



**Minutes**  
 January 9, 2020  
 Regular Board Meeting 6:00 pm-8:00 pm  
 West Grand School District Board Room  
 715 Kinsey Avenue, Kremmling, CO

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:08 PM.

**II. Roll Call**

School District	Board Member	Superintendent	BOCES
East Grand	Ed Raegner		Tina Goar
Hayden	Brian Hoza		Trish Cook
North Park	Matt Shuler (via Zoom)	Ed Vandertook (via Zoom)	Chloe Flam
South Routt	Jane Colby		Megan Hartsel
Steamboat	Kim Brack		Kristen Atwood (via Zoom)
West Grand	Jessica Smiley	Darrin Peppard	

**III. Pledge of Allegiance**

**IV. Welcome/Introductions New BOCES Board Members**

**V. Election of BOCES Board Member Officers**

Brian started with requesting a nomination for Board President. Jane nominated which Brian accepted but added that this likely being his last term, it might be a good idea to work on a transition plan/process part-way through this year or next year, if there is anyone who is ready to step in, rather than wait until the position is vacated. There were no other nominations.

On motion by South Routt, seconded by East Grand, it is hereby resolved to re-elect Brian Hoza as NWBOCES Board President.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

Brian requested nominations for Vice President and discussed position and time requirements for the position. Brian asked Matt if he would accept the nomination for Vice President, which he accepted. Brian nominated Matt Shuler for Vice President. There were no other nominations.

On motion by Hayden, seconded by South Routh, it is hereby resolved to elect Matt Shuler as NWBOCES Board Vice President.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

Brian requested nominations for Secretary/Treasurer and discussed position and time requirements for the position. Chloe asked Jane if she would accept the nomination for the position, which she accepted. Chloe nominated Jane Colby for Secretary and Treasurer. There were no other nominations.

On motion by North Park, seconded by Steamboat, it is hereby resolved to elect Jane Colby as NWBOCES Board Secretary and Treasurer.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

## **VI. Review/Modification/Approval of Agenda**

We have a revised agenda. Tina pointed out a typo on Consent Agenda E. Where it says Presence Learning, it should say Lawrence Speech and Hearing Services. It was also noted that all of the board members were sent the revised agenda with all of the attachments. There was a pause while the Superintendents were sent the revised agenda and attachments as well.

On motion by Steamboat, seconded by East Grand, it is hereby resolved to approve the Revised Agenda as presented.

Roll Call Vote:        East Grand - Yes        Hayden - Yes        North Park – Yes  
                             South Routt - Yes        Steamboat – Yes        West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0.

**VII. Action Item – Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting** (attachment 1)

Brian asked if there were changes to the minutes from the previous meeting, to which Tina replied that there were not.

On motion by North Park, seconded by West Grand, it is hereby resolved to approve the Minutes as presented from the Previous Board Meetings.

Roll Call Vote:        East Grand - Yes        Hayden - Yes        North Park – Yes  
                             South Routt - Yes        Steamboat – Yes        West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

**VIII. Consent Agenda**

- A. Check Register – November-December (attachment 2)
- B. New Hire – Megan Hartsel, Administrative Assistant
- C. Rose Community Foundation Education Technology Mini Grant \$650
- D. Reopen NW BOCES ColoTrust account (attachment 3)
- E. Lawrence Speech & Hearing Services Contract. (attachment 4)

On motion by North Park, seconded by South Routt, it is hereby resolved to approve the Consent Agenda.

Roll Call Vote:        East Grand - Yes        Hayden - Yes        North Park – Yes  
                             South Routt - Yes        Steamboat – Yes        West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

**IX. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**X. Executive Director Highlights**

**6:40 PM**

- A. Alternative Licensure and Induction Programs Updates

Tina: Our alternative licensure program is going very well. We have 10 now. It's going very well, they are all

doing well and keeping up with the work. They have all had at least one, possibly two observations by either our professional learning coaches at BOCES, or their mentor, or someone on site. I'm really pleased to see and hear that they are moving along. Teacher induction continues to move forward as well and principal induction, same. I have 10 principals and assistant principals I'm working with on their induction program. It's just really nice to know that everybody is on track and working hard to taking care of what they need to do with their professional learning and/or requirements for their license. I have 10 principal inductees, 4 counselors, 3 nurses, and approximately 15 teachers. For new board members, I found out that for school nurses, the Department of Education provides the mentor and the local health services department, hospitals have been providing assistance as well so we're well connected with that program. That was the first time I've ever done a nurse induction so I was learning right along with them.

#### B. Re-design/Revision Job Description for Professional Learning Coordinator/Coach 20-21

Tina: As all of you know, we are moving out of our i3 SEED federal grant which means that our 2 professional learning/innovation coaches' positions will end at the end of the year. Unfortunately, we had Julie Dalke, our professional learning coordinator resign and she took a teaching position at Steamboat High School and since that was mid-year, and with the grant ending, and looking at the needs both service-wise and dollar-wise, what makes the most sense is to redefine the professional learning coordinator position into professional learning coordinator/coach and redesign the job description to include that they must have teaching experience, some type of teacher leadership/professional learning experience because it will be the executive director and that person facilitating alternative licensure and induction next year. Since those will be the 2 people that will be available. We will look at service provider induction programming and probably look at Trish and Kristen taking on a little bit of that but I'm not worried about that piece. It just made sense after about 11 years of not really changing much in that job description although it had changed, and with our changes within the organization, the revision of the job description. We will advertise somewhere around late February, early March, have interviews and the person on board sometime in April so there can be some transition and have them officially come on board July 1. We still have to work through some of the details of contract and pay but it's the idea of assuring all of you and the superintendents, which I've shared this with them, that yes, we're losing some personnel. We have needs and priorities and how are we going to best meet this. That's where we are with it. I'm pretty positive that we will have several applications. I think there will be people interested in the position.

Brian: Any questions about that positions? Any input or anything else to add from superintendents, from your discussions? Does this adequately merge meet the needs that are vacated?

Darrin: Aside from a little bit of conversation...I mean we haven't seen a job description so...Do I think it makes adequate sense? Yes.

Brian: We haven't seen a job description yet either and we didn't think you had. One of the questions that was discussed at previous meetings was, also looking at executive director roles and how it disseminates out to other positions, including this position so that there's an appropriate delineation of roles and responsibilities and that there also is a supervisory hierarchy for lack of a better word, when it comes from making decisions.

Tina: So this person would be under my direct supervision. I wanted to share tonight, as I shared with the

superintendents, the overall concept and the direction I'm going and our next board meeting and our next SAC meeting they will actually see the draft but before I went any further, I wanted to make sure everyone was comfortable with that direction.

Brian: Any questions. Are you relatively comfortable with the general direction it's going, board members?

Jane: Is there a percentage time for coordinating vs. coaching?

Tina: I would say it's going to be pretty close to 50/50. Some of that will determine the needs, meaning the number of alternative licensure teachers that we will have and teacher induction candidates and that really varies from year to year.

Brian: It seems pretty hefty so as far as the load so it's hard to know without seeing the description. Will there still be lead from the executive director and then this person will be in the support role?

Tina: Yes, and there will be actual side-by-side teamwork. For instance, teacher induction, more than likely will be the responsibility of the professional learning coach which is not as much time and work vs the alt license which probably more of the lift will be by the exec director, meaning teaching the classes and the supervision. As I said a few moments ago, we will need to look at the numbers and what is going to be the best way to approach this? It could very well be that the professional learning coach does all the teacher induction and the executive director does the alternative licensure. That may be the better direction so that it's completely delineated. I think the idea that the person that comes on board knows that they're going to be a part of facilitating both programs or either one.

Brian: That's helpful. One last question I have, is in the past we kind of moved from facilitating both getting the resources and the classes they needed for alternative licensure to really teaching more of the alternative licensure. What's your vision in terms of will we continue as we are now, teaching the curriculum?

Tina: Yes, we will continue teaching because that is what we are authorized to do so there will be direct teaching which we feel it is very important and a powerful piece of the program. I myself was trained in one of the major components of the Classroom Instruction That Works through McREL. Then the English language portion is included in that as well. That program is at least 50 percent direct instruction. Which we desperately need to continue to do.

Brian: I'm assuming that's been a crucial element from superintendents' perspectives in terms of just the challenge of hiring rural teachers and promoting from within, so to speak, with the alternative licensure?

Darrin: Yes.

C. Executive Director Evaluation Draft (attachment 5)

D. NW BOCES Services & Program Evaluation Draft (attachment 6)

Tina: This isn't specifically my evaluation but we had conversation regarding the need to update the evaluation document and then I had asked for the executive director evaluation to be separated out from the programs and services evaluation because it was clumped into one and it was hard to separate and privacy with my own

evaluation. So I could share with my staff the programs and services and what our districts are thinking as far as how are we doing. This is a rough draft of what how it would look if we wanted to maintain the ratings and the questions asked. Obviously, it will be put in a Google Doc-type form that you will respond to and then we will collect the data. More than likely, it will be myself collecting that with Megan's assistance, and yours as well, Brian. This is how I have it at this point. Once key question I have of everybody: If you look at the Programs and Services Evaluation, I took from the old document and what we are doing currently and listed every program and option that folks in the districts, superintendents would want to respond to. If I'm missing something, please let me know. On the executive director evaluation, I believe the questions are pretty good. At this time, I don't have any suggestions for additional questions but I'm quite open to additional questions or changes, whatever the case may be. My thought on the timeline would be that we could work through this and then come the March board meeting, have a finalized version that everybody could respond to.

Brian: I think it's been helpful in the past to have 2 ways of evaluating each of these programs. One being some type of scale on how valuable or important the program is and then the second being your assessment of how effective it is. Because I think when it comes to prioritizing and strategy and so forth it's good to have a weigh-in on the programs that folks think are most beneficial or most important and then it might present an appropriate time to ask for perspective on programs that they feel may be appropriate to drop off or add on for new priorities. This gives us an assessment of the status quo but it doesn't give us directions as far as what else would you like to see or what else is needed. I don't know if you get different information than you do just from conversations or meetings. What say you all to those questions? Do think it's helpful to know value or importance as well as level of effectiveness.

Jane: Who answers these questions? I'm hoping it's not the board members.

Brian: That's a great question. What we've done in the past is try to involve the board but capture the superintendents who he or she would be more connected with the programs, is to have them work cooperatively, so they get together and do it together. That way you get information that may become valuable to the conversation as we review this (performance) and it's a great learning opportunity because you learn more. Your superintendent may say this is probably one of the most important things that they do or this might be something that I don't use at all, kind of a thing and that helps you know more about your district in relation to the BOCES. So I think it becomes valuable insight. It's a little tricky to coordinate but I think it's helpful to spend time together on it. Any different or other opinions?

Kim: There is no way I could answer any of this fairly, without some input.

Tina: Brad will be able to help you. In the past, he has indicated that he has sat down with the board members and gone through all of the questions.

Brian: Technically, they could just do it but then you would still not have working knowledge of how they feel about how things are going so if it's possible to coordinate, that would be preferential.

Tina: I will continue to take feedback, it doesn't have to end tonight, but I can put this in the format that you would actually see and submit as far as an evaluation. Then will be collected and collated into one document that is shared.

Brian: One of the challenges as far as process has always been the question from participants in terms of confidentiality as well as anonymity.

Tina: How it's been set up in the past, there has been both. I have no idea if it's North Park answering or Hayden or SR. I know that there's an answer but I don't know which district or which superintendent it is.

Brian: Occasionally the answer might give it away.

Tina: Occasionally it might.

Brian: Would you agree or disagree that we continue to attempt to do it anonymously and confidentially? Any objection to that?

No objections noted.

Brian: For that purpose, it's ended up being a challenge for, in the past it's been the president, but there may be someone more capable in the group. In the past, we've worked with staff members to help set it up but then the results have been isolated and directed to one of the board members and then disseminated to the board.

Tina: My recommendation would be since Megan has been working with me on this and since I trust Megan implicitly, just to have her help with the set up and send it out and go forth.

Brian: Megan, I can also share the format and system the Hayden School District uses. It's essential in terms of compiling, the times that's involved in compiling and also reporting. That's been the challenge with the Google doc is to get it to look condensed into a readable format. I will help you connect with Tammy Delaney, district secretary.

Megan: ok

Jane: Is this something where the input of the staff would be important?

Brian: Good question. This particular method doesn't involve staff but that is a question that comes up from time to time. When and where do staff have an opportunity and should we be doing more of a 360 evaluation so that everyone else... When you look at this instrument from a staff perspective, some of these items are more well known by the superintendent, some more by the staff and some more by the service providers so that becomes a little bit important in how the questions are raised, who the delivery would be. What's your feeling about that? Would you like to see more of a comprehensive evaluation?

Jane: We at Soroco, do a 360. We get reports from the staff because they answer the same questions but you know, then the board makes the final evaluation and you know when it's coming from staff so you have an awareness of their breadth of knowledge and can add to it. It can be really important to uncovering an issue or something like that.

Brian: I think staff and service providers; I think you said in orientation that there are 40. Is that right?

Tina: Yes.

Brian: But that includes the ones that work directly with BOCES because another tier are the people in the district that work with the BOCES staff both in BOCES or in their building.

Tina: The unique situation that I have is that, except for maybe 5 of the service providers, they never see me because they're out in the field or on this side of the pass. We don't interact a whole lot except maybe occasionally via email. I'm not opposed to staff [input]. I think it's fine and wonderful. There are some problematic challenges with BOCES executive director and staff because of the nature of the business. Definitely office staff, the 10 folks I work with on a very close basis, that would be easy and they would be able to answer most anything.

Brian: Are you telling us that that's extensive enough at least for this program? The direct BOCES staff? Anyone disagree?

No objections noted.

Brian: It might be interesting to have staff perspective look through the questions and identify if there are things that would be useful to the executive director to know about relative to both board and superintendents as well as staff.

Tina: I'm very fine with that. So when we prepare all this, it will include superintendents, BOCES board members and the 10 office staff of the BOCES.

Brian: Yes and we'll have to do a branching so that we can separate out the feedback.

Tina: Yes, we will get the technology work out and get in touch with Tammy.

Brian: Any other input.

None noted.

E. Special Education Report                      Trish Cook, Special Education Director

- Disproportionality Letter from CDE (attachment 7)

Brian: We will talk about the Special Education report now.

Tina: I will ask Trish to talk about the letter we received. You have a copy in your packet. It is from CDE, addressed to Dear. Ms. Cook.

Tina: Essentially, a very new requirement of the State of Colorado receiving federal funds is to look within the state at a particular aspect and that aspect is called disproportionality or significant disproportionality and you might think of that in terms of ethnicity and race. Essentially, what they are looking at is any administrative unit over identifying kids in a particular realm. How they decided to do it was they looked at 3 years' worth of data with the last year being 18/19 so this data going 3 years back. We received a letter on November 22nd, that

indicated that BOCES was identified for significant disproportionality in one area and that is American Indian/Native Alaskan. After that time until right before Christmas, we've been contacted about that information. They provided us a listing of students over the years and then they gave us a handbook right before Christmas. Since that time we have been in contact with Paul Foster who is the head of the Special Education Unit at CDE. I requested that he assign a mentor to us, and he has done so, to look at this issue and really delve into it. We have that scheduled for next Monday and Tina, Chloe, and I will be part of that discussion group. Prior to that though, Chloe and I have been digging deeply into the data. We have been looking very closely at what was reported and then Chloe has been digging into something called the data pipeline and asking is that accurate information? I've also been in touch with all the districts and all of your data people within the districts from East Grand all the way to Steamboat to verify the names and what we are finding out is that the data is not accurate.

Tina: CDE does not have the accurate data.

Trish: So, come Monday morning, Chloe has prepared a list based on what we've been able to find as we dug through the data going back 3 years. We will be providing and presenting that information to them. Then we will have to talk about next steps: If there's something systematic within BOCES that we need to look at and make sure that we are reporting accurate data and that they are receiving and looking at accurate data as well. There is a big process. Apparently in the state of Colorado, there are 3 districts, 2 are metro districts, really big districts and one little rural district who is us. Again with that category of American Indian/Native Alaskan, you can probably picture that there are not that many within our BOCES region and we have identified that so we are prepared on Monday to talk with them. We are just putting this out as information to you that this is one of the procedural challenges that we need to go through and address and we will have more information.

Brian: So it's not that we don't have the population, it's that they were under reported or over reported?

Trish: They were over reported. They sent us quite a long list and according to guidelines that they produced, your (n), your number of students per year, needs to be 10 or more and as we look back at the last 3 years, our numbers are 5, 9, 7. So we've got basis and a lot of data to share with them. So we are going to go forward with sharing that data.

Tina: Because this is a new revised process for CDE, they are looking to us, I'm not sure about the other districts, to kind of help them through this process and are open to suggestions in this conversation. Obviously there are consequences if you are found disproportionate but in my conversations with CDE, they are very open to let's take a look and see where we are with this rather than saying, "Oops, sorry, that's it." Which is not necessarily the normal procedure from CDE but in this case that's definitely what I'm getting as the intention and Monday's meeting will be really important to set that ground work and next steps. Trish and Chloe have done a great job in preparing all of the data to take to that meeting regarding count and identification, etc. And then, as Trish said, these are always learning experiences we well for us so if we need to tighten and look at our data reporting for SPED at the district level and making sure we are all on the same page with these particular students, then we will do that. You are always looking at ways to improve and make sure your data is absolutely correct.

Chloe: Just one point of clarification, if we are found to be significantly disproportionate, then the consequence of that is that we have to set aside 15% of our FIDEA allocation which is about \$150k and spend it on early

intervention and professional development mainly targeted at improving our processes. So there is a lot at stake financially but, as Trish said, the data is showing that we are under the threshold in these new regulations so we are confident that we will be able to steer around this. I think it is an important topic because these thresholds of disproportionality are kind of ratcheting down year by year so even though there are only 3 LEAs in the state that have been identified it might be a bigger problem next year or the year after that.

#### F. Alternative Principal Licensure - Future Changes to the Program

- Letter from CDE (attachment 8)

Tina: The NWBOCES has had the alternative principal license for a number of years now and we went through an official reauthorization process with the department of education last year, in 2018. In order to have alternative teacher license and to have alternative principal license, you have to be authorized by the department of education so we went through the process. It's lengthy and a lot involved but it's a learning experience as well. At the time, not much was said about the principal alternative licensure program but apparently, this past year and department of education just received their official opinion from the attorney general that the alternative licensure statute talks only about BOCES or authorizing agencies the ability to authorize and give alternative license. It does not authorize BOCES or agencies such as ours to authorize alternative principal licensure and so the department of education has had to take a couple of steps back and make adjustments. So as we move forward after the end of this school year, if you have an alternative principal licensure candidate in your school or district, the licensure process will be the responsibility of the district to go through the process, work with the principal candidate and follow through. Now there is full awareness at the department and even myself that many districts really don't have the time or the capacity and maybe the expertise to do so. The BOCES directors who all handle these programs are working with the Department of Education right now to ask and to have clarified if a district needed an alternative principal licensure candidate to step into a principal position, could they contract with a BOCES that already had a program to complete it. We could conduct the program, whatever that may be but the district, by statute, would have to apply, approve the individualized principal plan which is part of the process and work with that principal, sign off saying they've completed all of the work. One of the interesting thing is that this individualized learning plan, which is multiple pages by the way, and we've had 2 principals in our region complete that because we had that as part of our process already, although for many it's a new part of their process – those big plans. They are about 8-10 pages long. One was in North Park and one was in South Routt that we've already been involved using that. You would still have to sign off as the district but the BOCES could do everything else. You would just be the official signer and the approver but these individualized plans have to be submitted to the Department of Education. So the Department of Education is going to review and approve all of the alternative principal license candidates in the state. They are indicating that they do not have the capacity to do that. Everybody is trying to figure out, with this attorney general opinion, what's going to happen next. We know, as the NWBOCES, we no longer can authorize and sign off on a principal alternative license. We know that we will never be able to do that again. We do know that work is in progress and nothing indicates that a district couldn't contract with us to say, "I have an alternative principal license this year. We need to contract with you to really carry out the program. We'll be a part of it but you're going to do the heavy lift of what all needs to be done and then when it's all done, we'll sign off this principal plan and submit it to the Department of Education. Does that make sense?

Brian: Yeah, it's a lot. Basically, the district has to put it together but the someone else has to provide it? And then the districts need to agree that it was provided?

Tina: Yes.

Brian: That's kind of convoluted.

Tina: Yes, it is. Right now I'm making you aware. We've only had 3 alternative principal license in the past 3 years. We don't have that many. Other BOCES have had like 30, that's quite the number. I'm not finding this a critical mass of folks to be concerned about but, as I heard from the superintendents, it's something that we need to work and how are we going to proceed forward with making sure we have support for our districts to provide this licensing program for a principal that they would like to hire.

Brian: I'm curious if the superintendents feel that this would be more or less awkward for the staff person wanting to pursue alternative licensure. We're talking about someone who has already been selected as a principal that needs to get the license, right? So they wouldn't have selected them if they didn't think they were a good candidate.

Tina: Right.

Matt: My perspective from North Park is that we don't have all of the necessary resources or those who can provide the experience that they want, that BOCES provides for candidates. That's why I encourage Tina to think about, again, providing the resources and support necessary to get those experiences as well as all of the professional learning community experiences with other principals.

Brain: So you're defining it but then you're asking BOCES to really carry it out and then come back to you to say, "We've accomplished all of these learning opportunities that you've outlined."?

Matt: Why reinvent the wheel when we have something that we think is very effective and productive. There's nothing in the way that CDE really handles it that prevents us from basically subcontracting back to the BOCES.

Tina: And what Ed describes is what the 6 other BOCES, there are 6 BOCES that have an alternative principal license program and that's what all 6 BOCES directors were saying, "We can just continue the programming we have. Why reinvent the wheel?" But we'll have to come up with some type of contractual agreement so it's all very clean and legal and CDE can support it and sign off saying we've done everything we're supposed to do.

Ed: What's the reasoning for sending this letter out?

Tina: The reasoning is that they've been waiting for quite a while to get the opinion from the attorney general. There was a concern with what was stated in the statute and what wasn't stated in the statute. They realized nothing in the statute talked about principal licensure. It was only about teacher alternative licensure. So that's where it all started.

Tina: That's all I have.

Brian: I guess to some degree, the districts probably just need to be more dialed in to what that person needs. In the case of teachers, it's general, instructional, and so forth so that's maybe more generic but that allows the districts to tailor it.

Tina: The principal program is a little bit more individualized.

## **XI. Discussion and Update Items**

**7:00 PM**

### **A. District information sharing**

Brian: District information sharing is a time we give districts an opportunity to talk about what may be going on in your district as well as an opportunity to ask questions - if you're concerned about something and you want to get input from other districts and what they're doing and it's a chance to collect perspectives on best practices. Any district information sharing. Matt, would you like to begin?

Matt: Sure. We had freezing temperatures in North Park and frozen pipes in the lunchroom. We're encouraging kids to bring packed lunches so they can eat.

Brian: I'll mention that Hayden is progressing on schedule with the new facility. We finally got through the process of getting our additional classrooms added since we merged all of the grades and all of the students into one kind of convoluted facility in the meantime. So that is going exceptionally well considering that folks have had to be very accommodating to do that. The biggest issue on the docket right now is that we're in collaborative conversations with the town of Hayden who has elected to try to remodel the old facility that we're vacating for community use, particularly the section of the building with the most recent build but still, obviously not to code or up to spec or we wouldn't be building a new school. However, they also think that it would be nice if we just gave it to them so that's been the sticky point. I will refresh your memory that when we voted, the bond passed by 6 or 8 votes after cheering? the votes...so word on the street is that the other half of the community didn't vote for it because, "we want to continue to use the auditory and the gym and we think you ought to just give it to the town because we paid for it anyway and it ours. The town's ours and the school's ours." So it's been an interesting conversation to weigh the school board's responsibility to protect assets that are for education albeit paid for by the community and so forth and the town's desire to just say, "What's ours is ours and what's yours is ours." So it's been an interesting dynamic. They wanted us to just give it to them. There was some extreme compromise but we're still working all that through to see if it's feasible. They still have to engage a lot of resources to remodel the facility. The school knows the facility very intimately so we're probably more questioning of their assessment of what it will take to get it all up to speed. As you know, with BEST grants and so forth, the grant is intended to abate and level the buildings and if we don't do that then it will become someone else's responsibility to abate and demolish and re-engineer.

Darrin: West Grand was awarded the Colorado All Pupils Grant so that is partner-shipped with Mountain Parks Electric and their power providers, Tri-State. West Grand will be getting, this summer, a full-size route bus that is electric. The best part is that it will be at no cost to us. There is actually a great partnership with East Grand and West Grand School Districts with Colorado Succeeds, Colorado Education Initiative for the Homegrown

Talent Initiative which is allowing the 2 school districts to work collaboratively with a lot of our business resources here in the community to develop career pathways and some really authentic learning opportunities for our students for internships, job shadowing, so really good, exciting stuff. We're actually hosting Colorado Succeeds and CEI? next week (70:58), the 2 districts together - an evening in Granby and a full day here so we're really excited. We are one of 8 groups in the state that are part of that grant.

Brian: Congratulations!

Ed: A lot of stuff [from East Grand], obviously the CTE program which is very exciting. I think it really fits a niche. Right before Christmas Break, we had a school shooting threat which was very educational. The one big takeaway was that your communication has to be often and impactful. The worst part of it was the Grand County rumor mill. Everybody was an expert and everyone could tell you that they knew what was happening. Hopefully none of you have to go through that but if you do, you need to communicate often and impactfully. Obviously there are a lot of things you cannot share with kids and privacy rights. Fortunately, it was more of a threat than anything else. It was more of a cry for help.

Brain: You do learn a lot from that and you're hosting the Threat Assessment that is coming up so that's timely. It does spark everyone's interest and until you've been through a drill or a situation, you don't know what you don't know.

Ed: You can train all you want...we did discover that our protocols that are in place were good and worked. Safe To Tell can be tedious but it worked really well. Our relationships with the Granby Police Department worked really well. There are a lot of good things that came out of it - our protocols and our trainings that were in place were good but like I said, that was the biggest takeaway was the communication aspect. It needs to be more impactful, more timely and a lot more often.

Brian: Steamboat?

Kim: A lot going on in Steamboat. Our focus should be on the new school but we've had a lot of distraction. I think it's a good opportunity. We're bringing in an outside consultant to look at the culture of the high school. I think there's a lot to be gained and learned. I'm open to it and I think the board is open to it.

Brain: Yeah I think it was a difficult time...? It kind of came right after the election but I think the responses have been appropriate and hopefully the process will be helpful. Anything else? No? Ok.

## B. Future agenda items

Brian: Future Agenda Items: Anything that needs to come to the forefront?

Tina: I would say for the March meeting; we will obviously have the executive director evaluation which will be an executive session. We will also bring to the table for review the MOU between districts and the BOCES. We are not recommending, at this point, any changes to that MOU but since we have new board

members, just a review and understanding. Then what happens is that MOU goes to each district board for review approval and then we approve all the final ones at the following meeting and we're all good to go for the next year. The MOU really delineates and outlines how we cooperate and work with each other and then too it outlines if there are any legal issues regarding special education and how it's handled so it's a good document to have, clear guidelines.

Brian: Anything else? No, then we'll move on to action items.

## **XII. Action Items**

**7:15 PM**

### **A. FY20 Revised Budget Approval and Adoption of Appropriation Resolution (attachment 9)**

Brian: The FY20 Revised budget has been presented, the 2020 version.

Chloe: Obviously this is a revised budget that will reflect changes since the budget that was adopted in June. We got feedback in superintendent meetings that the way we assessed districts should always be explained in a budget presentation. So district assessments are calculated based on our general fund cost. Half of the costs are divided evenly between districts and the remaining half are allocated using total pupil count. Just to recap on what happened earlier in the year, we had suggested a partial refund of district assessment this year because of the budget surplus of about \$75,000 but at the last board meeting, the board voted to keep that money in reserve so this budget reflects that change. It also reflects, in the narrative on page 2, that we've switched our dental and vision insurance back to CEBT. That was approved in the last board meeting and it makes mention of staffing changes that have happened during the year such as the professional learning coordinator resigning and also our contracting with an agency to provide SLPs after one of our speech/language pathologists resigned in October. Those are the only thing I wanted to highlight in the narrative. Just continuing to turn pages, on page 4 is the Appropriating Resolution which is required by statute. Pages 5 and 6 is staff budget. It's a little bit small because we had a formatting issue but it's the usual format. It's showing all of our employees with salaries and any step/cost of living increases during the year and benefit costs for a total. Then on page 6, staff costs are separated out by fund and program. Those dollar amounts tie out to the detail schedules that follow later on. Pages 7 and 8 are our new salary schedules that the board approved for this year. Page 9 is the budget summary page that shows revenues and expenditures and fund balances separated out to general fund and the grant fund and then within the grant fund, each grant. There's distinction between federal and state funds on the revenue side. Then on the expenditure side, you'll see money that is spent at the BOCES level and then there's a separate column for amounts that have flowed through to our member districts. I'm going to skip over pages 10-15 because that's a CDE required form that I can't really explain, other than saying that. On page 16 is line item detail that corresponds to the format in our quarterly financial statements that you'll see at the next board meeting. Starting on page 16, that's general fund revenues and you'll see columns for prior year actuals and then this year's revised January budget. There's also a change column so you can see what's changed. For example, we've increased the revenue budget for alternative licensure by \$25k because we have more candidates than originally projected. They pay \$5k. That's the candidate fee. On page 17 you'll see general fund expenditures. Page 18 is ECEA which is our state special education revenue. One thing to point out on that page, if you look in the change column about a third of the way down, there's an amount of \$64k. That's a big change. That is the agency contract that we signed to hire an independent contractor SLP. That's a big budget item but on the flip side, we are spending less money on SLP employees. There was definitely a cost increase associated with that

change but it was not \$64k. I think the net impact was \$25k or something like that. Continuing on the next page, 19, is IDEA Federal Special Education funds. Title funds is just we have a Tile III consortium because the districts that are included in that consortium don't have enough of an allocation do be able to even claim it unless they form a consortium with other districts. Then on page 20, the i3 SEED grant which is going away at the end of the fiscal year but is included in this revised budget. Carl Perkins federal funds that are flowed through to member districts for CTE programs.

Tina: Carl Perkins is the career technical education, if you are not aware. I know we talked about that at the orientation.

Brian: Yes, you mentioned that there was a big change with it though.

Chloe: Yes, we're just in the process of transitioning to Perkins 5, that's what CCCS is calling it so there is new legislation governing those funds. We're learning as we go on how that's going to look. Our coordinator is Krista Shank who is the CTE teacher in Moffat County and I'm glad we have her because otherwise, that would be tough.

Tina: We will have more conversation as we become more aware of all the details in our budget process for next year. We will give you more information. We're still learning what all is going to take place.

Chloe: On page 21, House Bill 1345 BOCES regional grant which pays for Collab and then gifted is on page 22. There's even more detail on page 23 for a few different budget categories. Page 24 and on shows district assessment and flow through. So there's a page for each district in alphabetical order. Page 24 is East Grand. Up at the top, you see what you're paying us and again half of the costs are divided evenly between districts so everyone has that dollar amount of \$30,820 up at the top. Every district pays that and then the second amount is allocated based on pupil count. Then the bottom half of this sheet shows the money that we're paying you. ECEA is the state special education funds and we pay an amount to each district using the same formula as the general fund assessments. Then gifted funds are flowed through, Carl Perkins, and for some, but not all of the districts, there are Title III funds. If you don't see Title III funds for your district, that's because you're claiming it directly because you get more than \$10k. At the very back there is more detail on the assessment calculations, showing every district's funded pupil count. You will also see that Moffat District, which is an associate member, a non-voting member at the BOCES, pays a fee of about \$20k for the programs and services that they participate in. On the very back page, page 31, you will see the calculation of flow-through amounts to each school district, both for ECA state special education funds and gifted and talented funds. And that's it. No further discussion.

On motion by North Park, seconded by East Grand, it is hereby resolved to approve and adopt the revised January 2020 Budget.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

## B. Moving Forward Beyond i3 SEED Grant - Scenario D (attachment 10)

Brian: Next on the agenda is the discussion of the transition following the i3 SEED grant expiration. Scenario D is the document that we're reviewing at this time.

Tina: I, or Chloe, am not making any suggestions or changes from what the sups have recommended for us to proceed next year and how the board discussion from last time. Basically if you go through each of the asterisks:

- No change in administrative structure: full time executive director, fulltime SPED director, fulltime assistant SPED director.
- We would maintain current office staff except, obviously the professional learning coordinator which was Julie Dalke. The job description would be revised and it would be a 0.8 position, meaning 4-day work week or so many days per year, however that contract may look.
- The 2 professional learning coaches, the innovation coaches that were paid through the i3 grant, their positions would end as of June 30th.
- Professional Learning: Because so much of the professional learning that we've had has been paid through the i3 grant, we will see what we are able to offer through general fund or our 1345 State Assistance, but if and as needs arise, it could be that we would offer professional learning but there would be a fee for the participants from each district and we would bill the district for that. That is actually something we did prior to the grant.
- We would look at how we could reduce COLLAB day budget by \$10,000. We believe that is quite easily, more than likely able to be done with no issues. Other non-staff budget reductions, looking at \$15,000. Just looking at each line item and what we could do to make everything work.
- The potential increase in district assessments: a grand total of \$3,724. If you look below that, you will see what your estimated allocation amounts will look like. It is pretty minimal.
- There are some assumptions made here: No staff turnover of any major proportion, no step increases and no increase in employer-paid health insurance cost. We always have that hope. But as far as step in salary, that is always a separate conversation because we wait to see what the districts do and then we have conversation with the sups on what can we do to continue to be as competitive as possible with our salary schedule.
- The 1345, the Sate Regional funds: Basically, the priorities with the approximate \$130,000 we receive will pay for COLLAB and our profession learning coordinator/coach position
- The superintendents, along with your agreement, have identified the priorities. If we are to look at what do we want to see with our BOCES? What are the services and programs we feel are the most important? It would obviously be special education, alternative licensure, induction, and English language learners - the new professional licensing requirements. Those would be our focus. Those would be where we would expend our energy and time and recourses and anything beyond that would be discussion and as needs arise. I know Chloe included some detailed info regarding the impact on general fund, the different line items of expenditures and how that would look. You can review and look through. I'm not sure it's necessary for me to go through each one unless anybody has questions for me or Chloe on how this breaks out. As I said before, we have clear direction with no problem as we move forward with how this structure will be that priorities and funding and completely understand that increases to district assessments are

extremely challenging and not something that is feasible. We need to look within what we have and move forward and we will do our absolute best in providing quality as we always have.

Brian: Any input? Matt?

Matt: Thank you for giving us the numbers. I appreciate that. My question is when we adopt this, this is the goal of what we're going to develop next year and budget off of, right?

Tina: Yes.

Matt: So this gets us a start for where we're going to be working from for next year's budget, 20/21. Ok?

Chloe: I would say yes to that as far as the assumptions that are stated and the dollar amounts for districts but one thing I wanted to point out was that that detail was prepared using the adopted budget numbers because I wanted it to be something that had already been published that people could refer back to, if that makes sense. Whereas now the board has adopted a revised budget so really when I start building next year's budget, I will be using out revised budget that the board just adopted as my starting point. Does that make sense?

Matt: Yes, Chloe, thanks for that explanation.

Brian: This format is easier to understand so that we're not trying to do mental gymnastics to figure it out so that's helpful.

Brian: What level of contingency is built into this?

Tina: Our reserves: \$474,000, so it's within our policy. I will add one statement that this structure is very similar, not exactly, to the staff and such that we had before the grand came on board. So, it's not as if this is something totally new, just a few adjustments.

Brian: You have returned back to a semblance of the starting point?

Tina: Yes.

Brian: This is listed as an action item, are you asking approval of Scenario D format for staffing structure and budgeting?

Tina: Yes.

Brian: Does anyone have a motion to that effect and a second?

On motion by Steamboat, seconded by East Grand, it is hereby resolved to approve Scenario D.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

Brian: It's always a difficult thing to go the other directions so thank you for the process and for complying to the requests along the way.

Tina: We've tried our best.

Brain: I know it's challenging when people are involved.

- C. Policy DAB-E Manual Exhibit Financial Administration - Timeline for Online Posting of Financial Information – First Reading (attachment 11)
- D. Policy JLF-R Reporting Child Abuse/Child Protection – First Reading (attachment 12)
- E. Policy EHC Safeguarding Personal Identifying Information – First Reading (attachment 13)

Chloe: There are 3 things listed, one is an exhibit, one is a regulation and one is a policy. I think technically, the board only needs to take action on the policy but we included any change to the policy manual, bring it in front of the board.

Tina: That's my comfort zone. Your responsibility is policy, even if we put an exhibit to share with you as well.

Chloe: So with the financial administration, the only change in wording here is to reflect the fact that the financial transparency law is fully implemented because it was kind of a phase process. At one point we had to post check registers on the website and so on but this is what is currently required and CDE checks it so we have to stay on top of that. And then the regulation, is just more information about obligations for reporting child abuse. We do have the policy in the policy manual but we felt that it would be helpful to include the regulation as well because it just gives more information on reporting requirements.

Tina: And BOCES staff are just as required as any education and it's always good that we remind our BOCES staff.

Chloe: This is exactly the CASB sample regulation. Then the last one is a new policy that we are required to adopt by law regarding safeguarding PII and again it is exactly the CASB language.

Brian: This is not one that we had in place?

Chloe: No, we didn't have it in place. It came out relatively recently.

Brian: It's been our practice but it puts a policy behind it.

Tina: And we felt that it should be in policy, that it's very clear to our staff what we do.

Chloe: And it's required by law for it to be in policy.

Brian: Because these are policy changes, we do need to approve them individually. First Reading on Policy DAB-E, do we have a motion and a second?

On motion by East Grand, seconded by South Routt, it is hereby resolved to approve First Reading on Policy DAB-E.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

Brian: First reading passes. We'll have a second and final reading at the next meeting. Ok, next Policy JLF-R, Reporting Child Abuse/Child Protection. Do we have motion and a second to approve this addition to the policy manual?

On motion by East Grand, seconded by West Grand, it is hereby resolved to approve the First Reading of policy JLF-R.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

Brian: First Reading passes, we'll have a second reading at the next meeting.  
Final Policy EHC – Safeguarding Personal Information. Motion and a second requested.

On motion by East Grand, seconded by West Grand, it is hereby resolved to approve the First Reading of policy EHC.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

Brian: Next, we do have some items to discuss in Executive Session. The Chair would entertain a motion pursuant to section pursuant to section 24-6-402 (4) (f) for purposes of discussion of personnel matters relating to the evaluation and contract of the BOCES Executive Director. Those present at the Executive Session would be the BOCES board and the executive director.

On motion by East Grand, seconded by Steamboat, it is hereby approved to move into Executive Session.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park – Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat – Yes	West Grand – Yes

Motion carried 6 to 0. Motion approved.

**X. Executive Session**

Pursuant to Section 24-6-402 (4) (f) for purposes of discussion of personnel matters.

A. Executive Director Evaluation/Contract

- Executive Session took place

**XI. Adjournment**

On motion by East Grand, seconded by Steamboat, it is hereby resolved to adjourn the Board meeting at 7:55 P.M.

Roll Call Vote:	East Grand - Yes	Hayden - Yes	North Park - Yes
	South Routt - Yes	Steamboat - Yes	West Grand - Yes

**XII. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned.**