will prepare each student with the knowledge and skill, confidence and personal integrity to contribute as a thriving citizen in our ever-changing global society.

CORE VALUES

World Class: Globally rigorous, relevant curriculum and instruction that inspire critical thinking, creativity, communication, and collaboration.

Students First: Decisions based on what is best for students.

Culture of Excellence: A pervasive expectation for excellence that drives opportunities for high achievement and growth for all.

Data Driven: Decisions based on the best information and practices available.

Positive Relationships: Interactions based on honesty, dignity, respect, and integrity.

BOARD GOALS

GOAL 1: All students receive an excellent education and are prepared for their future.

GOAL 2: All students demonstrate personal integrity and responsible citizenship.

GOAL 3: All schools provide safe, nurturing environments conducive to learning.

GOAL 4: The school district operates with the highest level of fiscal stewardship while maintaining effective and efficient practices to meet Board goals.

WORLD CLASS OUTCOMES

Consistent with the district Purpose, Mission, Values, and Goals all children of Bend-La Pine Schools will attain the highest level of academic achievement, develop the essential skills and attributes necessary

for continued growth in learning, and graduate prepared to contribute as a thriving citizen in our ever-changing global society.

In that effort, the Bend-La Pine Schools accepts the responsibility, through the adoption of the following ends/results, to commit all resources to help give all students regardless of ethnicity, socio-economic status, English language proficiency or disabilities the knowledge, skills, and attributes necessary to succeed, grow, and ultimately graduate from Bend-La Pine Schools prepared to thrive in their future:

Academic Excellence

1. Bend-La Pine Schools students' academic achievement will show continuous improvement, as measured by the percent of 3rd-8th and 11th graders annually scoring 3 or higher on the Smarter Balanced State Assessments, or by the percent of 9th-11th graders meeting ACT's College and Career Readiness Benchmarks, in Reading, Mathematics, Writing, and Science.
2. Bend-La Pine Schools annual progress in eliminating the achievement gap for all students will show continuous improvement, as measured by the percent of state or federally identified student populations in grades 3rd-8th and 11th annually scoring 3 or higher on the Smarter Balanced State Assessments, or by the percent of 9th-11th graders meeting ACT's College and Career Readiness Benchmarks, in Reading, Mathematics, Writing, and Science.
3. Bend-La Pine Schools shall make continuous advancement toward on-time graduation, as measured by Bend-La Pine Schools' 4-year cohort graduation rate.

Thriving Citizen

4. Bend-La Pine Schools students' demonstration of the essential skills and attributes of hope, engagement, and well-being will show continuous improvement, as measured by the Gallup Student Poll of students in grades 5-12.
5. Bend-La Pine Schools students' participation in extra and co-curricular activities will increase annually, as measured by the percent of secondary students participating in school-based extra- or co-curricular activities that are recorded in the district's student information system.

Future Ready

6. Bend-La Pine Schools students' participation in advanced, career and technical, arts, world-language, and post-secondary courses shall increase annually, as measured by the average number of credits earned per secondary student, per year. This shall include high school credits in middle school, college credits in high school, technical and career ready coursework, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, arts, world-language, and other advanced learning opportunities.
7. Bend-La Pine Schools students' use of the essential 21st Century skills of critical thinking, communication, creativity, and collaboration will show an increase, as measured by the BrightBytes Clarity Student Survey of students in grades 3-12.
8. Bend-La Pine Schools shall show continuous advancement in the number of students' entering post-secondary education, as measured by the percent of graduates entering 2- or 4-year colleges within 16 months of graduation.

Bend-La Pine Schools: High School Configuration
Information-Gathering Process: Spring, 2017-Fall, 2017

Issue
All of the district's Bend area high schools are currently at or over capacity.

Parameters
- The district must create more space for high school students. The current capacity of our three large, in-town high schools is 4500 students. Enrollment for 2016-17 is approximately 4700 students. This number is projected to grow to 5300 students by Fall, 2020; and to 5900 students by Fall, 2024.

- To promote increased options for high school students, the district is committed to starting two small high school options for students in Fall, 2018. Primarily because of space limitations, these programs will initially be located at leased locations within Bend, not at any current high school. These programs are described below:
   - ✓ *The EL Education (formerly Expeditionary Learning) high school will be a continuation of the education that has made REALMS such a successful and attractive option for students and families in our community. The new EL Education high school will share REALMS' focus on instruction that inspires students to be active participants in their learning and curriculum that engages students to make a difference in the world through environmental stewardship, social justice, and other real-world investigations. The new EL Education high school will also share REALMS' commitment to strong student outcomes that balance mastery of knowledge and skills with an emphasis on character development and a student's commitment to high-quality work.*
   - ✓ *The Academy is a program that begins with individual students' hopes and dreams, strengths and weaknesses, interests and abilities. Students experience flexible learning times and spaces; real-world problem solving; focused, individualized learning experiences in areas of concentration; acceleration; and support for blended/online learning. Students' learning includes the Core, an interdisciplinary Project Based Learning experience where real-world concepts are explored and creative solutions identified. Each student will also participate in flexible modules concentrated around personal areas of interest. Finally, the Academy makes sure each student has the skills needed to be prepared for his/her next steps in learning. The Academy is about much more than traditional academic skills: it's where students develop grit, flexible and fluid thinking, resilience and adaptability-essential skills for their futures.*

   Each of these programs is designed to be a smaller learning environment for high school students. The district is also interested in developing 1-2 additional small high school options for high school students in the future.

- The bond includes $9.5 million to modernize instructional space at the current Bend Senior High School location.

Task
If the school bond is successful May 16ᵗʰ, the district will begin an information-gathering process to inform decisions about high school programming for the new fourth large high school. This decision involves choosing from among the following alternatives:

- *Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Create four neighborhood attendance areas. Include small high school options as strands within large high schools. Strand options would be open to students across the district.*

- *Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Create four neighborhood attendance areas. Find additional space in the city of Bend as locations for small high school options.*

- *Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Maintain three neighborhood attendance areas, and relocate Bend Senior High School to the new location.*
    - ✓ *Use the current BSHS campus as the site for small high school options, open to students across the district.*
    - ✓ *Students attending these small high school options would participate in co- and extra-curricular activities at their neighborhood high schools.*

Proposed Process
Steering Committee
In order to make a decision, the district needs to understand the interests and priorities of all major stakeholders: students, staff, parents and community partners. We will begin by creating a steering committee, facilitated by Lora Nordquist. This committee will be composed of the following representatives: a) two community members; b) four administrators, representing each of our large high schools and REALMS; c) three teachers, representing each of our large high schools; and d) three students, representing each of our large high schools. The steering committee will hold two meetings: the first will occur as soon as possible after the passage of the bond; and the second will be after all focus group meetings and community forums are complete. Steering committee members will be invited but not required to attend community forums. The committee will ultimately make a recommendation to Shay Mikalson about what it considers to be the best alternative.

Focus Groups
The next step involves Lora's facilitation of a series of focus groups at each of our large high schools; La Pine High School; Marshall High School; middle schools, including REALMS; and community partners, such as Looking Forward, Rotary, the Chamber of Commerce, COCC, and OSU-Cascades.

At each high school, Lora will conduct four hour-long focus groups: 8-10 freshmen and sophomores, 8-10 juniors and seniors, 8-10 staff, and the administrative team. At each middle school, she will also host four groups: 8-10 8ᵗʰ graders, 8-10 parents, 8-10 staff and the administrative team. With each community partner, she will work with a single group of 8-10.

The format of the focus group will be as follows:
- 10-15 minute introduction, including overview of the issue and related parameters and an opportunity to answer clarifying questions from participants.

- 45-50 minute discussion of these questions: 1) What is the appeal of these small high school options...what students may be interested? 2) What would be the barriers/drawbacks to attending them? 3) What would be the benefits/drawbacks of each of the three identified alternatives for the programming of the fourth large high school? 4) Are we missing other practical alternatives? 5) What other small high school options might be appealing to students?

After all the focus group meetings have occurred, Lora will analyze transcripts of the meetings and consolidate information into major recurring themes.

Community Forums
The final step of information gathering will be a series of 3-4 community forums, beginning with the Bend-La Pine Schools' Board of Directors at their August retreat. At the community forums, Lora and other interested Steering Committee members will present the alternatives, as well as central themes from the focus group meetings. Attendees will have opportunities to provide additional input regarding the alternatives.

Timeline: May-September
- Week of May 15th: Jay, Jim and Lora meet with all middle school and high school administrators to discuss the process and to schedule dates for focus groups at each site.
- Week of May 22nd: Lora meets with steering committee.
- May 23rd-June 1st: Lora conducts focus groups at all five high schools; Denise begins transcription work.
- June 5th-June 16th: Lora conducts focus groups at all seven middle schools; Denise continues transcription work.
- Week of June 19th: Denise finishes all transcriptions of groups to date.
- Week of July 10th: Lora conducts focus groups with community partners; district staff completes transcription.
- Week of July 14th: Lora completes initial analysis of transcripts and prepares a summary. ***Summary is complete by Friday, July 18th.***
- Week of August 1st: First community forum is held as part of the school board's annual retreat.
- Week of September 15th: Additional community forums take place.
- Week of September 22nd: Steering committee reconvenes to review all data from focus groups and community forums. Committee reaches consensus regarding a recommendation to Shay.
- Week of September 29th: Shay makes final decision.

Next Steps, Beginning in October
- Secure leased space for two small high school options.
- Begin programming for design of new large high school.
- Begin programming for instructional improvements for current BSHS.
- Create timeline for information sessions, registration, etc. for two small high school options.
- Create timeline for high school boundary process, if necessary.
- Create timeline for hiring of planning principal for new high school, if necessary.

Bend-La Pine Schools: New High School Configuration
Findings from Focus Groups Spring-Summer 2017

Report prepared by Lora Nordquist, Assistant Superintendent

Background

Bend-La Pine Schools' leaders made a decision early in the 2016-2017 school year to support staff and community interest in creating two small high school options in order to broaden choices and help ensure success for all students. For the short term, these two small high schools, scheduled to open in Fall, 2018, will operate in leased space. However, we realized that if voters supported the construction of a new high school in the 2017 bond election, we had alternatives regarding the location of these small high school options. These are described below:

- *#1) Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Create four neighborhood attendance areas. Include small high school options as strands within large high schools. Strand options would be open to students across the district. Students attending the strand programs would participate in extra-curricular activities at the site where the strands were located.*

- *#2) Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Create four neighborhood attendance areas. Find additional space in the city of Bend as locations for small high school options. Students attending these small high school options would participate in co- and extra-curricular activities at their neighborhood high schools.*

- *#3) Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Maintain three neighborhood attendance areas, and relocate Bend Senior High School to the new location.*
    - ✓ *Use the current BSHS campus as the site for multiple small high school options, open to students across the district.*
    - ✓ *Students attending these small high school options would participate in co- and extra-curricular activities at their neighborhood high schools.*

Immediately after the passage of the 2017 bond, we met with all middle school and high school principals to share the process for decision making. This process started with the creation of a steering committee, composed of school staff, students and community members. This committee, facilitated by me, is charged with making a recommendation from alternatives 1, 2, or 3 (hereafter referred to simply as 1, 2, and 3) to Superintendent Shay Mikalson by the end of September, 2017. To gather information, I was first charged to conduct a series of focus groups with middle and high school staffs, students and parents, as well as with community members. Between May 23rd and July 17th, I hosted 50 groups, with a total of approximately 500 participants. During the focus group sessions, I asked participants to provide feedback on the three alternatives. In addition, they talked about the perceived interest in small high school options and shared ideas about interests in future small high school options. The second step, scheduled for August and September, will be to hold three to four community forums focused on the alternatives for reconfiguration. The committee will use information from all these sessions to inform their recommendation.

Consideration of Alternatives

For each alternative, I have listed the positive and negative comments. These are listed according to the frequency with which they emerged in focus groups, with the most frequent responses coming first.

#1) Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Create four neighborhood attendance areas. Include small high school options as strands within large high schools. Strand options would be open to students across the district. Students attending the strand programs would participate in extra-curricular activities at the site where the strands were located.

Positive Comments
- This presents the "best of both worlds": small environment but easy access to extracurricular opportunities.
- Students in small high school options can interact with the larger student body.
- This alternative makes sense financially.
- This could be a strategy for "launching" small high school options until they have sufficient numbers of students to ensure success (REALMS example).

Negative Comments
- There is potential for identity issues/conflicts between students and staff in the small strand and those in the larger school.
- This alternative negates the small environment many students are seeking in a small high school setting.
- Existing high schools already have signature programs, such as the IB programme at BSHS. How will strands fit in with these?
- The potential duplication of staffs (for example, administrators, secretaries and custodial support) could cause unanticipated difficulties.

#2) Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Create four neighborhood attendance areas. Find additional space in the city of Bend as locations for small high school options. Students attending these small high school options would participate in co- and extra-curricular activities at their neighborhood high schools.

Positive Comments
- The small schools will have their own space, and with that an opportunity to create their own "identity."
- One major appeal of the small high school option is "small." Separate spaces would allow for this.
- This feels like the safest choice, with unpredictable enrollment numbers and lack of certainty about the ultimate appeal of the small high school options.
- This alternative helps the most with capacity.
- Students who are interested in small high school options are often unconcerned about barriers to participation in extra-curricular activities.

Negative Comments

- The cost of leasing is a general fund expenditure: the district needs to eventually build or buy property. In the meantime, the small high school options' leases take funds away from the classroom.
- If students attend the small high school options away from any neighborhood school setting, they may be perceived as outcasts or failures.
- The community may be upset if the district successfully passes a bond to meet capacity, then continues to lease space.
- There won't be opportunities for students to participate in extra-curricular activities at the site.
- Given available space for lease in Bend, the quality of the leased space might not be high or appropriate for educational purposes.

#3) Build a fourth large high school in Bend. Maintain three neighborhood attendance areas, and relocate Bend Senior High School to the new location.
- ✓ *Use the current BSHS campus as the site for small high school options, open to students across the district.*
- ✓ *Students attending these small high school options would participate in co- and extra-curricular activities at their neighborhood high schools.*

Positive Comments

- The site is a good centralized location to promote access for students from all over the district.
- There will be opportunities for students from all the small high school options to bond with one another, creating a larger "school identity."
- There is a synergy to having multiple specialized programs in one space.
- Using the current BSHS campus would give the small high school options access to the library, gym, auditorium, etc.
- The current facility does not meet the needs of BSHS's student body and staff.
- This alternative might enable the district to locate specialized staff in one location, eliminating travel and/or attracting skilled teachers because of the possibility of full-time employment.
- (BSHS staff and students) This alternative would allow the staff and student body of the current BSHS to stay basically intact.

Negative Comments

- This alternative has the potential to cause overcrowding at neighborhood high schools.
- The current BSHS site is rich in culture, traditions and history. The community may respond very negatively to this alternative.
- This feels like "bait and switch" for the voters. They thought they were voting to create a fourth neighborhood high school.
- Even though there will be several small programs, it could still feel like a large high school.
- The current BSHS campus has excellent athletic fields and auditorium. These spaces might not be put to good use in this alternative.
- Students will not be able to participate in extracurricular activities on site, at least in the short term.
- There is a potential for conflict among the different small high school options. Who's in charge of scheduling? Maintenance? etc.

- This feels as if the district is creating an elite environment for students in the small high school options.
- Fewer schools with extra-curricular programming reduces opportunities for students to participate in these activities.

Summary of Data from Focus Groups
As I conducted the focus group sessions, I concluded by asking each individual participant what his/her recommendation to the superintendent would be, based on the information discussed. Appendix 1 is a visual representation of the responses to this final question. If all or almost all participants in a group chose one alternative, it is colored green and the other two alternatives are colored red. If participants were split between two alternatives, they are colored yellow and the third is red. If participants were split among three alternatives (which occurred only in a couple of groups), all three are colored yellow.

Summary of Reactions to Small High School Concept

Based on the reactions of the hundreds of individuals participating in the focus groups, the district has acted wisely in developing small high school options. In general, individuals were highly supportive of the concept. The primary reasons for their support included the following:
- Recognition that our neighborhood large high schools are not meeting the needs and/or interests of all students;
- Enthusiasm about innovative educational models;
- Opportunities for closer relationships between staff and students; and
- Potential for students to focus on their passions.

One caveat emerged from the focus group discussions: much of the community associates small high school options with students who are struggling to succeed in our neighborhood high schools. It will be critical to communicate effectively, promoting small high school options for a broader population of students.

Suggestions for Additional Small High School Options

By far, the idea that emerged most often was a CTE center, also referred to as a vocational center. Many focus group participants stressed the need for meaningful career training that would not require students to earn a college degree. In this discussion, a number of participants talked about partial-day programs with transportation to and from neighborhood high schools. They talked about models from both within and beyond Oregon. The second most popular idea centered around the visual and performing arts. Finally, several participants supported an option with a STEM focus.

Related Issues Discussed

As the focus groups discussed the topics I provided, a number of additional related issues arose. Three, in particular, deserve inclusion as part of the findings because they came up in multiple conversations.

First, there was frequent discussion about the process for selecting students for the small high school options, should interest exceed space available. I explained that I did not know the process but surmised

the district would use a lottery, as we do with our magnet and dual immersion programs. Student groups, in particular, had negative reactions to this idea. Their concern was that the options should be available for students who had the greatest interest or passion for the program. Some suggested an application process.

A second important topic related to transportation to small high school options. Focus group participants often asked questions about this. They expressed a high level of concern that these options would become schools for the "elite" if students across the district did not have transportation available.

Finally, many participants across focus groups expressed concerns about the boundary process if the district selected alternative #1 or #2. Those who raised this issue talked about the need to consider equity in the process, expressing fears about large differences in the socio-economic status of students and families at the various high schools.

Note: Appendix 2 attached to this report includes summary notes from the focus group transcripts.

Tally Sheet From Focus Group
Responses from All Groups

School	Group	Comment	1	2	3
BSHS	Stu 1		yellow	red	yellow
BSHS	Stu 2	Forgot to poll group	(gray)	(gray)	(gray)
BSHS	Staff		red	red	green
BSHS	Admin		red	red	green
CMS	Stu 1		red	yellow	yellow
CMS	Parents		red	yellow	yellow
CMS	Staff		yellow	yellow	red
CMS	Admin		red	green	red
HDMS	Stu 1		red	yellow	yellow
HDMS	Parents		yellow	yellow	red
HDMS	Staff		red	green	red
HDMS	Admin	No preference stated - both against #3			red
LPMS	Stu 1		red	green	red
LPMS	Parents		green	red	red
LPMS	Staff		red	yellow	red
LPMS	Admin	No clear preference discussed pro's and con's			red
LPHS	Stu 1		green	red	red
LPHS	Stu 2		green	red	red
LPHS	Staff		red	green	red
LPHS	Admin		yellow	yellow	red
MHS	Stu 1		red	yellow	yellow
MHS	Stu 2		red	green	red
MHS	Staff		red	red	green
MHS	Admin		red	yellow	yellow
MVHS	Stu 1		red	green	red
MVHS	Stu 2		green	red	red
MVHS	Staff		red	green	red
MVHS	Admin		yellow	yellow	red
PCMS	Stu 1		red	green	red
PCMS	Parents		green	red	red
PCMS	Staff		yellow	red	yellow
PCMS	Admin		red	red	green
REALMS	Stu 1		green	red	red
REALMS	Parents		red	green	red

Tally Sheet From Focus Group
Responses from All Groups

School	Group	Comment	1	2	3
REALMS	Staff		red	red	green
SVMS	Stu 1	Forgot to tape!	gray	gray	gray
SVMS	Parents		yellow	yellow	yellow
SVMS	Staff		red	yellow	yellow
SVMS	Admin		red	green	red
SHS	Stu 1		green	red	red
SHS	Stu 2		green	red	red
SHS	Staff		yellow	yellow	yellow
SHS	Admin		green	Undecided	
PBMS	Stu		yellow	red	yellow
PBMS	Parents		green	red	red
PBMS	Staff		red	green	red
PBMS	Admin		red	red	green
AD's	act		red	green	red
Looking			red	red	green
Rotary, Chamber			red	red	green

Tally Sheet From Focus Group
Student Responses

School	Group	Comment	1	2	3
BSHS	Stu 1		Yellow	Red	Yellow
BSHS	Stu 2	Forgot to poll group	Gray	Gray	Gray
CMS	Stu 1		Red	Yellow	Yellow
HDMS	Stu 1		Red	Yellow	Yellow
LPMS	Stu 1		Red	Green	Red
LPHS	Stu 1		Green	Red	Red
LPHS	Stu 2		Green	Red	Red
MHS	Stu 1		Red	Yellow	Yellow
MHS	Stu 2		Red	Green	Red
MVHS	Stu 1		Red	Green	Red
MVHS	Stu 2		Green	Red	Red
PCMS	Stu 1		Red	Green	Red
REALMS	Stu 1		Green	Red	Red
SVMS	Stu 1	Forgot to tape!	Gray	Gray	Gray
SHS	Stu 1		Green	Red	Red
SHS	Stu 2		Green	Red	Red
PBMS	Stu		Yellow	Red	Yellow

Tally Sheet From Focus Group
Parent Responses

School	Group	Comment	1	2	3
CMS	Parents				
HDMS	Parents				
LPMS	Parents				
PCMS	Parents				
REALMS	Parents				
SVMS	Parents				
PBMS	Parents				

Tally Sheet From Focus Group
Staff Responses

School	Group	Comment	1	2	3
BSHS	Staff		🟥	🟥	🟩
CMS	Staff		🟨	🟨	🟥
HDMS	Staff		🟥	🟩	🟥
LPMS	Staff		🟥	🟨	🟨
LPHS	Staff		🟥	🟩	🟥
MHS	Staff		🟥	🟥	🟩
MVHS	Staff		🟥	🟩	🟥
PCMS	Staff		🟨	🟥	🟨
REALMS	Staff		🟥	🟥	🟩
SVMS	Staff		🟥	🟨	🟨
SHS	Staff		🟨	🟨	🟨
PBMS	Staff		🟥	🟩	🟥

Tally Sheet From Focus Group
Admin Responses

School	Group	Comment	1	2	3
BSHS	Admin		Red	Red	Green
CMS	Admin		Red	Green	Red
HDMS	Admin	No preference stated - both against #3			Red
LPMS	Admin	No clear preference discussed pro's and con's			Red
LPHS	Admin		Yellow	Yellow	Red
MHS	Admin		Red	Yellow	Yellow
MVHS	Admin		Yellow	Yellow	Red
PCMS	Admin		Red	Red	Green
SVMS	Admin		Red	Green	Red
SHS	Admin		Green	Undecided	
PBMS	Admin		Red	Red	Green

Tally Sheet From Focus Group
Community Responses

School	Group	Comment	1	2	3
AD's	act				
Looking					
Rotary, Chamber					

Appendix 2
Summary Notes from Focus Group Transcripts

Focus Group Summaries: Non-Site Based Groups

Athletic/Activities Directors 6/19

- All participants except 1 preferred #2
  - 1 person preferred #1
- Major reasons were concerns about growth, need for space and more opportunities for participation
- Several participants also expressed concerns about boundaries and balancing SES at HS

Looking Forward 7/10

- This group was very enthusiastic about the notion of small HS options
- The majority of participants preferred #3, with 2 supporting #2. They raised questions about the order in which the district was considering issues – recommended programming first, then a discussion of structure. There was also a concern that the district should be suing more data in the decision. Costs, outcomes…
- Strong negative reaction to #1

Community Leaders 7/12

- This group unanimously supported #3, based on the information given to them
- They were very supportive of small HS options – expressed enthusiasm for CTE, arts
- Several felt leasing was not a good use of resources

School by School Summary

School – BSH

Student Group 1

- Students saw pros and cons of all three options
- A number expressed concerns about need for co-curricular, extra-curricular activities
- Saw #2 as a "safe" option in some respects, but split between #1 and #3
- Didn't want BSH to split up staff or students

Student Group 2

- Similar pros and cons as group #1
- #2 concerns about spaces, but saw that it helps with capacity
- (forgot to poll)

Staff Group

- Many concerns expressed about current facility – safety

- Concerns about splitting staff
- Concerns about equity of boundary process
- 100% for #3

Admin

- Same as staff
- Lots of enthusiasm for small options

School – CMS

Student Group

- Students did not like #1; split between #1 & #2
- Did not like idea about application process

Parent Group

- Many parents expressed concern about lack of transportation – equity issue
- Having options in one place makes sense
- Capacity concerns
- Support for options generally
- Split among the three options

Staff Group

- Discussed option of building a strand campus in the future
- Many concerns about politic perception with #3 – "bait & switch"
- While some saw appeal of #3, split between #1 & #2

Admin

- Both saw #1 as least desirable – kids seeking small setting

School – HDMS

Student Group

- Most preferred #3, then #2
- Many students talked about appeal of small schools – more teacher attention, "not slipping through the cracks"
- Crowding an issue at BSH
- Benefits of cluster: times for general population of students to mingle

Staff Group

- 6 staff members preferred #2 – Two preferred #3

- discussion of power of small size. #2 preserves this

- concerns about access for all students – transportation

- Concerns about boundaries

- Some participants felt BSH staff and students should have the strongest vote

- Concerns about small options generally – costs (admin, custodial, etc)

Parent Group

- Split between #1 & #2; saw #3 as too risky. Might not ease overcrowding

- Appeal of small school

Admin

- Both were against #3 – risk of overcrowding, creating an "elite" environment with those in small programs

School – LPMS

Student Group

- Majority of students like option #2
    - Keeps programs in small settings, makes more room at other schools
- Students spoke of benefits of small schools
- Saw their distance from Bend as barrier to participation
- Lots of ideas about options: College like schedule, AVID, Arts

Parent Group

- Parents like the idea of small schools – relationships with teachers, less bullying

- Questions about overcrowding with #3

- #1 preferred by most parents

Staff Group

- Expressed concern about access for LPMS students – as well as other equity issues related to transportation

Admin

- Robi talked about LPM staff feeling they are irrelevant in the conversation – too far for their students to access
- Leaning to all in their own space – either #2 or #3

School – LPHS

Student Group 1

- Unanimously supported #1 – "best of both worlds"

- Easiest for transportation

- Costs the least

- Mixed feelings about benefits of small schools

Student Group 2

- All students supported #1

- Little support in the room for small HS options

- #1 seemed preferable – sports, etc. without extra travel

Staff Group

- (Forgot to turn on recorder)

Admin

- Concerns were primarily about LPH and possible impact of more students going to BSH

- Also discussed options that would benefit LPH

School – Marshall HS

Student Group 1

- Group split between #2 & 3

- <u>Lots</u> of support for small schools – personal relationships, etc – consequently, upset about large school option #1

Student Group 2

- All students chose #2, but several were really against leasing – wanted district to buy or "find space" in existing buildings

- <u>Lots</u> of support for small schools

- Any type of large configuration (1 or 3) defeats the purpose of small schools

Staff Group

- Unanimous support for #3 – see future .5 option that Marshall student might access

- Deep appreciation of the value of small schools

- No support for #1

- See their student population impacted by other options

Admin

- Julie & counselor split between #2 & 3
- Very supportive of increasing small HS options – hope that Marshall might be able to access future options (CTE)
- "Redefining" Marshall – What is its role? Behavior?

School – MVHS

Student Group 1

- Most of the group was very supportive of #2
- Worried about divisiveness. #1 would make tension between strand/school
- <u>Lots</u> of interest in small options

Student group 2

- (Younger students) All of this group supported #1 – transportation for sports, ability to still participate in co-curricular

Staff Group

- To a person, staff members voiced their opposition to #3
- Not terribly enthusiastic about small options – wanted district to focus on getting big HS built

Admin

- No definite position, but all against #3
- Saw idea of small schools as very powerful

School – PCMS

Student Group

- Most of students preferred #2 – importance of smallness, isolation with strands, risk of overcrowding with #3

Parent Group

- Parents who selected an alternative all selected #1 – concerns about overcrowding, cost of leasing. Wanted students to have option of exposure to other types of individuals
- Parents found small HS options attractive, but expressed concerns that they are currently seen as only for troubled students. Importance of marketing

Staff Group

- Four preferred #3, Two #1 – some undecided
- Thoughts about the district's goal with small HS options – is small the point, or is "different" the point?

Admin

- Liked the idea of cluster campus – Chris had a similar experience in N. Clackamas
- Saw difficulties of strands within schools

School – PBMS

Student Group

- Most students supported #1 – availability of extra-curricular programs, ability to be with friends

- Some expressed concerns about overcrowding with #3

Parent Group

- Parents thought the small HS option would be popular – especially enthusiastic about REALMS HS

- Unanimously supported #1 – "best of both worlds." Thought students would be more attracted to small options if they could interact with wider population and participate in curricular activities

Staff Group

- This group was very enthusiastic about small HS options

- Overwhelmingly supported #2. Worried about overcrowding with #3; liked the sense of "smallness," unique identity with #2

Admin

- Both Steve & Terri supported the idea of the cluster campus. They liked the central location, the possibility of sharing some staff among small programs, and the need to rebuild BSH

School – REALMS

Student Group

- Students leaned towards #1 because of connections to friends and opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities

- Students' interest in attending an EL HS was limited – they expressed interest in advanced classes, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities

Parent Group

- Parents were most focused on REALMS – they were enthusiastic about a 6-12 campus for REALMS

- Most support #2 – no animosity between programs – capture the unique culture of each program

Staff Group

- Almost all staff supported #3, with the caveat for some that they liked #2 if in the long run it meant building for the unique needs of the small options

- Several staff members had memories of sharing space at PBMS – not a good relationship, in their minds

Admin

- (Included with staff group)

School – SVMS

Student Group

- (Forgot to tape)

Parent Group

- Parents were split among all three alternatives. They saw the pros and cons of each

- The group was very enthusiastic about small HS options – many expressed interest in CTE offerings; one spoke of need for a two-year program where students would leave career-ready

Staff Group

- Most staff preferred #3 with #2 the second choice. Concerns about overcrowding dominated for those who chose #2, along with sense of identity. Those who chose #3 were concerned about leasing costs
- Group was very supportive of small options – wanted to add trade school

Admin

- Saw pros and cons to all options, but preferred separate location for small HS programs
- They were very supportive of the idea of more choices for HS students

School- Summit HS

Student Group 1

- This group had many reservations about the attractiveness of small HS programs. They saw stigmas attached to students who choose the programs – cited Marshall HS as example
- They unanimously supported #1 as a way to overcome these drawbacks

Student Group 2

- This student group, juniors and seniors, was much more enthusiastic about small options than the other student group
- The majority supported #1, as well. They had the same reasons as the younger group

Staff Group

- Only one staff member supported #3. Several were undecided between #1 and #2 but stated they supported having four large high schools. They expressed concerns about message to voters and overcrowding
- They wanted to make sure students who would benefit most from the small options would have access – transportation

Admin

- Very different views on the potential of small HS options – only one of the three enthusiastic about them
- Two supported option #1, one undecided

2016-2017 BLS BOARD WORK PLAN
approved at 12/13/2016 meeting as an 18-month plan

1. Governance
    a. Re-affirm Carver's Principles of Policy Governance (retreat)
    b. Complete Board-Staff Linkages policies (by end of October)
    c. Monitor and refine Executive Limitations

2. Board Professionalism
    a. Complete self-evaluation by monitoring Governance Process policies
    b. Invite staff feedback on board performance
    c. Participate in professional development opportunities (including OSBA, NSBA and other opportunities)

3. Outreach and Relationship Building
    a. New, or admin in new roles; connect at least twice this year:
        i. Andy Slavin @ Amity Creek (JC)
        ii. Steve Stancliff @ PBMS (JC)
        iii. Kim Crabtree @ Transportation (SY)
        iv. Linda Burley @ High Lakes (NJ)
        v. Jesse Rasmussen (VP) @ Jewell (RG)
        vi. Lybe Crumpton (VP) @ Lava Ridge (SY)
        vii. Tom Lence (VP) @ High Lakes (NJ)
        viii. Joan Warburg (VP) @ Bear Creek (RG)
        ix. Colleen Funderburg @ Special Programs (CH)
        x. Josh Marks @ Special Programs (CH)
    b. Public Agency Outreach (PK and AH will organize and invite other board member participation):
        i. Parks & Recreation
        ii. Higher Ed (OSU Cascades and COCC)
        iii. Deschutes County
        iv. La Pine Chamber & Sunriver Rotary
        v. City of Bend & La Pine
        vi. Board involvement on potential bond campaign committee
    c. Strengthen relationship with
        i. Looking Forward
        ii. Education Foundation
    d. Engage parents: Outreach effort this year focused on helping parents with homework support for their students. Julianne will help with outreach tools (social media, etc.) and messaging.

4. Education Advocacy
    a. Engage with 2017 legislature
        i. Face to face meetings with local legislatures
        ii. Participate and meet with members of legislative education committees

   iii. Participate with OSBA Revenue Reform Committee (Cheri)
  b. Specific targets:
   i. Revenue reform
   ii. PERS reform
   iii. High school assessment alternatives (ACT)
   iv. PE requirements (broaden the definition of "PE time")
   v. School board member personal liability protection

5. Leverage District Resources
  a. Consider options for vacant, district-owned land (Andy will work with board members to put together guiding principles and a perspective of what the board would like. Shay will then work with staff on possible processes to bring back to the board for a full discussion)
  b. Create Charter School position paper to clarify the board's expectations

6. Leverage Board Resources
  a. Board meetings focused on priority issues
  b. Prioritize board time
  c. Create structured, clear, effective committee assignments

Board goals:
1. All students receive an excellent education and are prepared for their future.
2. All students demonstrate personal integrity and responsible citizenship.
3. All schools provide safe, nurturing environments conducive to learning.
4. The school district operates with the highest level of fiscal stewardship while maintaining effective and efficient practices to meet board goals.

Remaking Governance

The creator of 'Policy Governance' challenges school boards to change

BY JOHN CARVER

The familiar—even cherished—practices of school boards are strangling public education. Most of what school boards currently do is a travesty of their important role. Much of what is published for boards—including advice appearing regularly in these pages—reinforces errors of the past or, at best, teaches trustees how to do the wrong things better. In my opinion, school boards don't need improvement so much as total redesign. And they are not alone in this predicament, for governance is the least-developed function in all enterprises.

Preparing people for contributing, satisfying adulthood is

worth the most effective governance a board can achieve. If school boards must completely reinvent themselves to be worthy of their mission—as I'm convinced they must—then so be it. If that means much of current board training must be discarded—as I'm convinced it must—then let it be done. No role deserves transformation more than that of the nation's school boards.

A new governance model

For two decades I have studied and taught governance—the process by which a small group, usually on behalf of others, exercises authority over an organization. I have found that

although boards work hard to solve practical problems as they arise, the crucial missing element is credible theory. The Policy Governance model of board leadership that emerged from my work is arguably the only existing complete theory of governance, whether of businesses, nonprofits, cities, or schools. Its philosophical foundations lie in Jean-Jacques Rousseau's social contract, leadership philosopher Robert K. Greenleaf's servant-leadership, and modern management theory.

The model redesigns what it means to be a board, challenging other approaches as founded more on anecdotal wisdom than good theory. A tightly reasoned paradigm, the model must be used in total to achieve its promise of greater accountability. Partial implementation sacrifices the model's benefits, for it is a complete, logical system, not merely tips for improvement.

Using this new paradigm requires a school board to exercise uncharacteristic self-discipline, but it enables the board to govern the system, rather than run it; to define and demand educational results rather than poke and probe in educational and administrative processes; to redirect time from trivia and ritual actions to strategic leadership; to give a superintendent one boss rather than several; to grant administrators and educators great latitude within explicit boundaries; to be in charge of board agendas instead of dependent on staff; and to guarantee unbroken accountability from classroom to taxpayer.

Space here does not allow full explication of Policy Governance. I can, however, list seven characteristics that differentiate this model from governance as now widely practiced and taught.

1. Primacy of the owner-representative role. The board directly touches three elements of the "chain of command": the general public, the board itself, and the superintendent. Although the succession of authority within the system is best left to the superintendent, the board must maintain the integrity of the initial three elements. Let's consider the first link in that chain.

The board's primary relationship is with those to whom it is accountable—the general public, the "shareholders" of public education. The board is the public's purchasing agent for the educational product. The public-board relationship supersedes the board's relationship with everyone else.

The central task of a board is to assimilate the diverse values of those who own the system, to add any special knowledge (often obtained from experts, including staff), then to make decisions on behalf of the owners. The formal link from owners to trustees is the election process—a tight link with respect to a trustee holding office, but a very loose link with respect to knowing the public's mind. Typically, boards rely on open meetings, public hearings, and constituent phone calls for the bulk of public input. These methods not only fail to fulfill the board's obligation to connect with the owners, they are misleading in that the "public" is self-selected and typically expresses not its owner role, but its customer, vendor, or operator role. Boards rarely hear from a representative sampling of owners. Because the general public is so large, a continual system of focus groups, surveys, and advisory mechanisms is required to achieve even a semblance of fulfilling the board's owner-representative role. The time is overdue for putting the public back into public education.

Cultivating a principal-agent relationship between the public and the board holds great promise for the position of education in society, but this relationship has been impaired by decades of conventional practice. For example, boards promote an inappropriate direct link from public to superintendent. This connection circumvents the board's role as sole owner-representative and lets the board off the hook for poor system performance. If the public can blame poor school performance on the superintendent, then the fact that it is the board that has let the public down might go unnoticed. Making the hiring of a superintendent into an affair of high-profile community involvement is part of this same aberration. Superintendents are instruments of the board, not of the public. The public's instrument is the board.

Another mistake is behaving as if parents are the system's owners and that the board is their representative. Boards historically have shortcut the owner-board-organization-customer circuit, partly because parents are the most vocal subgroup of owners, and partly because they are fewer and easier to identify than the true ownership. Consequently, both politics and logistics induce boards to act as if parents own the system. Parents might resist losing any part of this role, but public policy (and, in the long run, parents and students) will benefit by facing the fact that parents, *as parents*, do not own the public schools. Parents are owners by virtue of being part of the public, but they constitute only a percentage, not the whole. The same is true of teachers, administrators, and the media.

This is not to denigrate the importance of parents. Parents and their children are customers/consumers of the system and, as such, are no less important and no less to be courted and pleased than customers of any other enterprise. Nor does this formulation minimize the central role of parents in their children's education. In fact, failing to give parents an integral role in the educational process would be unconscionable.

2. One voice from plural trustees. Trustees have authority only as a full board—but few boards behave accordingly. Staff members take instructions from and answer to individual trustees and board committees. Individual trustees judge staff performance on criteria the board as a body has never stated. Superintendents seek to keep individual trustees happy quite apart from fulfilling board requirements. Trustees enjoy getting things "fixed" for constituents. There is often unspoken agreement that "you can meddle in your district if you'll let me meddle in mine." It is not enough to dismiss these phenomena as simply politics and personalities. Whether the board intends it or not, the realpolitik of school systems demonstrates regularly that staff members do, in fact, take direction from individual trustees.

If a board seriously intends to speak with only one voice, it must declare that the staff can safely ignore advice and instructions from individual trustees, that only the explicit instructions

of the board must be heeded. Excellence in governance will not occur until superintendents are certain that trustees *as a group* will protect them from trustees *as individuals*.

Commitment to the authoritative unity of the board in no way compromises board members' right to speak their minds. Vigorous disagreement among trustees does not damage governance, but allowing intraboard skirmishes to affect the staff is irresponsible. In short, trustees who disagree with the vote may continue to say so, but may not influence organizational direction. It is in boards' interest that superintendents treat a 5-4 vote as a 9-0 vote.

3. The superintendent as a real chief executive officer. Boards frequently give direction to subordinates of the superintendent, degrading the chief executive role and the board's own ability to hold the superintendent accountable. Only if the board expresses its aims for the system as a whole—rather than part by part—can the powerful utility of the chief executive role be harnessed, simultaneously simplifying accountability and saving board time.

In other words, the superintendent is the only person the board instructs and the only person the board evaluates. The superintendent should be authorized to use any reasonable interpretation of instructions the board gives. This requires the board to take full responsibility for its words and enables the superintendent to take the board at its word.

4. Authoritative prescription of "ends." The board's greatest and most difficult responsibility is to clarify and reclarify why the system exists. This requires the board to be both proactive and authoritative—to define expected results for students and to demand system performance. The public is buying specifiable results for specifiable groupings of students at specifiable costs or priorities.

Informed obsession with the system's "ends"—that is, results, recipients, and cost of results—should be the dominant work of the board. Involvement in curriculum, special reading initiatives, or testing programs will not suffice. To the contrary, holding a system accountable is impeded by board involvement in these and other internal processes. Instead of demanding ends performance, boards routinely fail to describe the ends and then intervene in what they've hired professionals to do. No amount of telling people how to run the system can substitute for simply demanding designated results and getting out of their way.

5. Bounded freedom for "means." Boards struggle with the dilemma of being accountable for others' work. Con-

trol is necessary, but so is empowerment. Authority not given away does little good, but too much given away constitutes rubber stamping or dereliction. How can the board have its arms around the system without its fingers in it?

If ends expectations are met (right results, right recipients, right costs or priorities), the "means"—that is, other decisions, such as methods, practices, and conduct—must have worked. So the board does not have to control means prescriptively. In fact, to tell staff how to accomplish ends impedes creativity and innovation. Why does the board need to control means at all? Because not all means are justified by the ends—some means would be unacceptable even if they work. The achievement of ends demonstrates that means are effective, but it doesn't prove that means are acceptable.

To address the acceptability of means, the board need only define the boundaries of acceptability. The board limits the superintendent's latitude regarding certain situations, activities, or risk. In effect, the board does not tell the system how to operate, but how *not* to—an approach that is simpler and safer for the board and freeing for the staff. The message from board to superintendent, then, is, "Achieve these ends within these restrictions on means." This instruction embraces the whole of board-staff delegation, which is to say, the superintendent's job description.

6. Board decisions crafted by descending size. There is no way the board can determine every result for every child and the cost appropriate for that result. Similarly, it is impossible to state every unacceptable action or situation. So what prevents the seemingly simple protocol of prescribing ends and proscribing means from deteriorating into maddening detail?

Boards must manage the sequence of different sizes of decisions. First, the board defines ends and unacceptable means in as broad a way as possible. For example, the broadest version of ends might be, "Students acquire skills and understandings for successful life at a tax rate comparable to that of similar districts." The broadest version of means limitation might be, "Don't allow anything imprudent or unethical." This is broad indeed—which is to say it is open to a wide range of interpretation. If the board were willing to allow the superintendent to use any reasonable interpretation of these words, the board could stop with these two short instructions.

But no board would allow that. Instead, the board must define a bit more, perhaps adding, "Don't allow assets to be unnecessarily risked or inadequately maintained," along with similarly narrowed prohibitions about personnel treatment,

> *In effect,*
> *the board does not*
> *tell the system*
> *how to operate,*
> *but how not to.*

compensation systems, parental involvement, and so forth. As to ends, the board might augment its initial, broad statement with, "Students will be literate above age-level expectations." This is also too broad for most boards, so the next step is to define still further. The process continues step-by-step into more detail until the majority of trustees are willing to accept any reasonable interpretation of the words used to that point. At this level the board stops and superintendent authority begins.

7. System-focused superintendent evaluation. The only reason to have a chief executive officer is to ensure system performance. Consequently, board expectations of the system (ends and limits on means) are the *only* criteria on which a superintendent should be assessed. The board actually evaluates the entire system (not the superintendent personally) and "pins it" on the superintendent. Most discussions of superintendent evaluation—including articles in recent issues of *ASBJ*—miss the power of this simplicity, falling back on such nonperformance, personalized irrelevancies as "leads by example" and "proficient in educational thinking." It is archaic and spurious to evaluate a superintendent on anything other than whether the system produces and operates as it should. It is *system performance* for which the board is accountable to the public.

Annual board approval of the superintendent's objectives is another testimony to poor governance. If the superintendent accomplishes the board's expectations, it is immaterial whether he or she achieves his or her own as well. Typically, boards have not expressed system expectations sufficiently to enable recognition of success and failure on their own. In the Policy Governance model, ends to be achieved and means disallowed embrace all the board's expectations. Moreover, they are targeted at system accountability, unaffected by how a given superintendent retains or delegates the various elements of management.

Monitoring data are reviewed throughout the year, as frequently as the board chooses. Because these data directly address performance on ends and means limitations, they constitute a continual evaluation of the superintendent. Although there might also be a summative annual evaluation, the criterion-focused monitoring system is the most direct measure of superintendent performance—a seamless process through time rather than a sporadic event.

This comparison of reality to expectations must be fair as well as uncompromising. Trustees should not judge the superintendent's performance on criteria the board has never stated. Expectations not incorporated into the board's ends or means limitations cannot be admitted into evaluative monitoring. Further, "any reasonable interpretation" of the board's expectations must mean just that—not the interpretation of the most influential trustee or what the board had in mind but didn't say.

What it looks like
What does the public see the board doing differently under Policy Governance? The board gets out of the superintendent's job

and takes responsibility for its own job. Because agendas are no longer staff-driven, board meetings are the *board's* meetings—not the staff's meetings for the board. The steady stream of documents for approval disappears from the regular agenda due to more sophisticated delegation. (Criteria that would have led to disapprovals are known and monitored, so the "approval syndrome" becomes inconsistent with proper delegation. The consent agenda is reserved for decisions the board would delegate, but on which law requires board action.) Freed from endless crowding of its agenda by managerial material, the board does its own work instead of pretending that looking over the superintendent's shoulder *is* its work.

Board meetings are not characterized by shoot-from-the-hip instructions to the superintendent, much less to the staff. Board meetings are not to help manage the system, nor to go over operational details. The board no longer struggles through extensive reports unrelated to preestablished criteria. It has learned that what it previously thought was monitoring was merely wandering around in the presence of data.

Board meetings are not parent and vendor complaint meetings. Any system in which customer complaints must go to the board for resolution is poorly designed. (Envision having to take your cold hamburger to the fast food chain's board.) On the contrary, the board expects the superintendent to have parents taken care of as courteously and effectively as possible. If a parent problem gets to the board, it is considered symptomatic of a system flaw rather than an opportunity for trustee involvement. Parents get their say in the way the system affects their children, but not by supplanting the owners' meetings.

Most board committees disappear. If a board has committees, it does so only for help with *its* job—never to help, advise, or instruct staff, lest it destroy the clarity of delegation. The board does not believe that the kind of internal involvement described in an article about board committees in a recent issue of *ASBJ* is related to governing the system. For a board committee to focus on staff activities is probably the most intrusive of board practices and the most wasteful of staff and trustee time.

Liberated from hours of preoccupation with system operations, trustees have more time to meet with community groups, other public boards, and pertinent authorities. Raising its visibility as a governmental leader, the board demonstrates its focus on ends and its long-term perspective by the language it uses, questions it asks, and topics it schedules. Joint meetings with city councils, hospital boards, social service boards, and other organs of the public become commonplace.

Board meetings are spent learning diverse points of view on what is most important for schools to produce, differing projections of future needs of students, and any other wisdom that helps in making wise long-term decisions about ends. The public is integral to these meetings, but carefully organized so the board gets representative input.

Many board meetings are not meetings in the usual sense at all, but take place in community settings where certain segments of the public can be heard. Wherever the meeting, the atmosphere is tailored for listening and entering into dialogue.

Board meetings are places of thoughtful dialogue and debate rather than the trivia that commonly besets conventional agendas.

Through focus groups, the board assesses public values about priorities and costs of educational products. This is not a sporadic or single-purpose effort, but an unending process. These carefully planned interactions are not for public relations, but for the dual purpose of enhancing board understanding and reinforcing the public's sense of ownership of its schools. Trustees are perceived as the public's servant-leaders in the great challenge of preparing citizens for a democracy.

What schools are for

The critical role of education in a democracy demands exceptional governance integrity. Commitment and intelligence cannot overcome our institutionalized hodgepodge of traditional practices. Conscientious, detailed preoccupation with what schools *do* can never compensate for failing to define clearly what schools are *for*, then demanding system performance from a chief executive officer. Visionary leadership is not forged in a flurry of trivia, micromanagement, and administrative detail. If school boards are not the place for serious, perpetual community debate of how much this generation is willing to pay for which skills and understandings of the next generation, what other place does the public have?

Earlier, in illustrating flaws of conventional wisdom, I cited two articles from previous issues of *ASBJ*. I'll close by quoting a refreshing article ("Changing the Entitlement Culture," Paul McGowen and John Miller) in the August 1999 issue. "The challenge is for leaders to change the culture. ... It is time for public school leaders to seize the initiative." If there is to be a renaissance of public education, it will begin when boards discard the conceptually incoherent practices of today for a public leadership founded on sound governance theory.

John Carver (*polgov@aol.com; http://www.carvergovernance. com*), a governance theorist and author of numerous books and articles on boards, is an Atlanta-based consultant. For a more complete description of Policy Governance, see *Boards that Make a Difference* (Jossey-Bass, 2nd ed., 1997).

Refining the board's monitoring of Executive Limitations, Summer 2017

In an effort to improve the board's response to policy monitoring, the following is presented as a framework for evaluating and scoring each EL at the time it is monitored. This will help us improve accountability for the superintendent in his role as chief executive and for the board in our role as evaluators.

I reviewed notes from individual superintendent evaluation input and thought through ongoing board conversations about what we value. This is not a comprehensive list of our interests, but I believe the Ends address some of those specific. I have identified the following values that I propose we use in measuring EL performance:

accountability	excellence
communication	innovation
continuous improvement	safety
efficiency	students first
equity	transparency

<u>Suggested values to score when monitoring Executive Limitations</u>

EL 1: **Global Executive Restraint**: accountability, transparency

EL 2: **Emergency Superintendent Succession**: communication, accountability

EL 3: **Treatment of Students, Parents/Guardians, and the Public**: communication, equity, safety, students first, transparency

EL4: **Treatment of Staff**: communication, excellence, safety, transparency

EL5: **Staff Compensation and Development**: continuous improvement, equity

EL6: **Staff Evaluation**: accountability, continuous improvement

EL7: **Facilities**: accountability, communication, efficiency, equity, safety, transparency

EL8: **Academic Program**: accountability, equity, excellence, innovation, students first

EL9: **Technology**: efficiency, equity, safety

EL10: **Financial Planning and Management**: accountability, communication, efficiency, transparency

EL 11: **Asset Protection**: efficiency, safety

EL 12: **Legally Required Policies**: accountability

Superintendent Evaluation Analysis, Summer 2017

During Shay's first year as superintendent (2015-16), the school board utilized an interim evaluation to measure board satisfaction with Shay's work, but we agreed to begin evaluating the superintendent exclusively on 8 Board Ends and 12 Executive Limitations. Because of the data lag and a variety of other challenges, the formal 15-16 evaluation wasn't complete until the end of the 2016-17 school year. Some board members have expressed concern that the superintendent is no longer evaluated on personal qualities, communication, educational leadership, etc. Following is an analysis of ways the old "key competencies" are measured through monitoring Executive Limitations. This report also includes a recommendation aimed at refining the board's evaluation of the ELs, along with a proposal for adding a "personal qualities" measure to the formal, overall evaluation.

Following are the 6 key competencies the board used in evaluating our previous superintendent. For ease of referencing these key competencies as they relate to the current Executive Limitations, each competency is followed by a list of the basic elements desired.

1) *Educational Leadership*
   a) *academic program*
   b) *safe schools*
   c) *student discipline*
   d) *professional development*
   e) *employee accountability*

2) *Administrative Leadership*
   a) *school finance*
   b) *school law*
   c) *human resources*
   d) *communication*
   e) *delegates well*
   f) *team management*

3) *Fiscal Management*
   a) *develops budget*
   b) *resources focused on priorities*
   c) *keeps board informed*

4) *Board Relations*
   a) *communication*
   b) *good relationship*
   c) *provides good recommendations*

5) *Community Relations*
   a) *relationship with media*
   b) *participates in community*
   c) *keeps community informed*

6) *Personal Qualities*
   a) *integrity*
   b) *work ethic*
   c) *professional growth*
   d) *positive face of Bend-La Pine Schools*

The Executive Limitations are listed below and cross-referenced with elements of the key competencies from above, along with a very basic summary of that EL's emphasis.

EL 1: **Global Executive Restraint** (2b, 6)
Comprehensive accountability

EL 2: **Emergency Superintendent Succession** (2f)
Administrative Leadership

EL 3: **Treatment of Students, Parents/Guardians, and the Public** (1b, 1c, 5a, 5b, 5c)
External communication (including complaints), safe schools, meet individual student needs, effective and appropriate discipline, parent/guardian as partner (communicate with, invite participation, keep informed)

EL4: **Treatment of Staff** (1b, 1e, 2c, 2d, 2f, 6d)
System to recruit and select the best, culture of common goals, clear communication, recognition of outstanding work, safe environment, handle complaints professionally

EL5: **Staff Compensation and Development** (1d, 3b)
Ethics re: employee hires; attract, retain and develop staff

EL6: **Staff Evaluation** (1e, 2f)
Evaluate, support and hold staff accountable

EL7: **Facilities** (1b, 3b, 3c, 4a, 5—sort of)
Clean, safe and efficient; planning is transparent, fair, fiscally responsible, adaptable; fair access to facilities

EL8: **Academic Program** (1a, 1e, 3b, 4a, 4c)
Best practices including rigor, the 4Cs and social-emotional learning; college/career readiness; innovative; measure, evaluate and modify regularly

EL9: **Technology** (1a, 1b, 1e)
Equitable access, expectations for use of technology, sustainability

EL10: **Financial Planning and Management** (2a, 3a, 3b, 3c, 4a, 5c)
Alignment with board priorities, get input, accessible/understandable, best practices, transparent

EL 11: **Asset Protection** (1b, 4a)
Protect, insure and maintain

EL 12: **Legally Required Policies** (1, 2)
Compliance

If you are keeping score, you'll notice that most of the elements of the key competencies are addressed by language in the ELs. The only leftovers are 2e (delegates well), 4b (good relationship with the board), and 6abc (the personal qualities of integrity, work ethic, and professional growth).

Recommendations:
- In the current contract, up to 10% of base pay can earned through performance incentives (up to 6% on Ends, up to 3% on ELs, and up to 1% for scores of 3.5 or higher on Ends and ELs). I propose we eliminate the third category and instead measure and offer up to 1% of base pay for performance on the personal qualities of integrity, work ethic, professional growth, and board relationship.
- Identify specific board values to score for each EL, thereby more closely connecting the EL to the board's interests and making scoring more objective.