district five
OF LEXINGTON & RICHLAND COUNTIES

Minutes/May 21, 2012

The Board of Trustees of School District Five of Lexington and Richland Counties met at CrossRoads Middle School with the following members present:

Mr. Robert Gantt, Chairman
Mrs. Beth Burn Watson, Vice Chairman
Mrs. Ellen Baumgardner, Secretary
Mrs. Jan Hammond
Mrs. Kim Murphy
Mr. Jim Turner
Mr. Ed White
Dr. Stephen Hefner, District Superintendent

The following staff were in attendance:

Ms. Helen Anderson, Chief Instructional Services Officer
Dr. Angela Bain, Chief Human Resource Services Officer
Dr. Karl Fulmer, Chief Financial Services Officer
Mr. Michael Harris, Director, Student Services
Mr. Keith McAlister, Director, New Design and Construction
Mr. Buddy Price, Director, Office of Community Services

Chairman Robert Gantt called the meeting to order and gave welcoming remarks.

The Invocation was given by Buddy Price. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Robert King, a student at Irmo High School.

The School Board Spotlight was led by Robert Gantt, Beth Watson and Ellen Baumgardner.

During the superintendent's report, Dr. Hefner gave a Vision 2015 presentation along with Barry Lindler, Peter Lauzon and Amy Carter; and Dr. Fulmer presented the monthly financial reports (Exhibit B).

During the public participation, Craig Young spoke regarding communication; Peter Lauzon spoke regarding the IPAD initiative; and Elizabeth Knott spoke regarding raises for all employees.

Buddy Price presented the committee's recommendation for the name of the new high school (Exhibit E).

Beth Watson presented a proposed resolution requesting flexibility for state funded instructional materials (Exhibit F).

SCHOOL DISTRICT FIVE
OF
LEXINGTON AND RICHLAND COUNTIES

Meeting of May 21, 2012

		BAUMGARDNER	GANTT	HAMMOND	MURPHY	TURNER	WATSON	WHITE
1.	M. Baumgardner S. Hammond	X	X	X	X	X	A	X
	Enter executive session to consider the following: a) selected employment items (Exhibit A); and b) personnel matters related to the organization of the District's Administrative Staff for 2012-2013							
2.	M. Watson S. Baumgardner	X	X	X	No	X	X	X
	Approve the agenda							
3.	M. Turner S. Baumgardner	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Move item 12 (first reading approval of the 2012-2013 General Fund Budget) to the end of the agenda (Exhibit D)							
4.	M. Baumgardner S. Hammond	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Approve the selected employment items (Exhibit A)							
5.	M. Watson S. Baumgardner							
	Approve the resolution for the issuance and sale of general obligation bonds as recommended by the administration in Exhibit C							
	M. Murphy S. Turner	No	No	No	X	No	No	No
	Amend and place on the discussion agenda to be voted on at the June 11 meeting							
	Vote on the original motion	X	X	X	No	X	X	X
6.	M. Watson S. Hammond	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Approve the minutes of the May 7, 2012 board meeting with the correction of Mr. Turner's name							

A = Absent
AB = Abstain
N = No
X = Yes
R = Recuse

SCHOOL DISTRICT FIVE
OF
LEXINGTON AND RICHLAND COUNTIES

Meeting of May 21, 2012

		BAUMGARDNER	GANTT	HAMMOND	MURPHY	TURNER	WATSON	WHITE
7.	M. Watson S. Baumgardner Give first reading approval of the 2012-2013 General Fund Budget as presented by the District Administration (Exhibit D)							
	M. Baumgardner S. Watson End the meeting at 10 p.m.	X	X	X	No	X	X	X
	Vote on the first reading of the 2012-2013 General Fund Budget	X	X	AB	No	AB	X	X
8.	M. Watson S. Baumgardner Adjourn at 10:05 p.m.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

A = Absent
AB = Abstain
N = No
X = Yes
R = Recuse

As many of you may know from a recent newspaper article, Dr. Hefner stated in an email to the Board on May 17, 2012, that he is willing for the discussion regarding his evaluation to be conducted in public. That meeting will be held on June 11, 2012. At that meeting, the Board will have before it the report from Dr. Hefner containing the materials relative to his goals (the required actions from the District's 2010 SACS-CASI accreditation visit), which will serve as the basis for Dr. Hefner's evaluation. The public is welcome to attend the meeting.

Attachment 1 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Robert Gantt pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item "For The Record" requested by **Robert Gantt** for attachment to the Minutes.

The State
South Carolina's Homepage™

Posted on Sat, May. 19, 2012

District 5 schools chief favors public evaluation

By TIM FLACH
tflach@thestate.com

Lexington-Richland 5 school superintendent Stephen Hefner endorsed an open evaluation of his performance Friday.

His decision dampened a fuss that threatened to steal focus from what supporters consider progress he's fostered in classrooms in Chapin, Irmo and Dutch Fork.

Hefner urged the school board to "proceed in this manner" of rating him in public to allay controversy over the traditional method of a review behind closed doors, with a summary made available later.

He is likely to get his way as the seven board members undertake their assessment next month, Hefner's first since taking over supervision of schools in January 2011, following 16 years in the same role at Richland 2.

Support for doing what Hefner favors appears strong, board chairman Robert Gantt said.

"There's been no pushback against doing it that way," he said.

The approach was settled on after a leader of the South Carolina Press Association complained about the possibility of an evaluation in which school lawyers would take part and could keep secret, even in limited form.

That option drew fire from association executive director William Rogers, who lives in the district, as obstructing public disclosure and similar to a practice banned by courts.

It's regrettable that the possibility of the review happening that way "generated controversy," Hefner said in an email to board members.

School boards across the Midlands customarily evaluate superintendents privately as a personnel decision — an exception allowed under state open meetings standards — and then release a recap, and possibly more, if asked.

Lexington-Richland 5 has done it in different ways and always privately, but without lawyers polling board members for views, an option suggested this time, Gantt said.

Gantt predicted high marks for Hefner any way the review is done.

"I expect it will be very positive," Gantt said. "I'll be absolutely shocked if it isn't."

Reach Flach at (803) 771-8483.

© 2012 TheState.com and wire service sources. All Rights Reserved. http://www.thestate.com

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Beth Watson** for attachment to the Minutes.

Submitted by Beth Burn Watson
May 21, 2012

Attachment 2 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Beth Watson pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

gmail

Superintendent's Evaluation

Stephen Hefner <shefner@lexrich5.org> Thu, May 17, 2012 at 3:44 PM
To: D5 Board Members <d5-board-members@lex5.k12.sc.us>
Cc: Buddy Price <bprice@lexrich5.org>

I regret that the proposed process for conducting my evaluation has generated controversy.

Please know that I am happy to be in District Five and that I am proud of what we have accomplished since I became superintendent on April 1, 2011. I certainly understand that "nothing is ever so good that it cannot be improved." Thus, I welcome your critique.

If the Board wishes to conduct my evaluation in public, I am more than willing for the evaluation to be conducted in public.

I have shared this sentiment with Mr. Gantt; he is agreeable to conducting the evaluation in public. Unless I hear differently from the Board, I am requesting that we proceed in this manner.

I plan to have a packet of materials for you relative to my goals (the required actions which came out of the District's 2010 SACS-CASI accreditation visit) one week in advance of the June 11 evaluation.

Thanks... Steve Hefner

Attachment 3 is included with the minutes of the 5-12-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Beth Watson pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Beth Watson** for attachment to the Minutes.

For the record, I support this budget but my abstention tonight is to allow time for Dr. Fulmer to bring to the board the cost of a STEP increase for all employees that qualify. We need to reward employees for their hard work and those at the lowest salary need it most. Jan Hammond

Attachment 4 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Jan Hammond pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Jan Hammond** for attachment to the Minutes.

May 21, 2012

Motion to Approve Agenda

I move that we add Item 12a under the Action Agenda:

Approval of the annual evaluation of the superintendent to be held in public session, and that the Board members' written surveys and any other related documents be placed in the superintendent's file and be available to the public under the SC Freedom of Information Act.

Mr. Gantt probihited me from making the above motion by interrupting me in the middle of the motion and calling me out of order.

Please see the attached drument for DISCUSSION of the motion

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

Attachment 5 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Discussion of Motion page 2

I am making this motion for several reasons;

- I want to be sure that the evaluation takes place in a public manner.
- Because some board members were considering conducting the evaluation of the superintendent by using expensive attorneys ~~and assessing the board~~ to contact us individually and privately, with no written notes or comments to place in the file of the superintendent or be available to the public, conducting the evaluation publicly with a motion to do that assures the public we will be open with it. → (CBoard Policy CBI attached)
- Our board policy states that the evaluation will be conducted in Executive Session, I want to be sure that we don't violate board policy.
- I want to be clear on the process we will use.

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

Attachment 6 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise

page 3

Policy CBI »Evaluation« of Superintendent

Issued 11/06

Purpose: To establish the basic structure for board »evaluation« of the superintendent that ensures board accountability to the community.

To maintain leadership and to promote professional excellence and improvement of the superintendent's skills, the board will formally evaluate the superintendent on an annual basis. Each member of the board will be involved in this »evaluation«.

The board will make the »evaluation« on the basis of the board's written statements concerning the abilities needed by, and the responsibilities and duties to be discharged by, the superintendent. The board will give the superintendent a written opinion on his/her abilities and performance in various areas. The document will be given to the superintendent and discussed with him/her in an executive session. The superintendent will be allowed to respond to the »evaluation«. A written summary of the »evaluation« and the superintendent's response will be maintained in the superintendent's personnel file.

The assessment of the superintendent's performance will result in review of his/her job description and appropriate changes to it as needed. It also will establish a foundation for identifying new priorities and objectives to be used as a basis for the next year's »evaluation«. The board may also consider adjustments in the superintendent's contract and rate of compensation on the basis of the »evaluation«.

Adopted 11/16/81; Revised 1/21/85, 11/27/06

SCHOOL DISTRICT FIVE OF LEXINGTON AND RICHLAND COUNTIES

Item "For The Record" requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

Attachment 7 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. § 30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

For the Record:
I am voting "no" on this $149 million budget because again I was not able to get my questions answered and important data necessary to review the budget.

Kim Murphy

5:16 PM (2 minutes ago) May 12, 2012

to ROBERT, EFH, bhwatson, bhwatson, ebaumgar, ekw, EWhite, EBaumgar, ebaumgardner, ewhite, jhammond, janh08, jturner, jimturnjr, kwmurphy, rgantt, shefner, swhefner

Dear Robert,

Though I have now received some partial answers to my questions that were asked some time ago for information purposes and to assist me in the review, prior to the work session two weeks ago, of the now $149 million budget, what I have received has come at the 11th hour.

At the last meeting, I asked if you would allow time during the First Reading discussion tonight for my questions that were not allowed to be asked during the budget work session because the work session adjourned prior to board members' full discussion of the budget. However, the agenda allows only 30 minutes for the entire Action Agenda, including a new item to vote on -- borrowing $15 million. It does not appear that you are going to do what you said you would do.

Again, I believe that providing very limited information to board members, not answering board members' questions and severely limiting the time on the agenda for discsussion of the budget is designed so that board members and the public are left in the dark.

I will not rubber-stamp a budget that has been presented to board members and the public in this manner.

Sincerely,

Kim Murphy

PS I asked for the scope of the IHS project. What you have provided to me is a rendering. Please provide me with the scope of the project.

On Mon, May 21, 2012 at 1:34 PM, ROBERT W GANTT <ganttrw@bellsouth.net> wrote:

Dear Kim,

Attachment 8 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item "For The Record" requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

Dr. Fulmer has reviewed your questions to make certain answers to your questions were included in his response to budget questions at our last board meeting. As you will see in the information attached, he has cross-referenced your questions to the appropriate chart available in the budget book. Those charts are:

Chart 12 for the first question

Chart 14 for the second question

Chart 20 for the final three questions

Attachment 9 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member kim murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

You also asked for the latest McKibbon report by school/grade and for a new and updated budget book, both of which have been provided. Also, your question about the changing scope of work at Irmo High was answered at the last board meeting. Bottom line the only change was moving a transformer

during Phase I (Previously scheduled in Phase II) for student safety reasons and moving a canopy area to Phase II so all materials etc would be done at one time and match. Our construction manager, the architect and engineers along with our District employee all agreed to the minor changes. The overall scope for IHS did not change. Student Safety has and remains the top priority from Day 1 on all District 5 construction projects. We (School District 5) pay Professionals and we need to listen to their advice. They recommended these minor adjustments to the Phasing of the project.

In regards to your concerns about the accuracy of the budget document presented to us for discussion on April 23rd, I believe Dr. Fulmer pointed out that the incorrect information was a result of a programming error by our vendor and was background and secondary data provided only for additional information. That data had no bearing on the General Fund Budget being proposed, all of which was complete and accurate. When the vendor has corrected the programming error, a new budget document will be provided to all board members.

Your concerns about the budget process and its fairness are unfounded. Before our budget is approved we will have had a discussion, two readings and a work session and as we all can see, very in depth questions answered by our staff. That is four opportunities, in public, to ask questions and voice concerns. I would also remind you that the budget continues to evolve during the approval process. Changes are common between meetings due to input from the board and funding changes made as the legislature finalizes education funding within the State Budget. From discussion, work sessions, first and second reading changes are likely due to the status of the House and Senate versions, found money from time to time by the State, and conference committee results. In addition, our staff has been and will be reporting those changes while continuing to answer all of our questions in between these meetings and they are giving as much detail in their answers as possible.

Finally, you are more than welcome to ask the board about having another work session on the budget if you feel that is necessary. I would ask that we concentrate on the Budget and what District 5 provides to the students and community. I personally think District 5 is one of the best public school systems

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

anywhere. Good use of time tonight is key to spending needed time on the Budget. Dr. Fulmer and his staff have provided answers to all your questions and provided other reports you requested.

Sincerely,

Robert Gantt

Attachment 10 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Dear Robert,

I have concerns related to the budget and the process and the lack of fairness you are exhibiting towards members of this school board. My questions that were asked in advance of the Budget Work Session, which were in writing, as you requested, still remain unanswered. Based on that, the number of legitimate questions (28 written) asked by Mr. Turner and the administration's response to them (not all were completely answered) and other reasons mentioned below, I believe another Budget Work Session should be scheduled before a vote is taken on the First Reading of this $147 million budget, which you have scheduled for Monday night. And as I stated in emails copied below, I believe that the position that you have taken to keep information from certain board members is in an effort to keep board members AND the public in the dark. ABSOLUTELY A FALSE UNFORTUNATE POLITICAL STATEMENT.

Since the First Reading of the Budget is scheduled for Monday night, will you please provide a correct and accurate Budget Book -- at the latest -- in our Board Packet on Thursday along with complete answers to my previous questions? Please also provide the information I requested, and have not received, for page 5 of the PowerPoint presented by Dr. Fulmer on April 23 related to enrollment and revenue generated for the surrounding districts and the expense you have shown as a total for projected salary increases and increased cost of benefits for teachers, administration and support staff broken out between each category. Because it appears that the state will mandate a raise for teachers only, board members will have to decide whether to fund additional raises for other employees (support and administration). Your budget shows a lump sum for a 2% raise for all employees. Knowing how much additional funding will be required to fund a raise for other employees is a logical question and I certainly hope you will provide it. [According to the EOC, the salary increase for teachers may be based on the SMSS (Statewide Minimum Salary Schedule) and not their current salary. If the mandated increase is based on the SMSS, then the board will need to see a revised calculation of increased cost.]

I am also hopeful that you will allow for adequate time for me to ask my questions and for discussion from other board members at our meeting on May 21, since we have not yet been provided with an accurate Budget Book to review nor answers to important budget related questions.

Here are some of my concerns:

During the May 7 Budget Work Session, Dr. Fulmer stated that the Budget Book for the then proposed $145 million budget that we received in the Board Packet for the April 23 meeting and is posted on the District's website was inaccurate. Dr. Fulmer then explained that he was aware of these errors in April prior to providing the Budget Book to us, but failed to inform us of this before our review. (We have not yet received a corrected Budget Book.) Some of us spent a good deal of time reviewing the Budget Book only to discover that the information contained in it was not correct. As evidenced by some of the questions asked in advance of the Budget Work Session by board members who realized this, it appears that their questions prompted Dr. Fulmer's admission. How can we properly review and prepare for an important discussion and a vote on the Budget when the information that is provided to us is inaccurate?

In addition, on April 23, in advance of the May 7 Budget Work Session, you asked us to prepare questions related to the Budget Book, the one we received in April that we have now heard was inaccurate, rather than taking up time during the Budget Work Session. (This is something that I frown upon because I believe our business should be conducted in a more public manner rather than in email communication.) However, as you asked, I sent in preliminary questions (shown in the emails copied below with your receipt acknowledged), some, I asked but were never answered at the April 23rd board meeting, so that I could begin review and more thoroughly study the Budget Book. My written questions remain unanswered. How can we prepare for discussion and a vote (First Reading is Monday night) when board members have not received answers to just the preliminary questions?

Also, will you please post the corrected Budget Book that you will be presenting to us, and the presentation on our website, on Friday morning when the Board Packet is posted so that the public can review the proposed budget that we are to vote on?

Related to the Irmo High School project: The board approved the recommendation of the superintendent to accept the bid for the Irmo High project on May 7, however, when asked, the construction manager stated at the meeting that the project had changed since the board originally approved the plans. But because the project has been changed from what the board voted on previously, the board has no idea what was approved. I requested a copy of the scope and I have not received it. Please provide a copy of this to me.

Thank you for your time in this matter.

Kim

Forwarded conversation

Subject: Documents requested for tonight's school board meeting

---

Attachment 11 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.

From: Kim Murphy <movingmountainskwm@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, May 7, 2012 at 12:35 PM

To: "Gantt, Robert" <ganttrw@bellsouth.net>, rgantt@lexrich5.org, Beth Hutchison <EFH@sc.rr.com>, Beth Watson <bhwatson@lex5.k12.sc.us>, "bhwatson@lexrich5.org" <bhwatson@lexrich5.org>, "ebaumgar@lexrich5.org" <ebaumgar@lexrich5.org>, Ellen Baumgardner <EBaumgar@lex5.k12.sc.us>, Ellen Baumgardner <ebaumgardner@sc.rr.com>, Superintendent Steve Hefner <swhefner@gmail.com>, Stephen Hefner <shefner@lexrich5.org>

Cc: Ed White <ekw@sc.rr.com>, Ed White <EWhite@lex5.k12.sc.us>, "ewhite@lexrich5.org" <ewhite@lexrich5.org>, Jan Hammond <jhammond@lex5.k12.sc.us>, JanH08 <janh08@aol.com>, Jim Turner <jturner@lex5.k12.sc.us>, jimturnjr <jimturnjr@gmail.com>, Kim Murphy <kwmurphy@lex5.k12.sc.us>, Kim Murphy <movingmountainskwm@gmail.com>, Robert Gantt <rgantt@lex5.k12.sc.us>

Dear Robert, Ellen, Beth, and as much as I hate to say this, Dr. Hefner,

I am very discouraged and disappointed that you have not provided board members with important information that I have requested in advance of tonight's budget work session in order to be prepared for discussion and what little information was sent to us was incomplete. In fact, I feel like this is in an effort to keep board members and the public in the dark.

Another issue related to tonight's meeting is that the information pertaining to Action Agenda Item 12 (Approval of bid for phase one improvements at Irmo High School, Exhibit B) is not included in the Board Packet. You expect us to vote on a matter of great importance, but do not provide the information necessary to make an informed decision.

Robert, as board chairman and as an official elected to represent the best interests of the community and their children, this is unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Kim Murphy

Attachment 12 is included with the minutes of the 5-21-12 meeting, at the request of Board member Kim Murphy pursuant to S.C. Code Ann. §30-4-90(a)(4) and Board Policy BEDG. The Board majority did not approve, disapprove, or otherwise act upon the contents of this attachment.

Item **"For The Record"** requested by **Kim Murphy** for attachment to the Minutes.