

HYDE PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING MINUTES
HYDE PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LIBRARY
MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 2011

Board members present: Mark Freeman, Jim Lipinski, Dan Regan, Kalee Roberts, Raven Walters.

Others: Michelle Mathias, Debra Taylor, Marilyn Frederick, Jennifer Darrow, Berta Baxter.

Note: All votes taken are unanimous unless otherwise noted.

Items highlighted for follow-up are shown like this.

1. Call to Order

J. Lipinski called the meeting to order at 6:30.

2. Approve Consent Agenda (Minutes from 12/20/2010, Principal's Report)

K. Roberts moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by M. Freeman.

D. Regan asked about the committee work described in the principal's report. Are there going to be opportunities for different committees to come together and share what they have in common? M. Mathias said committees will be sharing out monthly, and the understanding is that if a committee needs to communicate with another group, it will make arrangements to do that. If committees need to get together, the 3rd Monday of each month is a day they can use in any way they need. She is trying to move the staff from feeling everyone has to be involved in everything.

K. Roberts noted that the \$33 million from the federal government to study assessments (mentioned in the principal's report) isn't just for Vermont, but is shared with other states.

The motion was passed.

3. Executive Session Concerning Employment Matter

M. Freeman moved to enter executive session to discuss an employment matter, inviting administration to remain, and the motion was seconded and passed at 6:39. The board consented out of session at 6:54.

K. Roberts moved, after further research and consultation with the school's attorney, to uphold the administration's decision in this matter. M. Freeman seconded, and the motion was passed. (J. Darrow and B. Baxter arrived at 6:55.)

4. Staff Presentation - ESS

B. Baxter and J. Darrow gave a presentation on the Educational System of Support toolbox on the HPES website. B. Baxter said she and J. Darrow went to a conference last April where they learned about some new diagnostic tools, best practices and interventions. They thought about how they could incorporate those at HPES and decided the school needed some type of real or virtual resource shelf. They started researching how other schools made their resources accessible to parents and

teachers. A school in Ohio allowed them to use their site as a stepping stone to build an HPES site. She and J. Darrow created the toolbox on the HPES site.

J. Darrow showed the information available on the toolbox site. It provides an efficient, systematic tool for parents and teachers to use to find new things to try, and a systematic way of referring a child. J. Darrow said we needed to develop a system like this – a common tool for everyone to view and access – as we moved into the RtI model. She showed descriptions of the three tiers of intervention. Tier I is for everyone. Tier IIa is for when a red flag is initially noticed. Tier IIb is a second attempt at intervention when the first was not as successful as desired. Interventions need to be research based and have to fall within a system. If an intervention is working, a child may go back to Tier I. If the child is not making the progress we want, then we move to Tier III, specialized instruction. Tier IIa also includes enrichment. AIMSweb identifies those who need enrichment.

M. Mathias said a lot of subjectivity has been removed by using data. In the past, especially with the discrepancy model, teachers sometimes gave report card grades to struggling students that might not support intervention, perhaps because the student tried hard. J. Darrow said a teacher chooses one to two interventions and documents progress or lack of progress over 4-6 weeks. K. Roberts asked, do we have the same kind of direct interventions for those who need enrichment? J. Darrow said we don't have the staff in place to facilitate that as much as we could. Enrichment intervention mostly happens during common instruction time. K. Roberts said if we don't have the same systematic method for making sure instructors have tools to use with kids who need enrichment, that's where parents feel frustrated. What, if anything, can the board do to support finding and implementing those interventions? B. Baxter said she and J. Darrow will attend the same conference this year, and finding interventions for enrichment will be one of their main focuses. D. Taylor suggested someone in Vermont they could also contact. M. Mathias said she consults on enrichment. She can give ideas about how to make an assignment deeper for a student.

J. Lipinski said the board has talked a lot about having every kid on an IEP. Will the triangle showing different levels of intervention scale as capacity is built? Can we shrink the green section (showing students who do not get individualized interventions?) (M. Frederick arrived and D. Taylor left at 7:14.) D. Regan said he would like to see more focus on enrichment. He likes J. Lipinski's idea of shrinking the green over time. He also thinks the utility of this resource for parents could be improved over time. Currently, it might be easier to use for educators than for parents. K. Roberts suggested we could offer training. M. Mathias suggested the website could provide training. We could put a video on the site explaining how to navigate it. K. Roberts suggested we could identify parent-friendly links by color.

The board assured J. Darrow and B. Baxter that their comments should not be seen as criticism. The site is great, and seeing it has gotten them thinking about ways to make it even better. J. Darrow and B. Baxter said they do not currently have time to do any more work on the site. M. Freeman suggested maybe the parent group could

help with some of the website workload. K. Roberts said J. Darrow and B. Baxter should feel free to reach out to the board if they have questions or need support. The board thanked them for their efforts. (*J. Darrow and B. Baxter left at 7:20.*)

R. Walters said she thought J. Cormier's presentation last time was great. She thinks the board needs to get to know staff, and she really appreciates staff presentations. Others agreed. K. Roberts suggested that over time the board could be presented with information about gifted and talented kids who got interventions and the measurable advances they made as a result. M. Freeman said it should not be just gifted and talented students. We should be looking at how to reach each individual learner. K. Roberts said if we can put up graphs showing individual advancement of each kid, that's the kind of evidence the public is looking for. M. Mathias said she reviews AIMSweb results often.

5. Announced Tuition – Possible Action

M. Frederick reminded the board that by law we have to announce tuition by January 15 if we are going to change it. Otherwise, the last announced tuition is the most we can charge. We don't currently have any tuitioning students, but we should be in the habit of checking the tuition figure every year. She sees no reason to announce a new amount, because based on our budget and FTE's, we could charge less than the last-announced amount. She explained how the allowable tuition amount is calculated. The board agreed to maintain the latest announced tuition of \$10,477 for FY12.

6. Budget Discussion and Possible Action

M. Frederick distributed information on the expected allocations by district of the federal Education Jobs funds. Governor-elect Shumlin has announced he will recommend that the Education Jobs funds be disseminated to districts to help with their budgets. The money will be sent out this current year, but they recommend that we not use it this year.

M. Frederick distributed proposed budget figures, including CLA, equalized pupil, and tax rate figures. She said we don't yet know the secondary tax rate, but it is projected to be lower than the previous year's.

K. Roberts suggested, since we are looking at an 8-cent drop in the tax rate, putting a separate article before the voters for replacement of the gym floor. K. Roberts and M. Mathias agreed that \$100K would probably be a reasonable ballpark figure for the cost. M. Freeman asked, is it worth asking for that now if we may be asking for more later, depending on the results of the work with the Lengels? K. Roberts said if we put the money aside for that intended purpose, we can choose later not to spend it.

M. Mathias suggested adding the math coach position to the budget, and also adding about \$7K to supplement the 21st Century Grant for the summer program. M. Frederick distributed a sheet with new budget figures, including \$60K for the math position. K. Roberts noted that the budget doesn't take into account the distribution of the federal \$19 million. M. Frederick said the board votes on an expenditure budget. J. Lipinski said he would like not even to consider using the federal money this year, as we will need it next year. It was agreed to include \$60K for the math

coach position and to ask the voters to approve about \$100K for the gym floor. The board also agreed to add \$7K for the summer program. Even with those additions, the budget is still down from last year. The tax rate after CLA would be 6 cents lower than last year's. K. Roberts said the disadvantage of adding that money to the budget is that we will have to say we didn't meet the target. M. Mathias said the state told us there would be money for the math coach position, then told us there wouldn't, and that position is critical to our program. It was noted that there is also about \$13K for step movements in the current budget. J. Lipinski said we are educating more kids for less money and charging taxpayers less, even though we didn't meet the target.

7. Board Development Work – Core Purpose

J. Lipinski presented the core purpose statements each board member, M. Mathias, and D. Taylor had written. Each person spoke briefly about their own core purpose. Then each person picked another person's core purpose to answer a set of questions about. There was discussion about which statements were rated the highest and why, and then discussion about possible new wording building on some of the existing statements. The group came up with the following core purpose statement: *To foster curiosity, engaged learning, and a sense of responsibility in each individual – now and for a lifetime.* It was agreed to leave that statement as is for now and let everyone think about it.

8. Discuss Town Report

J. Lipinski said he will do a draft of the town report and warning and email them out, probably this week. He suggested anyone who wanted to make edits could notify others that they were "checking out" the draft, and then when they were done they could "check it in" and send the revised version out to everyone.

9. Other

The board briefly discussed the issue of accepting out-of-district preschool students. K. Roberts said she has no problem accepting any teacher's child who is tuitioned. J. Lipinski suggested the issue could be warned for town meeting. J. Lipinski said he didn't put this on the agenda for tonight because he thinks the board needs to finish its development work first, because that work will drive policy. Board members thought the issue might be discussed in February.

10. Adjourn

It was moved and seconded to adjourn, and the motion was passed at 9:40.

Minutes submitted by Donna Griffiths

Items highlighted for follow-up:

suggestions for improving the ESS and the ESS toolbox:

J. Lipinski said the board has talked a lot about having every kid on an IEP. Will the triangle showing different levels of intervention scale as capacity is built? Can we shrink the green section (showing students who do not get individualized interventions?) D. Regan said he would like to see more focus on enrichment. He likes J. Lipinski's idea of shrinking the green over time. He also thinks the utility of this resource for parents could be improved over time. Currently, it might be easier to use for educators than for parents. K. Roberts suggested we could offer training. M. Mathias suggested the website could provide training. We could put a video on the site explaining how to navigate it. K. Roberts suggested we could identify parent-friendly links by color. M. Freeman suggested maybe the parent group could help with some of the website workload.

J. Lipinski said he will do a draft of the town report and warning and email them out, probably this week. He suggested anyone who wanted to make edits could notify others that they were "checking out" the draft, and then when they were done they could "check it in" and send the revised version out to everyone.

UNAPPROVED