

**REVISED** Board Meeting Minutes

September 19, 2013

Regular Session

Meeting Location: Canby High School, Applied Technology Center, OMNI Room

**Board members in attendance** were Brendan Murphy, Angi Dilkes Perry, Kristin Downs, Diane Downs, Mike Zagya, and Andrea Weber. Tom Scott was not in attendance. Also in attendance were Dr. John Steach (Superintendent), and Caryn Davis (Board Secretary).

**Signed in guests:** Traci Hensley and Kris Millar

**REGULAR SESSION**

**1.0 CALL TO ORDER**

Board Chair, Brendan Murphy, called the Regular Board Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**2.0 INTRODUCTIONS AND FLAG SALUTE**

The audience introduced themselves and Dr. Steach led the flag salute.

**3.0 CHANGES TO AGENDA**

Chair Brendan Murphy moved items 6.8 and 6.9 to the top of the Information/Discussion/Action Items.

**4.0 PUBLIC FORUM/ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chair Brendan Murphy opened the floor for public comments. No comments were made.

**5.0 CONSENT AGENDA**

**Diane Downs moved to approve the consent agenda. Andrea Weber seconded the motion.**

**Motion passed 6-0.**

Included in the Consent Agenda:

5.1 Work Session and Executive Session Meeting Minutes from September 5, 2013

5.2 Personnel Changes

**6.0 INFORMATION/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

**6.8 Superintendent's Report**

Dr. Steach reported that enrollment numbers were slightly above what was expected. Classroom numbers are an issue and this is still being worked on. Great demands are being put on staff to implement many Federal and State requirements. In addition to changing grading practices, House Bill 2220 requires changing report cards and implementing a new evaluation system; this is all being done while learning a new student record system.

Dr. Steach commented on the recently announced legislative special session. The amount of money Canby could potentially receive would be approximately \$800,000 over the biennium. This would help the district offset some of the class size problems, support the transition to Synergy, and/or add back school days. He also shared that he will be attending a COSA meeting the next day to learn more about the special session.

**6.9 Board Comments (Part 1)**

**Kristin Downs:** Thanked Dr. Steach for the positive publicity to the District when introducing his 40-40-20 student success model. She went to Ninety-One School's first assembly of the year. There were 70 new students at the school. The assembly allowed a great way to introduce the new students to the school community. She also sat in on a collaborative teaming time with staff at Ninety-One. The community needs to know how much the teachers are dealing with; there are so many changes all at once. From State mandates to Synergy the teachers are really having to handle a lot, we need to help support them through this time of change.

**Andrea Weber:** No comments at this time.

**Diane Downs:** She had the opportunity to visit very small schools outside of our District this week. It was a very interesting experience, much different from our schools.

**Mike Zagya:** No comments at this time.

**Angi Dilkes Perry:** Excited to be here and to get the school year underway.

**Brendan Murphy:** Sounds like the beginning of the school year was good. My son is officially in school and I am getting to do all of the parent things. I would like to take a moment to thank the Active Shooters' participants. From what I have heard it was an extremely efficient training experience. I would like to thank Dr. Steach for the District's cooperation in the event.

### **6.1 Innovation Grants:**

Dr. Steach gave a brief overview of the Innovation Grants topic to the audience. The money used to support these grants comes from the left over Facility Grant money. Customarily, \$50,000 a year has gone towards grant applicants. This year we hit a tipping point where staff requests, to go to 1:1 devices for their students, were so high that a decision regarding the direction of technology needs to be made. There have been two previous Board Work Sessions in which this topic was addressed. The Board seems to be concerned about sustainability of 1:1 devices. Additional information has been given to the Board at the previous meetings. The Board received a 13-page document leading into this meeting. We are asking for Board direction on whether or not we move forward with a plan to phase out our computer labs in favor of 1:1 devices for our students. Our hope for tonight is that we can discuss where we are now and how we can move forward.

The Board Members each expressed their concerns and further questions about this topic as follows:

**Diane Downs'** comments and questions regarding 6.1:

- Would like a clarification on speed to get to option 4c versus 4d.
- Explain 1:1 iPads or iPods and difference from grades 3-12 reaching 1:1 and K-12 reaching 1:1.
- In developing curriculum is math, for sure, the priority?
- Do we know what it takes to develop our own curriculum and what the true costs are?
- Worried about the potential for widening the gap, especially for students without WI-FI at home.
- If students don't have WI-FI and are absent, how do they know what their assignments are?
- Do we know that this is a benefit to our students?
- Time wise, when, realistically, would all new curricula be developed by?
- Going forward with technology is a must; concerns about outdated curriculum are also high.
- Not comfortable designating all additional revenues to one avenue or another.
- Would like to see the calendar restored, lower class sizes and adding back in previously cut programs.
- Would like to see specific, strategic figures for a long-range plan.

**Diane's Comment at Polling:** I have a much more measured comfort level. Sustainability is a concern, but we need to move forward in some manner. I want the focus to be on students and what is best for them. I can't go all in because number of days in school and class sizes have a significant effect on the quality of our students' education. We have to be creative enough to make technology and curriculum progress and still address all of the other aspects at the same time.

**Mike Zagya's** comments and questions regarding 6.1:

- It is my understanding that by 2015-16 we will be digital and every student grades 3-12 will use an iPad rather than textbooks. K-2 will use older iPads and iPods so they learn how to use technology.
- My position is that I am a strong supporter of digital and I would go with 4d with a goal of reaching 1:1 by the start of the 2016-17 school year.
- Feel confident that kids will pick this up and use it.
- Not worried about developing curriculum.
- Concern is in regards to students bringing their own devices to school and our inability to monitor their use.
- What is the percentage of kids that don't have WI-FI in their home?

- We need to set a target and then move towards it; we can't resolve all issues prior to proceeding.
- What is the percentage of teachers that are on board with technology?
- If a choice had to be made, I would never cut teachers over getting an object.
- I would like to see a Board Calendar item regarding Board Policies for iPads and Lease to Own.

**Mike's Comment at Polling:** I can't argue with the potential issues, we are all concerned. But I think we need to move on.

**Kristin Down's** comments and questions regarding 6.1:

- How is this school year impacted by this decision?
- Is training time for staff built into the amounts given?
- If we agree to 4d, is there flexibility for urgent areas, like 7<sup>th</sup> grade Social Studies curriculum?
- Instead of waiting to develop our own curriculum could we look into buying digital curriculum that is already available?
- I think it is important to talk to the schools to find out what they see as immediately urgent.
- In building curriculum, the new State requirements create checks and balances that are built right in.
- I understand the concerns, but going to the schools and seeing what the teachers had to deal with has changed my mind.
- This is a vote of confidence. I want to do this because we want to support our teachers and our students; we want to make that statement to our staff.
- We don't know what the future holds, but we can't keep pushing this off each year.
- My recommendation is that we move forward.

**Kristin's Comment at Polling:** Yes.

**Andrea Weber's** comments and questions regarding 6.1:

- Would most of the Innovation Grant awards be for grades 3-12, based on this model?
- With the exception of staff at our meetings, we haven't talked to staff, community members or students about this. Are they benefiting from technology?
- Will we instruct parents that aren't tech savvy?
- Technology is becoming integral to everything.
- Will teachers have to take time away from their classes to create curriculum, where is the time for this?
- Is curriculum development incorporated into this budget?
- I am in favor, but we are pushing this so fast that we might be leaving things out.
- Where in the timeline is the option of students bringing their own devices?
- Can we make Digital Citizenship a requirement for those who bring their own devices?

**Andrea's Comment at Polling:** Yes, it is a big financial move, but I think it is the right time for it. Following the status quo is not helping our District. We need to talk tech and curriculum. I would support it.

**Angi Dilkes Perry's** comments and questions regarding 6.1:

- While I don't see this as being a silver bullet that fixes all of our problems, I do see it as a great option.
- This sounds like it is what the teachers want.
- Policy updates, which would include some of these issues, are already on the Planning Calendar for this year.

**Angi's Comment at Polling:** I think that curriculum is critical, and this is a solution to both technology and curriculum. It makes the most sense, it kills two birds...

**Brendan Murphy's** comments and questions regarding 6.1:

- Asked for an explanation of associated costs.
- Asked about online curriculum adoption and the potential for yearly fees being increased.
- Will this make lesson planning easier for teachers?
- How will we get our parents prepared for this?
- What should come first, curriculum or devices?
- This is an overwhelming decision, I know it is frustrating and embarrassing for our teachers.
- Funding outlay is still intimidating to me; I would like to see a decision schedule.

- Should we consider easing into the steps taken before going to the next step.
- Are we looking at cutting teachers to continue supporting this?

**Brendan's Comment at Polling:** I think this has the potential to kill two birds with one stone, but what happens if it doesn't? I feel strongly that we have a current responsibility to our current students. I would like to see a more detailed savings schedule for next year. Look at a tech user fee and commit to lease to own. I am leaning towards this as being something I can likely support, but I do it with hesitancy.

**Joe Morelock's** (Director of Student Achievement-Secondary and Director of Technology & Innovation) comments to the Board regarding 6.1:

- There are no plans for new iPods or iTouches, only iPads in the future.
- Guessed that approximately 40% of students don't have WI-FI, if based on Free and Reduced Lunch Program numbers.
- If students are absent and don't have WI-FI, they would do what they do now. Parents could come in and retrieve the assignments for them using the iPad.
- Online curriculum adoptions are at set prices. The content subscriptions and updates are what we would pay yearly fees on.
- Online curriculum does not build lesson plans for teachers, they would still do that themselves.
- We have two issues, outdated curriculum and technology development. If moving forward, regarding curriculum, we still have a lot to do before we have our own digital versions developed.
- Believe that we have well beyond two-thirds of the staff onboard for technology.
- We are still looking at other grant opportunities to help support this goal.

**Dr. Steach's** comments to the Board regarding 6.1:

- Explained the time difference between getting to 1:1 devices with option 4c and 4d.
- If we move forward, we would be looking at funding about 80% of the Innovation Grant requests.
- There are two different funding models, one would involve spending \$400,000 this year, and the other involves spending \$680,000 this year of Facility Grant funds. We would have brand new devices for all students, grades 3-12, going into the 2015-16 school year.
- Regarding the training of staff, we are looking at options that involve using some of our building technology staff to help train teachers on a 1 to 1 basis in the classroom.
- I would love to be able to develop all four curriculum content areas this year. We are focusing on math first because it has the most staff developed content, so far. We will use the math development to learn what we need to do, while still producing a good product.
- Rather than using other programs, we would really like to push to own our own curriculum. Textbook creators structure their payment models so it ends up being the same as a physical textbook purchase, over the course of seven years. We have talked to other school districts that are developing their own curriculum; they have made progress and we may be able to get some of their online texts for year one.
- Curriculum development would occur over the summer. We would contract teachers, collect materials from teachers that have already been developing their own curriculum, and match the content to Common Core. Our estimate is that it would take about 5-6 weeks each summer for curriculum development. The cost would run about \$108,000 for developing each content area. I anticipate that by the start of the 2016-17 school year, we will have all new curricula in place.
- When it comes to our students being able to be trained on technology, I witnessed kids learning a new program in a classroom recently. The kids figured it out in minutes and were sharing their successes with each other. The biggest focus we will need to have is on keyboarding.
- The concept of students bringing their own devices would begin this year. Parents will learn what digital citizenship is about. We will be using this year to review our policies on these topics, including lease to own.
- If we come to years when we financially can't support the goal without other significant cuts, we would look at skipping a year for our technology purchases.

**Dr. Steach's Comment after Poll:** It seems there is a comfort level with moving forward, but how fast? We

need to figure out how much we would spend this year, likely somewhere between \$400,000 to \$680,000. For now, we are just looking at spending out of the Facilities Grant. We could position ourselves to move to 1:1 next year.

### **6.2 Achievement Compact:**

Dr. Steach: The Achievement Compact Team met last week. We had our OAKS results to take into account. We saw a dip in test performance scores across the board. We have set our goals to return to last year's performance level. Where there was an increase, we added 1%.

Angi Dilkes Perry asked about the potential for our data to be rejected by the State.

Dr. Steach explained that input is made within a spreadsheet that would only take certain values. If our values won't work, we will need to come back and notify you.

Diane Downs asked if there was a philosophy when setting the goals.

Dr. Steach explained that he was very pragmatic in creation of the goals; they were optimistic goals in light of all that our staff is facing this year.

**Andrea Weber moved to approve the Achievement Compact as presented. Angi Dilkes Perry seconded the motion. Motion passed 6-0.**

### **6.3 Synergy Conversion Update**

Susie Strangfield commented that conversions are never perfect outside of the box. Our goal was to get kids in and attendance taken, that is working. We have provided tons of training for staff, with more to come. Over the next two months, grading practices will be coming up. We have many other pieces left to train on. We are currently planning for the October Parent View release. It took us 9 years to create all of the custom reports we had with iSIS; things are coming along, but slower than we would like. ESD has been a great partner as we find and fix these issues. Questions? Brendan expressed his appreciation to Susie for the numerous hours she has spent on the conversion. Other board members expressed similar support of the time and commitment Susie has given to the conversion process.

### **6.4 Budget/Enrollment Numbers**

Mary Knigge, Director of Finance, went over her budget spreadsheet. With many contracts beginning on September 1st, we really won't have all details until September payroll has run. I estimate we will spend all of what is budgeted this year. Auditors will be coming in October for the final fieldwork; the report will be brought to the Board, after. The report does not reflect potential money conveyed in the Governor's press release.

### **6.5 Bond and Excise Tax Balance**

Mary Knigge explained the Bond Fund – Balance Tracking Memorandum, reviewing the following: The Softball Complex Project has been funded using the 2005 Bond Fund, with the help of the Canby High School Construction Class, and should be finished by November. The Facility Grant Fund is money we received from the State, after the completion of Baker Prairie Middle School. The Facility Grant Funds can be used for non-capital type purchases. Currently, we are using this fund to support the Innovation Grants. For 2013-14 the excise tax rate increased from \$1.11 to \$1.14. A resolution will be brought to the Board next month to raise the index collected to the \$1.14 amount.

### **6.6 1<sup>st</sup> Reading New Policy DFGA**

The Board reviewed and held a **1<sup>st</sup> Reading of Board Policy DFGA – Sale of Real Property**. The following change, as requested by the Board, will include the removal of the requirement for an appraisal, and instead, replace it with market analysis.

### **6.7 1<sup>st</sup> Reading Revised Policy FEF**

The Board reviewed and held a **1<sup>st</sup> Reading of Revised Board Policy FEF – Construction Contracts – Bidding and Awards**.

**7.0 Future Agenda Items**

The following items will be addressed at the next Board Work Session:

- Levy - Survey Estimates
- District Strategic Plan
- Charter School Applications
- Grading Practices
- CTE Impact & Program Change
- CHS Softball Complex
- Excise Tax Resolution

**6.9 Board Comments (Part 2)**

**Mike Zagya:** The technology discussion was excellent, with superb ideas. People were not afraid to say what was on their minds.

**Brendan Murphy:** Thanked Dr. Steach and Joe Morelock for figuring out how to condense the information into a more understandable format.

**Andrea Weber:** Felt the information was well presented.

**13.0 Adjournment**

Brendan Murphy adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Caryn Davis  
Board Secretary

Designated Board Chair