



Poudre School District Board of Education

2407 Laporte Avenue, Fort Collins, CO 80521 • 970-490-3607

Meeting Minutes

Minutes from Board of Education Business Meeting

February 28, 2017

DINNER SESSION - 5:30 PM

PRESENT: President Cathy Kipp and Vice President David Trask; Directors Nate Donovan, Christophe Febvre, Susan Gutowsky, Carolyn Reed, and Rob Petterson; Superintendent Sandra Smyser; Assistant Superintendents Jinger Haberer, Todd Lambert and Scott Nielsen; Executive Directors Pete Hall, Dave Montoya, Dustin Reintsma and Victoria Thompson; Legal and Policy Counsel Tom Crabb

ABSENT: None

Late Arrival: Susan Gutowsky

1.0 District Issues / Board Member Updates

The Board will hold an informal lunch meeting sometime after the 21st of March. President Kipp will coordinate a time and email the group.

There was discussion about the costs of building the new schools. Given the delay in building due to litigation, there is more time to consider all options. It is the recommendation of the Superintendent that the district look at the bidding process fresh from the start, welcome new contractors to bid, consider new building designs and/or consider building schools smaller than the original plan.

Director of Planning, Design and Construction Tammie Knauer presented information to the Board and Superintendent on the pros and cons of replicating school designs.

Discussions Included:

- Do the elementary school models still work? We asked principals, do these buildings work? Do we need to start over? They recommended using the same design. It's a good model to replicate.
- Do the high school models still work? We asked principals and the consensus of the group was that yes they do and it makes sense financially. Designs can be modified to give each school its own identity.
- We asked the facilities and operations departments, do the buildings work energy-wise, maintenance-wise, etc.? Yes, they do.
- Right now, the CM/GC (Construction Manager/General Contractor) owns the designs. Are there other designs for elementary schools from other design firms that would work for our school? It will still impact the timeline even if they have a readymade design. It would need to be modified to fit state, county, city codes, etc.

- We estimate that an entire school building can be built here for \$340 per square foot. This same estimate would be used for both a new school, and a replicated model of an existing school. This estimate is based on the current school construction costs in our region.
- Definitive numbers will not be available until all costs come in from design firms and contractors.
- Decisions on the building materials (flooring, paint, etc.) are always balanced between the highest and lowest quality materials available.
- The Board would like to see details regarding why projections to build PSD buildings were higher than Thompson School District's costs (when using the same design firm). The Board will receive this information by the next Board meeting (March 21st).

Ed Holder (PSD, Special Assignment) distributed the "2016 Long Range Plan Implementation" chart.

Right now, there is work in progress at some of the sites to get in the needed infrastructure.

April 1st is the deadline to pick an architect and design for a 2019 elementary school bid. District would need to move quickly on the elementary decision. There is more time for the other schools.

The elementary school timeline is approaching too quickly. The Planning, Design and Construction department will talk to RB&B Design about replicating the elementary school. They will come back to the Board with that information.

The department will go back out to the public to re-bid construction costs for all schools. They will get back to the Board with the results of the request.

To confirm, the district is also interested in seeing new designs for the Wellington and Prospect sites. The department will write the RFP (request for proposal) so that companies can bid for one or both of the high school buildings. Should the designs be the same or different? Write the RFP in such a way that there is flexibility.

Legal and Policy Counsel Crabb noted that at the March 21st Board meeting, he will bring district policies to the Board that directly affect purchasing processes.

The Board thanked the Planning, Design and Construction department for the information.

Director Petterson moved that the Board go into executive session as authorized under C.R.S. 24-6-402(4)(f) to discuss matters concerning a District administrator's potential misconduct and discipline. Individuals invited to join the Board and Superintendent in executive session are Legal and Policy Counsel Crabb, Executive Director Thompson and Assistant Board Secretary Davis.

Director Gutowsky seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Those voting AYE: Directors Donovan, Febvre, Gutowsky, Kipp, Petterson, Reed, and Trask

Those voting NO: None
ABSENT: None
Motion passed 7-0.

The executive session started at 6:16 p.m.

The executive session ended at 6:48 p.m.

The dinner session ended at 6:48 p.m.

BUSINESS MEETING/WORK SESSION - (BOARDROOM) – 6:30 PM

PRESENT: President Cathy Kipp and Vice President David Trask; Directors Nate Donovan, Christophe Febvre, Susan Gutowsky, Carolyn Reed, and Rob Petterson; Superintendent Sandra Smyser; Assistant Superintendents Jinger Haberer, Todd Lambert and Scott Nielsen; Executive Directors Pete Hall, Dave Montoya, Dustin Reintsma and Victoria Thompson; Legal and Policy Counsel Tom Crabb

ABSENT: None

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

President Kipp called the work session meeting to order at 6:52 p.m.

2.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no changes to the agenda.

3.0 COMMUNITY COMMENT

Olivia Becker: Student at Rocky Mountain High School who is in the teacher cadet program. It is a concurrent enrollment class for students who know they want to be future educators. There are various class requirements including learning educational philosophies, practicum and experiencing student teaching/classroom opportunities. Tonight she is here to observe a Board of Education meeting.

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Personnel Action

4.2 Board Meeting Minutes from November 28, 2016 (Special Meeting), January 10, 2017 and January 24, 2017

- 4.3 Revision to Meeting Minutes for November 22, 2016**
- 4.4 Support Fleet Vehicle Purchase**
- 4.5 Barton Building Major Renovation Project**
- 4.6 Colorado Department of Education (CDE) School Counselor Corp Grant**

Director Donovan moved to approve and adopt the recommended action for items on the consent agenda.

Vice President Trask seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Those voting AYE: Directors Donovan, Febvre, Gutowsky, Kipp, Petterson, Reed, and Trask

Those voting NO: None

ABSENT: None

Motion passed 7-0.

5.0 ACTION ITEMS

5.1 Revised 2017-2018 School Year Calendar

The Board thanked the PSD Calendar Committee for being responsive to the community's concerns.

Director Donovan moved to adopt the amended 2017-2018 school year calendar as presented to the Board.

Director Petterson seconded the motion.

The voting was as follows:

Those voting AYE: Directors Donovan, Febvre, Gutowsky, Kipp, Petterson, Reed, and Trask

Those voting NO: None

ABSENT: None

Motion passed 7-0.

5.2 Joint Statement of Inclusiveness

Director Donovan moved that the Board adopt the following Joint Statement of Inclusiveness: "We want to express our gratitude to school leaders, teachers, staff and community members during this time of uncertainty. Poudre School District is committed to serving all students regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability or legal status, and are committed to our mission of Educating Every Child Every Day. Our schools are safe and accepting places where diversity is valued and celebrated.

Poudre School District recognizes we are stronger when we come together as a community. Our students, our schools, our community stand together in support of one another."

Vice President Trask seconded the motion.

Representatives from PSD's three employee groups were at the meeting:

- Tony Rowland from the Association of Classified Employees,
- Tom List, President of the Poudre Education Association, and
- Joe Gawronsky from the Poudre Association of School Executives.

They thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak on this topic and for the consideration of this Joint Statement of Inclusiveness.

The Board and employee group representatives spoke to the importance of inclusiveness in the district.

The voting was as follows:

Those voting AYE: Directors Donovan, Febvre, Gutowsky, Kipp, Petterson, Reed, and Trask

Those voting NO: None

ABSENT: None

Motion passed 7-0.

6.0 WORK SESSION TOPICS

6.1 Monitoring/Policy Review: DE 1.0, District Ends

Director of Research and Evaluation Dr. Dwayne Schmitz presented a report on DE 1.0.

High-Level Points:

- PSD is a high achievement and high-growth district.
- The PSD 4-year graduation rate has increased back up to 83.5% for the class of 2016.
- PSD 7-year completion rates are approximately 94%.
- High School postsecondary outcomes and workforce readiness experience rates are high.

Areas to Improve:

- Gaps in outcomes exist for historically underserved student subgroups.
- The new Connections Survey data indicates patterns that align with persistent achievement gaps. Actionable items were identified in the survey.

Director Schmitz presented additional information:

- A chart detailing PSD's 4-year graduation rates and 7-year completion rates.

- Detailed descriptions of how student achievement is charted (i.e. Z-scores from testing in each category achievement area – language arts, math, etc.).
- Noted how mapping outcomes shows similarities across grades and subjects and work as a check against each other.
- Looked at student growth on PARCC testing by subject for each quarter of 2016.
- State data on student growth shows that in math and language arts, PSD students are growing faster than other students in the nation.
- ACT scores went down a little bit, but not just in PSD. It was a national trend.

Obtaining actionable data will improve district processes. The goal is for the Monitor Report to be widely read and used as a teaching guide.

Connections Survey:

- The survey was new to the district this year.
- The district piloted the survey.
- The district surveyed each school.
- Results were all above 80% favorable responses.
- This is an area where national numbers do not matter; the Board and district have agreed the goal is to have 100% connected students in the district.
- Data shows that students who perform at a lower level in their school also feel less connected. It is a very clear pattern and is an actionable item.
- Free and reduced lunch students tend to feel less connected, although there are schools where this is absolutely not true. What are those schools doing differently?
- Data shows that in middle school, female students feel more connected to teachers; male students feel more connected to their peers.

If the district can raise the level of students who feel connected, we should also see an increase in their test scores.

Board Questions and Discussion:

- How do we know students need additional support? Levels of support is a product created by the IT department. It takes various scores, compiles the data and assigns a “Z-score.” Students are identified as needing additional support by their “Z-score.” It’s important that educators use this information, understand it so they can prepare for each student.
- In general, schools with greater needs and challenges have lower growth results. Each school is different. What schools are closing the gap and having better outcomes? How can we transfer those successful ideas?
- Suggested putting a question on the survey that looks at students’ at-home factors (e.g. are they well-fed, do they have adequate transportation, a safe home, etc.).
- Why does 11th grade look like it’s falling behind for graduation rates (according to dashboard)? When and where 11th graders get class credits skews the 11th grade data. It looks like a timing issue. It’s hard to say right now how these numbers will reflect on actual graduation rates.

- Post-secondary workforce readiness students are taking advantage of opportunities. The district is working on reorganizing ACE and PACE courses so that those opportunities also count towards graduation credits.
- Right now, students who take an English course offsite (for example, at a community college for college credit) will not get high school graduation credit for that class. It is an old policy and the district is working to update the policy.
- The results of an ICAP (Individual Career and Academic Plan) survey indicate that 6th grade students are not familiar with ICAP. This may be misleading; they participate in it, but do not call it “ICAP.”
- Consider survey questions that would help to identify whether students feel safe in school. If we can ensure students feel safe, can we improve their learning? Would there be value in adding questions that reflect social/emotional learning factors?
- How much effort should we put into getting 100 percent student participation on these surveys? Or do we just need a representative sample? We are on track to get a representative sample and that gives us a general feel for our systems and what needs improvement.
- Targets – what about flipping some of the targets? Instead of saying 85% succeed, say less than 15% are not meeting the target. Refocus language in a more meaningful way? The district will continue to explore different reporting methods.
- Continue to refine language in the Monitor Report so that it is more user-friendly. Dr. Schmitz asked that Board members email him language suggestions that might work better for a broader audience (and not lean toward statistical lingo). The report needs to contain language that people can read and enjoy so that it appeals to a larger audience.
- How are we addressing schools that are falling off the bottom of the charts? How are we helping those schools? Assistant Superintendent Lambert noted that the district employs UIPs (Unified Improvement Plans). A UIP will point out those opportunities that need work in a particular school.

The Board agreed that the report met DE 1.0 Monitoring Report expectations.

Dr. Schmitz asked the Board for confirmation that the 15 measures and targets in the report are the right ones. It is important to pinpoint the right measures as the department begins to dig deeper into those targets.

The Board agreed that the measures being used in the DE 1.0 Monitoring Report are on point to achieve the district’s long-term goals.

Policy Review: The Board is in agreement that DE 1.0 is approves the policy.

The Board recessed at 9:40 p.m.

The Board reconvened at 9:50 p.m.

6.2 Long Range Plan Board Discussion Regarding Goals for 2017

The Board looked at the district's long range goals and expectations for calendar year 2017.

The following items were noted during a discussion on equity of square footage:

- Educating students is the number one priority.
- It is important to have highly efficient schools that meets students' needs.
- If an educational goal requires more space, then it makes sense to build larger to accommodate the goal.
- Consider programs offered at the school and design with that in mind.
- What is the public perception of building a smaller school? Will the community feel slighted?
- As discussed in tonight's dinner session, the district will request bids for different cost models of the schools.
- Build high quality and try to avoid expensive maintenance issues that may come with choosing lower quality materials.
- There will have to be clear tradeoffs to having smaller buildings.
- There is not enough time to redesign an elementary school and it doesn't make sense to do so. Redesigning an elementary school is not necessary. Features of the school can and will be changed to make it individual. The feedback from staff, maintenance, etc. is that the elementary school buildings (i.e. Bethke) are effective designs.

The Superintendent will put together a draft of the district's long range goals. The Board can review and fix language in it as needed. At the March 21st meeting, the Board will look at approving the finalized version.

6.3 Legislative Discussion

From Recent Legislative Session:

- House Bill 1181 – Bipartisan-supported education bill to streamline testing for students in the state.
- House Bill 1187 – proposal to readjust the TABOR formula (refer to the voters on a ballot measure) and amend education funding in the state.

The Board is considering how to better inform community members on these issues.

The State Budget Committee is requesting a group response from the Board. A subcommittee of two will fill out the form this week and submit it. Director Donovan and Vice President Trask will work on it. The Board gave the subcommittee the power to submit the final document without further Board approval.

7.0 AGENDA PLANNING

Future agenda items:

- School Innovation Act – potentially on the March 21st meeting agenda.

The next community engagement meeting is March 18th (check website for time and location details).

8.0 ADJOURNMENT

Board meeting ended at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kyla Davis
Assistant Secretary to the Board of Education