

**PALOUSE SCHOOL DISTRICT #301**

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

Thursday, July 21, 2022

Held in the Palouse Gymnasium

**OPEN:** The Palouse School Board meeting was called to order at 8:50 p.m. by Palouse Chair Jessica Smith.

**ATTENDANCE:**

Present: Palouse Board: Shealyn Holbrook, Jessica Smith, Heidi Evans, Andra Edwards, and Jessie Twigg-Harris  
Garfield Board: Sean Neal, Matt Bofenkamp, Ryan Pfaff, Paula Adams, and Justin Honcoop

Also Present: Palouse Superintendent/Principal Mike Jones  
Garfield Superintendent/Principal Brett Agenbroad  
Secretary/Reporter Debbie Anderson

Guests: Community Members

**REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE BOARD:** Aaron Flansburg strongly advised the board against changing the vote for the joint board meetings as brought up during the Joint Meeting tonight.

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:** Mike Jones requested that item C be stricken from the consent agenda.

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

B. Payroll:

Payroll-Warrants

July – 30111115-30111131 - \$78,173.64

Payroll Electronic Transfer

July- \$92,642.51

Payroll Electronic Transfer Fed W/H & SS

July - \$34,420.07

C. Approval of Minutes

June 23, 2022

D. Hire: Jennifer Raup – Evening Custodian – Start date August 8, 2022

**MOTION:** A motion to accept the Consent Agenda was made by Jessie Twigg-Harris and seconded by Shealyn Holbrook. The roll call motion passed as follows:

Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye

Heidi Evans - Aye

Andra Edwards – Aye

Shealyn Holbrook - Aye

Jessica Smith – Aye

As Accounts Payable was not finished this month due to timeline, Jeremy Loe requested that the board approve the July bills up to \$90,000.

**MOTION:** A motion to accept the approval of July bills up to \$90,000 was made by Heidi Evans and Shealyn Holbrook. The roll call vote was as follows:

Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye

Heidi Evans - Aye

Andra Edwards – Aye

Shealyn Holbrook - Aye

Jessica Smith – Aye

**OLD BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

A. Resolution #253 for the 2022-2023 fiscal budget.

**MOTION:** Heidi Evans moved to approve **Resolution #253** for the 2022-2023 fiscal budget, seconded by Shealyn Holbrook. The roll call motion passed as follows:

|                           |                        |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye | Heidi Evans - Aye      |
| Andra Edwards – Aye       | Shealyn Holbrook - Aye |
| Jessica Smith – Aye       |                        |

B. Superintendent/Principal Report:

- 1) Mike Jones reported that the athletic registration will be starting on August 1, 2022, with a new registration piece in the way of Final Forms. School registration will begin on August 15, 2022.
- 2) The board was given a newsletter that Mike plans on sending out in the next week.
- 3) Mike wanted to extend a big thank you to Brian Lentz for all his hard work this summer in getting classrooms set up and restructured. Please give Brian a big kudos when you see him.
- 4) The sprinkler system should be finished here soon.
- 5) The outdoor classroom is coming along great.
- 6) Still seeking an AG instructor and paraprofessional.
- 7) Mike Jones welcomed Brett Agenbroad to the Co-Op and looks forward to working with him.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business Shealyn Holbrook moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:07 p.m., seconded by Heidi Evans.

Board Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Superintendent: \_\_\_\_\_

## **GARFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT #302**

### **REGULAR BOARD MEETING**

Thursday, July 21, 2022

Held in the Palouse Gymnasium

### **OPENING OF MEETING:**

The Garfield School Board meeting was called to order at 9:07 p.m. by Board Chair Sean Neal.

### **ATTENDANCE:**

Garfield Board: Paula Adams, Ryan Pfaff, Matt Bofenkamp, Sean Neal, and Justin Honcoop

Palouse Board: Jessica Smith, Jessie Twigg-Harris, Shealyn Holbrook, Heidi Evans, and Andi Edwards

Also Present: Garfield Superintendent/Principal Brett Agenbroad

Palouse Superintendent/Principal Mike Jones

Secretary Debbie Anderson

Guests: Community members

**REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD:** Genna Bessey brought concerns to the board of the class size of the 2/3 combination class in the Garfield School District. She had some concerns on the dynamics of that class and the fact that there would be at least 18 kids in the 2/3 combo. She wondered if this could be changed to what the combination was this last year. She also stated that there needs to be a stand-alone Kindergarten class and a stand-alone 5<sup>th</sup> grade. She just feels that putting 16 to 20 kids together in one classroom is just too much. She also feels that

Kasey Kampster reported that the staff in Garfield has always requested a stand-alone kindergarten because of the need for better transition from Preschool to Kindergarten. She also brought concerns that we need more qualified paraeducators. Also, she has issues with how Title has been handled and

Andree' Marcus-Rader reported that the middle school will be having some high needs kids in the middle school and would like to see some para educators as well in the middle school.

Aaron Flansburg asked about the block schedule. He felt like this was too long for middle school students, especially 6<sup>th</sup> graders, and that their time was not well spent on learning during the class time. Other parents concurred.

Matt Bofenkamp reported that the board will get together with Brett Agenbroad to discuss these issues.

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:** None.

### **CONSENT AGENDA:**

#### A. Payroll:

##### 1. Payroll-Warrant

July – 30210022-30210038 - \$75,541.43

##### 2. Payroll Electronic Transfer

July – \$122,104.29

##### 3. Payroll Electronic Transfer Fed W/H & SS

July – \$43,912.72

#### B. Approval of Minutes

##### 1. June 23, 2022

#### C. **Resolution 231** – Authorization of Facsimile Signature

#### D. **Resolution 232** – Authorization of Warrant Signature

- E. **Resolution 233** – Authorization of Invest Funds
- F. **Resolution 234** – Designation of District Agent
- G. **Resolution 235** – Designation of Auditing Officers
- H. **Resolution 236** – Appointment of District Claims Agent
- I. **Resolution 237** – Certified Signatures of District Personnel Authorized to Sign School Construction Project Documents
- J. Approval of Superintendents leave Calendar.

**MOTION:** A motion to accept the Consent Agenda was made by Justin Honcoop and seconded by Paula Adams. The roll call vote was as follows:

|                      |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Ryan Pfaff – Aye     | Paula Adams – Aye |
| Matt Bofenkamp – Aye | Sean Neal – Aye   |
| Justin Honcoop – Aye |                   |

As Accounts Payable was not finished this month due to timeline, Jeremy Loe requested that the board approve the July bills up to \$85,000.

**MOTION:** A motion to accept the approval of July bills up to \$85,000 was made by Justin Honcoop and seconded by Paula Adams. The roll call vote was as follows:

|                      |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Ryan Pfaff – Aye     | Paula Adams – Aye |
| Matt Bofenkamp – Aye | Sean Neal – Aye   |
| Justin Honcoop – Aye |                   |

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. Resolution #230 – Adoption of 2022-2023 Fiscal Budget  
Matt Bofenkamp had some questions that he would like Brett and the board to go over with Jeremy regarding the FTE's and end budget amounts, the discrepancy between the two school budgets.

**MOTION:** A motion to accept **Resolution #230** for the 2022-2023 Fiscal Budget was made by Matt Bofenkamp and seconded by Ryan Pfaff. The roll call vote was as follows:

|                      |                   |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| Ryan Pfaff – Aye     | Paula Adams – Aye |
| Matt Bofenkamp – Aye | Sean Neal – Aye   |
| Justin Honcoop – Aye |                   |

**REPORTS:**

- A. Superintendent Report:
  - 1) Brett Agenbroad wanted to thank everyone who came out to the BBQ on Wednesday night. He received a lot of honest concerns. He stated that we may not be able to resolve some of the issues right away, but if we do not know about the problems, we cannot fix them.
  - 2) Brett also reported that Mike Jones has been helpful and gracious.
  - 3) He talked with Apollo and got information on the project. The sprinkler system for the softball field will be started in early August.
- B. Correspondence:
  - 1) The board was given correspondence in their packets.

**ADJOURN:** There being no further business Justin Honcoop moved to adjourn the Garfield Board meeting at 9:25 p.m., seconded by Matt Bofenkamp.

Board Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Superintendent: \_\_\_\_\_

**GARFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT #302  
PALOUSE SCHOOL DISTRICT #301  
REGULAR JOINT BOARD MEETING**

Thursday, July 21, 2022

Held in the Palouse Gymnasium

**OPEN:** The Joint Board meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Palouse Chair Jessica Smith.

**ATTENDANCE:**

Garfield Board: Paula Adams, Ryan Pfaff, Sean Neal, Matt Bofenkamp, and Justin Honcoop

Palouse Board: Shealyn Holbrook, Andra Edwards, Jessie Twigg-Harris, Heidi Evans and Jessica Smith

Also Present: Palouse Superintendent/Principal Mike Jones

Garfield Superintendent/Principal Brett Agenbroad

Secretary/Reporter Debbie Anderson

Guests: Many Community Members

**REQUESTS TO ADDRESS THE BOARD:** This will be moved to New Business.

**CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:** None

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

A. Approval of Minutes

June 23, 2022

B. Accounts Payable: Approval will be added to next month's agenda.

**MOTION:** A motion to accept the Consent Agenda was made by Sean Neal and seconded by Ryan Pfaff. The motion passed by the following roll call votes:

Sean Neal – Aye

Jessica Smith – Aye

Ryan Pfaff – Aye

Andi Edwards – Aye

Paula Adams – Aye

Heidi Evans – Aye

Matt Bofenkamp – Aye

Shealyn Holbrook – Aye

Justin Honcoop – Aye

Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**A) Discussion/Board Comment:**

Jessica Smith stated that the reason for the Town Hall meeting tonight was for:

- 1) Should the current cooperation arrangement between Garfield and Palouse continue?
- 2) If so, should control reside with the joint board or should individual boards have ultimate authority in their respective districts.

Sean Neal wanted to thank everyone for taking the time to attend tonight's town hall. It is of upmost importance to these boards that we receive direct input from all of you. We have fielded a lot of questions over the last few weeks, and we believe it is important to state the purpose and reasons clearly and succinctly for tonight's town hall. Now this next statement isn't meant to be accusatory in any way, shape or form, but I feel that it is important that we lay out the facts as they have transpired over the past several months. So, as you may be aware that early this year the Garfield Board took action unilaterally on items for which the Palouse Board opposed. In subsequent meetings discussions ensued on whether individual boards should have autonomy and authority in their respective districts. After multiple meetings an agreement was unable to be reached on our revised cooperative agreement with the issue of autonomy at the center. At last month's meeting a motion was put forth to renew the existing cooperative agreement to be replaced by the revised document once completed as a show of good faith to the community. This motion unfortunately failed on a 6-3 vote, with the 3 dissenting being members of the Palouse Board. Considering this fact, it became apparent that we needed input from all of you on the following two questions that are on the board.

**B) Town Hall – 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. – Community Comment/Discussion**

Mary Cocking: I have had four sons who graduated from Garfield-Palouse. What are the existing bylaws that are in place that are in question because I don't know why we are looking to change documents if we don't understand what the current bylaws are.

Sean Neal: There is some ambiguity in the existing agreement, and I think that it was written that way intentionally, but I think that is why we are having this discussion because it is not cut and dry as to which way that should go within the way that the current agreement is written and that is why there is some disagreement about it.

Jessica Smith: I think that part of the problem is that the original document was written by normal folks, and they assumed the best and occasionally things don't go the best. So, the new document that we are trying to put together was just something that predicts and plans for all the cases. The current document is not bad, it is actually in place now, since we have not ratified the new one the old one is automatically approved month after month. It is still enforced, and our vote last month had no impact on that. The goal here is to take a document that was written by normal people and give it a little bit more solid lines; where is the joint authority and where is individual board authority, and individual district authority. We started with the original cooperative agreement and then we gave it over to the lawyers that the school district has on hire, and we asked them to take a stab at it. The boards have since then spent a couple of meetings going over that document and we felt that it went too heavy with legalese, it went too far the other direction, so we have been tweaking this and making it closer to what we would like it to be over the last couple of meetings.

Heidi Evans: I would just like to stress to the public that this multi-establishment, as far as Garfield and Palouse and the way we have this trifecta, there are lot of complications right now that under our current agreement it doesn't really address that the other district could be potentially held liable for what someone else does by acting unilaterally, which is why it is imperative that we do update that to be consistent and current with the modern times.

Connie Newman: Graduated in 1985 from Garfield-Palouse. The cooperative went into effect in 1986. She wanted to say that it wasn't just normal people who wrote that document. Sean Neal's grandfather was on the board, my father-in-law was on the board and highly committed to this community and it didn't get written in one year. This was a multi-year process. They consulted with experts nationwide. We are not just the longest cooperative in Washington State, we are the very first cooperative in the nation and I think it is very important to remember that, and because of that this was incredibly thought out. I can tell you that in the last 36 years we have had much harder issues to deal with than whether or not masks were worn in one school or the other, and I really hope that we can stick with the original document as it was written. I haven't seen it or read it but it has withstood the test of time, and I have to believe that there was an intent in there. The decisions that are made in any school district, Garfield or Palouse, affect the entire community and my personal opinion is that a full joint board decision should affect any decisions that rule over both school districts.

Jessica Smith: The actual written 1984 document is not what we are revamping here, that doesn't need to be changed, the document that we are working on is the board cooperative agreement written in 2009.

Shishona Turner: New community member to the Garfield-Palouse School. We were so amazed that this cooperative was in place and working closely together. She stated that they were surprised when they got the news that Garfield School was no longer going to wear the masks and she wanted to know how that came about and then also why wouldn't we have a joint board making a decision about what goes on in both schools because the kids are together no matter what, mask or not, and so what they do in each school impacts the entire community. So why are we even having this conversation and where did that decision to remove the masks come from.

Sean Neal: I am happy to answer that question, but I hope that we can stay focused on the two questions that we have here and since everyone has opinions on this topic I think we could get off on that very easily. I also think that this particular topic is bigger than just this one issue. For clarity's sake, the motion that was made did not say that students couldn't wear masks, all it did was return the right to

make that decision to the parents. That was the intent behind it, to give parent's the right to make health decision for their child. That was the whole purpose and thought behind it and any child would be treated the same no matter if they decided to wear a mask or not. I would add that, as you are all aware, that motion was passed but then we quickly rescinded for a number of reasons, so obviously there was no impact of that motion. So, I hope I answered your question about where that came from. I do think that the issue is much broader than that specific issue, however, and I think that it is crucial that in 99% of the time the decision is made at the joint level is going to be adhered to and going to be agreed upon and even if one board doesn't like it or the other, an individual board isn't going to feel like it isn't important to act upon it unilaterally. However, there are extreme examples where I believe that the individual board should retain not only to act as they feel is in the best interest of their community. It is not going to be the exception not the rule.

Shishona Turner: What would be an example of the 1% of where the board would act unilaterally outside of the joint.

Sean Neal: What comes to mind is that in 2003 both districts shared a superintendent and one board felt that that was not the way of the future and the other board wanted to continue and there was disagreement on that.

Heidi Evans: One item that I would like to add, is that while it is very unlikely to have another instance like this come up again, I stress again that other districts can be held liable for what a district does unilaterally which is why that joint decision is so important because the Garfield School was facing fines that potentially could have impacted Palouse and our responsibility on the Palouse Board is to look out for the fiduciary responsibilities which means spending tax dollars wisely, being a good steward of the tax dollar, following laws regardless of our personal beliefs and convictions because at the end of the day we have to account for the funds and so it expands beyond that because we need to look for that 1% because at the end of the day that 1% can make or break things and why it is so important that this coop agreement is in place, that there is those boundaries, because if there is not that agreement both parties need to be protected. There is more at play behind the scenes that is really understood, and I just wanted to get that across to everyone.

Community Member: What protection is there for both sides if one board votes unilaterally and what did the lawyers say as to whether or not this was something that was allowed to happen and/or what financial impacted would that have made.

Sean Neal: There were conversations that were had before the motion was made with our attorney group by the Garfield Board and they said it was in our authority to do what we did, so that is what we did. Now later, after that transpired, we did not get that same answer from the attorney group. Now to steer it back to the funding question, the fact of the matter is, is that it would only become an issue if Garfield or Palouse were unable to meet the obligation of the cost sharing agreement. Just because fines are issued in any way shape or form doesn't mean those obligations cannot be fulfilled. To what safeguards there are, I am not aware of safeguards specifically addressing that, but from my perspective it only becomes an issue if one district or another is unable to meet their obligations to the other district. If that occurs there is definitely an issue there. There have been many times in the history of the coop where one district has borrowed money from the other and they have worked collaboratively together for many years and there has been a relationship that has been on trust and a longstanding history.

Jessica Smith: I wanted to address the question about the lawyer. We did go to the lawyer, we asked for guidance. My personal take on the lawyer, we are your elected representative, the Garfield Board and the Palouse Board, and I don't feel it is right for us then to turn that authority over to a lawyer to make that decision, that is part of why I personally was pushing very heavily for that new coop agreement because I wanted something in there that gave us a path to get through disagreements ourselves. If I take a marriage analogy – if I have to go to a lawyer every time my husband and I fight, that is not a good relationship. I want to go then go to somebody that can then help set up that relationship so that I can talk to the Garfield Board, we can say “hey, we don't think that mask thing was cool, having your own vote was not cool, and so let's hear what you have to say about it so we can come to some sort of resolution on our own. The goal for me of going to a lawyer was not for an answer, if there was something

legally wrong L&I has the authority to make those legal decisions. My goal for the lawyer was to help us develop a process/procedure so that we can be in a healthy relationship without having to go talk to a lawyer every time we disagree. So, I know that doesn't quite answer your questions, but I think the lawyer part is coming in this a little bit heavier.

Mary Cocking: So, the agreement that the lawyers rewrote and you all hashed back and forth, there were three people who did not agree with the final document?

Sean Neal: We are continuing to work with revisions to that document and going back and forth to try and find a compromise. Where the no vote came from was that a motion was put forth to renew the existing agreement that was last ratified in March 2021 for the next school year. Yes, it does roll over automatically month by month without us doing anything, but the intent behind the motion was a show of good faith to the community that while we work on these negotiations that we are committed to the coop agreement and committed to the coop in general, and so it is that motion that failed.

Mary Cocking: So, it is the ability to have a unilateral vote that is holding up this agreement. As a community we don't know what the issue is that is dividing the board so much that they want to discontinue a cooperative that has been successful for almost four decades and ten people have to find their way to agreement. I would not want to be a member of that board that let a coop fail because we couldn't come to an agreement, you are elected to work through the coop.

Jessica Smith: To answer you explicitly, the second question is up there is the one that we are hung up on. There is a section in that cooperative agreement that it attempts to define what is a joint matter versus what is an individual board matter. (Someone in the crowd wanted this read out loud) As that board document is written there are things that are joint and there are things that are individual. If something is decided to be joint, it is joint and then an individual does not have the authority to vote on that. The point of this agreement is - I am trying to speak for the Garfield Board so if there is anyone wants to jump in from Garfield please feel free - that the perception that I have got is that the Garfield Board is of the opinion that there is always that 1% chance that they may want to overrule the joint, that the joint should not have that full complete authority on joint issues. So that is what it comes down to, should the joint have a full binding vote or should the vote be an advisory and then the individual boards have the binding vote.

Aaron Flansburg: This cooperative is a lot like a marriage, a marriage between two towns, where two towns, two groups, have come together under a set of principals saying we are going to be working together as our number one mission statement to be keeping the cooperative together. What is best for our kids is keeping the cooperative together. So I am speaking to this standpoint. Let's say that in my wedding vows I honor and cherish my wife 99% of the time and 1% I am going to cheat on you and do whatever I want by myself, without your input, as long as you are cool with that. Now, to make this point for the Garfield board, not only once did you do this but twice in March, on two different incidences where it failed in the joint board meeting under the terms of the agreement that you all signed. I was trying to be as nice as I could in that letter I sent you but you all broke the agreement when you did that. You took action on your own and you broke that agreement. So we have a partner who says I am going to do whatever I want to in my school and 99% of the time it is going to be the same as what we all agree on and 1% it is not, and that 1% is basically a way of saying that we have unilateral authority to choose what happens to the tax dollars and the children of Palouse as a Garfield Board, or we as Palouse have the unilateral authority to do what we want with Garfield tax dollars and children whenever we feel that it is necessary. How can that possibly be tenable and how can we move forward knowing that you committed yourself in making these decisions according to a very simple set of rules of engagement for lack of a better term, it is like six pages, pretty simple stuff, clear language, nothing you need to be a lawyer to follow. So, in my opinion we have to hang together or hang separately, and it is in our best interest to hang together. It was a great experience to go through the coop in middle school and made great friends. I feel like as a citizen of Palouse that our kids are not being represented while they are in Garfield, or you are not being represented while your kids are in Palouse. It doesn't work that way. We have to work together from the same agreement that we started with and we need to move forward together.

Jessica Smith: The key phrases that we are disagreeing on are: "Cooperative matters must be jointly decided upon by the school boards of both Garfield and Palouse and may not be acted upon independently". There are a couple of paragraphs in here that explains what is cooperative and what is individual. "Decisions regarding public matter will be ratified if a majority of each board approves the decision, if the majority of one board approves the decision then neither board can act independently on the cooperative matter." And most of this language comes from the original agreement.

Genna Bessey: When I look at those two questions up there I don't understand why the first one is even there. I mean everyone wants us to stay a cooperative. Our kids start doing things with each other in Kindergarten – why would we want to rip that apart and why would this even be a discussion. It has been this way for the last 36 years and it has been working. Something is going on between the ten of you that are sitting there that we have elected, and I feel that this is something that you guys need to figure out. We elected you to figure out how to answer that question. I think we all don't understand what you are all talking about when you talk about the wording of this. It makes me angry that that this question is even up there. Both districts cannot survive without the other. We are one community and that is how we work. When you are making decision, you need to make sure that what you are doing is representing everyone sitting in this room and everyone that has kids that go to this school district

Tim Coles: A house divided against itself cannot stand. I can't remember a time in my life that it has ever been so political, and I hate it. Half the time we are talking past each other instead of to each other. Most of the time these decisions are not as hard as you make them if you are really willing to listen to each other instead of coming in, as many of us do, and we hold on to a certain belief and we are not going to let go of it. We have made this thing work because we wanted to work together, and we wanted a stronger school district. I was here when we started this thing and we both sucked in almost all areas that you can think of, but the reason that it worked is because everyone listened to each other. I was here when the superintendent thing took place and that was a scary thing also. I thought it was when individual boards voted on things that had to do with their building and improvements that they needed to make, and then things that had to do with all of our children had to be hammered out and decisions made and sometimes we had to swallow a bunch of crap to do it, but we did it because we knew it would make a better school district and it did. We can be strong, but it takes all of us to put aside our political beliefs and try and talk to each other. We are not that far apart. Let's turn a corner. Let's put the school district and the children of this school district first. Let's talk it over and make a decision. We worked together a lot at the beginning to try and get the communities together and that too has faltered some, but if you want a stronger school district you need to get Garfield and Palouse closer together, the way it was at the very beginning. That first question is ridiculous. If you are not trying to grow, you are trying to die. We want our children to have a strong unified school district, a unified staff working on the same direction for success for our children.

Sandy Jamison: I have served on the cooperative board, and it was an honor to serve and I hope that you all are still feeling that it is an honor to serve. I think I can bravely say that a majority of the group here does not want the coop to disperse and nor do I. My question to the ten of you is - what is it that you want from us? I would agree that we did vote you in and we do have faith that the ten of you can work something out and I think we are starting to get more of the details of what it is that you are trying to hash out. My sense is that some issues have passed but you are worried about what is going to be the next issue where you are divided and honestly you will probably always be divided, that is just part of working together. I can honestly say that when I worked on the board, we did have superintendent issues and what not and had very late nights, but we came back and worked it out. So, I would encourage you to do that. I would ask, are there specifics that you want to hear from taxpayer people that you are trying to get out of us tonight?

Sean Neal: I agree with you that it has been a resounding "yes" for the 1<sup>st</sup> question and I think that is the reason that we ask that question was to verify that that was still the case. We all thought and hoped that but we just wanted to make sure. So, to answer your question directly on what we are looking for input on is where should that line be drawn where an individual board can act and where the joint should have authority.

Sandy Jamison: I think that is a legitimate question, it has been a long time since I have read that cooperative agreement and again, I would say in my case I have elected Garfield directors to make that definition. I would also say that lawyers have their place and while they won't make your decisions that they can definitely make your life a little easier down the road so I would adhere to quite a bit of what they are telling you, but they are not the final say. I deal with lawyers as the Whitman County Auditor and I don't always agree with what I am supposed to do but I need to have a valid reason to negate it. There will always be issues that come down up down the road that we can't even anticipate at this time. So, for my feedback, I have faith that the ten of you can come up with an agreement and I think both sides are going to have to swallow a bit of what you really wanted in order to work it out.

Janet Barstow: I am very sad that this meeting is even happening. But I would like to thank the members of both boards for all the many hours you have given even though I do not always agree with you, and I thank you for arranging this meeting. I am confused as to why Garfield hired an administrator without Palouse's inclusion because it seems to me that the middle school is partly Palouse kids, so I didn't understand how that happened. It didn't seem very cooperative to me. I am also a little bit troubled that two Garfield Board members took their kids out of the school district, I know that there are no rules for this, but are they fully invested and I hope to see their kids back this fall. I hope that emotional havoc that we have all felt during the last two years will soon fade and wounded relationships will heal. Hopefully we will not have mask mandates this year and get over all the covid crap. I hope the two boards can reach a resolution on policy changes that will once again guide us to a successful cooperative. I also hope that both boards will adhere to those policy changes.

Rich Link: If the joint board says that this is what we are doing then the individual boards need to follow that. If it has not been stated, then it is an individual board agreement. If you don't agree come back and talk about it.

Sarah Bofenkamp: On February 25<sup>th</sup>, a few days after the Garfield Board called a special meeting to override the decision made by the joint school board, the Garfield-Palouse School District became vulnerable to immense fines. To be specific, \$70,000 per masking violation. Though some people may argue that this was an overreach by the state government, I would like to remind us that we are all talking about state funded public schools and that when we refuse to follow state guidelines, whether it be masking, minimum curricular requirements, etc, then we are breaking state law and are thus liable. I say this because that in that moment one board made the decision alone and in doing so endangered both schools financially. That is why the schools must move forward together and improve the cooperative agreement as necessary for the success, safety and continuation of the districts. Any decisions regarding the brains and body of the students and staff in the joint school boards charge should be made together and with state protocols in mind as we have always been. Unfortunately we can see how easily the current cooperative agreement can be abused and I encourage our respective school boards to continue their work in clarifying a revised one, one that hold each accountable for their actions to each other and one that truly means cooperation, and if it cannot be done by the boards alone I ask that mediation be considered.

John Keene: I wanted to come here today to say something about the Garfield School Board. As we have mentioned multiple times, they are our voted in representatives and at the time of their decision they considered the risks and calculated the risks in what was the normal timeframe of response upon getting a violation and they made a decision to make it masks optional and in doing so representing their community that voted them in and I understand that it went against the standard policy for this decision, that it was a joint thing, but, however, they represented us well. They represented the people that voted them in, and I respect them for that. I understand it caused waves and especially when the law came down a lot harder on us after that decision was made and I give them respect for changing their vote immediately instead of putting our district at risk for financial fines. I personally have put many hours into the board meetings and talking with my board members about what I feel is right and what changes I would like to see done, and yes it was an unpopular decision amongst the board members, but the Garfield Board did what we asked them to do as a community and I couldn't have asked for more of them in their position. So, Garfield Board, thank you for standing up for what we as a community asked of you even though it put you in the crosshairs of the big picture.

Emily Akin: Without teachers and staff the school is just an empty building and I think that it would be wise and pertinent for the board and for everybody here to consider in our dialogue tonight that not only do the decisions of the board affect the students of the school but those decisions affect the staff, and I think that it is important, moving forward, that we want our school to be attractive for teachers incoming especially with the teachers shortage right now nationwide and that we don't want to be making any decisions that threaten this. So, just keep in mind that teachers and staff are a huge part of why the school is so great. It is all for the kids but without teachers there is no school. So please keep that in your considerations.

Jessica Smith: The Garfield-Palouse Association wrote this letter and I feel this is a good time to inject this now. The letter was read by Kasey Kampster.

*"To the school boards and communities of Garfield and Palouse, The Garfield-Palouse Education Association believes the cooperative can provide more quality and enriching opportunities for students and ideally a better education for all students in both towns than either community can do on its own. Students who need and utilize services such as special education, speech therapy, or psychology services benefit from the cooperative and would be impacted negatively were the co-op to dissolve or break down further. Activities and classes both curricular and non-curricular like FFA, robotics, music, and drama would not be able to thrive or possibly even exist for students if the communities weren't working together and sharing students. Even our libraries and technology benefit from the cooperative, all in the spirit of providing quality education and meaningful opportunities for students regardless of where they come from. We lose many students to other, larger schools every year. Shouldn't our focus be to keep our kids in our school district? If we don't provide quality opportunities and education parents will seek it out elsewhere for their students.*

*As the districts acknowledge in a previous statement, the schools are the lifeblood of these communities, just like thousands of small towns and communities throughout the country. A large factor in the formation of the cooperative originally was to ensure financial stability for schools in both towns, thus looking out for the longevity of our communities in the future. As an association we ask, how has this situation changed and what is the focus for the future should the boards decide to dissolve the cooperative?*

*The Association believes we are more powerful together and united when it comes to providing a quality education and meaningful opportunities for students. We have consistently urged the boards to establish 1 superintendent position and have different staff functioning as principals in each building. We believe this is the best way to ensure inclusivity, safety and consistency for students and staff and we hope that down the road, if the cooperative is to continue, that this model can be seriously considered.*

*All this being said, the Garfield-Palouse Education Association agrees that if the two groups of people who chose to become public school board members, and to whom the community entrusts the education of all children cannot work together, the result will be the eventual dissolution of the cooperative. It is beyond unfortunate and truly sad, that our shared history of excellence and cooperation hangs in the balance. We ask that both boards work together toward the preservation and enrichment of the co-op. If this is not the goal of either of the boards, we ask for transparency and open communication as we navigate changes to 30 plus years of success."*

*Sincerely and respectfully submitted by the Garfield-Palouse Education Association.*

Alyssa Parkins: I would like to know how many board members graduated from the Garfield-Palouse School - four of them raised their hands. Secondly, if you are supposed to vote on like Garfield School and Palouse School jointly then why did the Garfield parents not vote for the Palouse Board to be the board members and why did the Palouse parents not vote for the Garfield Board Members. Like if you are supposed to be representing Garfield then shouldn't Garfield have a say of who runs for Palouse and vice versa?

Elisha Palmer: People are stuck in some decisions that were very political and I understand that we need to get past that and think about the kid's interest. When my kids go to Garfield, I want the board to have the best interest of the kids in mind. We are one community; can't we just work together. If you don't agree come back together and discuss the issues and keep going. Should control reside with the individual or joint board? Personally, I think that it should be with the joint board and make decisions that will impact our kids and teachers and make those decisions together.

Wil Edwards: To answer the first question – yes it should continue. To answer the second question – yes I feel that complete control should reside within the joint board on joint students. So, I have a question for the Palouse Board and the Garfield Board. Palouse – If you want autonomy why would you want to give full autonomy to the Garfield Board for Palouse kids.

Garfield - Why would you allow complete autonomy for your high school kids out of Garfield in the town of Palouse.

Sean Neal: For my perspective, we are a cooperative and there is a long history of us working together and being together. However, the people who voted for me, as an elected official, are Garfield individuals, they live in Garfield. So, my first responsibility, as a person who is elected by the people in Garfield, is to those individuals. So that is why I believe that either side should have the authority to act in the best interest of those who are in their community, those who voted for them, those are the people who have a say and so I think that each board should have the ability to best represent those who voted for them and not be necessarily handcuffed on an issue that they deem important enough to act on their own.

(A question in the crowd asked about the high school students). Sean Neal: It should be the same both ways. Let me use this as an example since we have been talking about the masks – and I have said this in the board meeting previously so you can see that – but if Palouse voted on masks to be mandatory for the rest of the school year or permanently, I think it should be well within the Palouse Boards jurisdiction to do so. I may not like it as a Garfield member, and I may be sending my kid over to Palouse and I may not like that, but I believe that should be their authority to do so. So, I am not saying it is a one-sided issue, it is a two-way street 100%.

Jessica Smith: This is my opinion and not the opinion of my board - I believe that our individual boards should have control over our elementary schools and our physical buildings. The joint board should have the authority over middle school and high school, anything that affects the students because it is all of our kids.

Kasey Kampster: So many of those students share spaces, so when it came to health and safety those Palouse kids that were coming into our building their health and safety rights as given to them from our state mandate were asked to be violated, and the staff members were asked to break the law. That was an incredibly difficult thing for many staff members. I am not honestly sure how many of us would have come to work had that decision not been rescinded.

Heidi Evans: So my answer to that original question, is of course that I have two kids myself in the Palouse School District right now in the elementary school, so speaking as an individual I absolutely mirror what Jessica Smith's sentiments are that we should operate independently for our elementary schools but things get much more complicated when we start talking about that middle school and high school, and one thing that was really hitting hard, especially in these last board meetings, the importance of the relationship to as well. Every single one of us brings different things to the table and skills and work experience, and what not, and we should be valuing each other for what we do bring to the table. And the fact of the matter is, there was an open conversation with masks because it is bigger than just kids, where also employers as well, and advice was given and we need to get that mutual relationship that also plays a factor in the greater joint decisions that we make and really at the end of the day, even being elected officials, it is bigger than us, we can do as much as we can for the constituents, but we still have that fiduciary shared responsibility, which means at the end of the day we could be legally liable personally for the decisions that we make and technically they could be held personally responsible for making that decision back in February. I would kindly ask that no constituent ask me to break the law because at the end of the day we are still bound to that whether we agree to it or not. Just like all of you could leave here today and do whatever you want, you could rob a bank, do whatever, but at the end of the day we are held accountable, you will go to jail, you will face huge fines, and that is why we need to work together to make sure that we are for the betterment of those joint students, protecting their health and safety, protecting the staff too, because as we've seen now the relationship has eroded and I think that is fundamentally what the problem is, there is not that mutual respect and I would like to see us get back to that and appreciate each other for the strengths that we do bring to the table. So that is just me speaking as an individual though, so I appreciate your time.

Jessie Twigg-Harris: As far as the autonomy issue goes, I believe that there are lots of small and large decisions that can be made about buildings, about all kind of things, but if we are going to put our kids first then our agreement, as a cooperative, must include accountability, and that is the only thing we are attempting to revise, is a path for accountability so that every board member here can serve with integrity.

Tom Boone: I worked for 13 years as the transportation supervisor here in Palouse during the coop. I was let go because of some problems in 2001 with superintendents. I agree 100% with Tim Coles, that I went through the good and bad in the coop. The good times, and I think we really need to get back to it, and just like the Gar-Pal Association said, we need one superintendent over both schools. I was really upset, and no offense to the new guy, that you guys hired a superintendent a couple of days before this meeting. I think that was pretty shady. You should have listened to what was going on here and I think it is really important that we go back to one superintendent. You have one person on staff right now that I think would be a perfect person to completely change this thing around. You need somebody that when you guys get apart on stuff, you need a superintendent that will get you back on track, get you back on focusing what you need to do. As far as the control issue, my dad was on the Palouse School Board when they set this cooperative up, and him and Larry Warner, who was the superintendent in Garfield, spent a lot of time in Olympia working on this. It was set up to where each school board had the say on how their building ran, but when it came to a joint deal involving middle school and high school, that is where your joint boards came into play. Now on this masking thing, I don't know the whole situation what happened, just from rumors I have heard, but that whole decision that Garfield evidently made should not have been made without Palouse saying, "Absolutely go ahead and do it." The Palouse Board didn't so it shouldn't have been done. Anyway, I don't know the whole situation, I drive bus for both schools, and I really think you need to get back to having one superintendent and I think it would solve a lot of these problems.

Josh Hightree: We homeschool our children. We know about 30 other people in the Garfield area that are in that vote of no confidence. It is not a vote of no confidence in individuals, it is a vote of no confidence in a structure where a governor who is elected primarily by one side of the Cascades makes a decision that reaches into the classroom of your children and your uncomfortable with that and you say I want my board to represent me to push back against something that is coming from a governor that doesn't necessarily agree with what I think is best for my children. This board represented their constituents. The calculus looks more like the district is bleeding kids and what are we going to do about it, if we don't do something about this mask mandate, we are going to be losing kids. Restoring confidence in parents that the school board is looking out for their best interest is what the Garfield Board was doing. There is a political division in the State and there is a political division amongst the two boards, this is where we are seeing this clash. It is difficult to run an organization when you have two different ideologies operating. I don't know what the solution is but I really thank the Garfield Board for what they did and I hope that the system is able to flex far enough that all those 30 parents will have enough confidence to put their kids back in the school system, because right now I am paying property taxes but I am not receiving any benefit as a homeschooled parent and I would like to put my kids into a system that would bring in revenue from the State to support the community but I don't have the confidence that this is a flexible enough system arrangement to meet the needs that I have as a parent.

Diane Main: I was here when Garfield and Palouse came together, and the kids thought it was great. It was the parents who had the problem, arguing about where the ballgames were going to be held. They both wanted to keep things in their own town. Finally, the parents started working it out and the board members as well. Everyone has their own political views, and we don't always agree but we have to for our kids and our towns.

Megan Cuellar: As far as that 2<sup>nd</sup> question, I think that if it involves the students from both communities then it has to be a joint board decision. I don't know why one board would think that they can mandate something for students from a different community that hasn't elected them. So, if you are going to talk about something that is going to affect middle school students or high school students then that must be a board decision that is made jointly and then it has to be adhered by.

Jens Hegg: I think it is important to come back to that last question in light of all the things that have been said that are really totally unrelated. If anyone sends their kids here it is directly not related to the wording of that last paragraph. So, there is no subtext of what is going on. I assume that is not being talked about and that is not the reason we are here. The reason we are here is because the board wants us to answer that question, so I would urge people not to get into the angriness of this stuff about whether people are sending their kids here. The reasons why people have their kids here are much much larger than the one question being asked, and that subtext needs to get worked out in the community and we need to talk about it, bring it into the open and say exactly what it is. Why don't we get back to that question because it is really not difficult and I am definitely of that opinion that if it involves, Garfield and Palouse, then both boards should have a decision. That is basic civics -taxation without representation. If there is something bigger that has to be said, then say it but say it in a different venue because this is not the place.

(A question was asked whether we should have a show of hands who are for or against the Cooperative)

Jessica Smith: On one hand the engineer in me wants the numbers, but on the other hand I would like to talk with people one-on-one. If there is anyone who wants to share their opinion I will be here after the meeting so please come and talk to me, I would rather hear it that way and so I can know what you are thinking and why do you believe that and that is important to me.

Robin Woltering: My question is, if you want us to speak to you afterwards and there is so many people that can be heard tonight, but there is a lot of people who can't, and everyone has a lot of opinions and each board members are going to hear from the people that support them, or have the same political views, etc. How are we going to move forward and make a decision. I guess I am just curious because we can talk and talk and talk but we need to make some strong decisions for our community. I know that everyone keeps saying "communities" as we have two towns, but I feel that it is one community. I love our school and we need to come together for our kids and our staff. I guess I just don't understand how this is all going to work. I have been to several board meetings and the same things are repeated and I don't see any decisions being made. My opinion - I am not going to raise my hands or close my eyes, I want to know if someone doesn't agree with that not so that I can go after them and be like "what are you talking about - I can't believe you voted that way", no I want to go "what is your perspective on this because I am probably missing something", or "I didn't know that". I think we should all be adult enough to have conversations because it is about our kids. So, should we have a co-op? YES. As far as the 2<sup>nd</sup> question, - I don't know all the legal parts of it, I work here, but obviously the board should take care of where they are at and we should come together as a joint board to make those decisions. But my question really is - How long are we going to discuss these things and not come up with an outcome. I think it is really important that we have a vote that we will continue to work just so the rumors can be squashed in both towns about what is happening - it is too important.

Jessica Smith: If I could predict the future I would play the Powerball, but I think I am pretty safe in predicting that there will probably be a vote that happens this evening. We will be going into board negotiations and board discussion after the town hall meeting.

Shannon Blankenchip: I consider us one and the more we fight amongst our school board the more divided we get. And it is really sad as adults to watch this. We all need to grow up and put our differences aside for our kids. As far as the first question - yes. When I drive around and see the banners they all say Gar-Pal, and our fight song says GPS, we are one and we need to get back to being ONE. As far as the 2<sup>nd</sup> question - if the 10 of you can't agree maybe we need to have another board overseeing the vote.

Mary Cocking: As I have been listening to all the conversations tonight, I just want to add that as a Garfield member, I think my board should have autonomy on voting on what they want for the Garfield School. But when my kids come to Palouse, I don't want Palouse to have autonomy because I want my Garfield Board to be able to speak for my Garfield kids. So, I guess they all have to agree to protect each other and our kids.

Sandy Jamison: What happens if there is a joint decision and it ends in a tie. What is the rule there.

Sean Neal: So currently as it written, for anything to pass in a joint board there needs to be a majority of both boards. So, there has to be three from each town in favor for something to pass. You can theoretically have six on the combined board that is for something but it will still fail because it doesn't have three from each town.

Sandy Jamison: Is that something you are looking to change at all or are you both comfortable with that, both boards?

Sean Neal: I think that is something that we are considering and evaluated.

Sandy Jamison: So, what would be another option?

Sean Neal: I think you could look at 2/3<sup>rd</sup>s so that you require 10, but the potential risk there is that you one board that have a majority against it but combined you have a majority vote for it. I think that is a potential compromise, that came to my mind as I was listening to everyone.

Sandy Jamison: Or a simple majority as that could be an option. I think this is something that the board members could decide.

John Keen: I have just a quick question because a couple of people here mentioned the idea of where it is Garfield is in charge of the elementary in Garfield, and Palouse is in charge of the elementary in Palouse, and you can have autonomy on that, but how would this work for the shared staff in the building.

Jessica Smith: I don't have an answer for you at this time, but I think that will be the point though of our board meeting after this to hash this out.

Mike Jones: Superintendent/Principal in Palouse. A couple of things that I want to point out and put in there. My background is that I originally came from LaCrosse/Washtucna and we were a cooperative for many moons. I grew up there and taught there for many years and honestly thought that I would be there forever, and one thing after another came about and I ended up having to move, and I moved for personal reasons that impacted my kids. The cooperative was struggling, and we were losing athletic programs, and losing athletic programs across the board. My kids were heavy into basketball, football and baseball, so for athletic opportunities they were being moved and we were seriously looking into moving our children, and I was looking at moving into the principal role potentially in LaCrosse. I lost that position for several reasons but one of the key reasons was that my kids weren't going to be in the district, and I was told that very specifically by the board. With that being said, that cut pretty deep at the time, but I am so thankful that my kids had the opportunity to go through this district. My kids came in at 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade, and if know my two boys or watched them they are very quiet and reserved and some of the opportunities that this cooperative have provided them were extraordinary. Right now I have a kid in his sophomore year at the University of Alabama, just going nuts with what he has been afforded, and another one that is working in graduate school at WSU and again going nuts with what he is doing and growing exponentially and all of this can be traced back to the staff, the community, and the people here. I am not saying here in Palouse, I am saying here in our community. It hurts that we are in this position. I have my own opinions on it but I am not going to share those and please don't ask me to. If you want to come visit with me, I can have some of those conversations, but this isn't the place for me to speak on that. I do think and I do appreciate all our board members, I think they are coming at things from a personal and good place, and I think their hearts are honestly in a good place, but I think they have some serious reservations about where they are going and how things have been done, and they want to make a better product. I am so glad to hear that everyone is a resounding "We are not going to dissolve this cooperative" and if that vote comes across, I will be sorely disappointed, that is not what we want. As far as the joint board, I can tell you that over the last 2 to 2-1/2 years it has been extremely difficult, and anyone who has come into my office or seen me throughout this has been the worst two years. It doesn't really matter what occurred or what happened, it is everything that is going on moving forward. There are some things that we are able to do in our two districts that I am so looking forward to. I really don't know Brett, we literally shook hands for the first time last night. We had a phone conversation previous to that. We are going to work together. Our promise to you is that we are going to work together, to bring the staff together to work for the students and that is our promise, and we are going to do the best that we can to help guide and work with the boards to move forward on this. That is all that I can promise right now. If you see staff out

there, retired or otherwise, please give them a pat on the back – they have worked through some extremely difficult times over the last couple of years and have done an amazing job for our schools and your kids. Whether you agree or disagree with what has come down from the state level, I can't say that I agree with everything there, but I am bound by professional obligation and not just personal opinion, and we have done the best that we can and I am so glad that, knock on wood, it is behind us and we can move forward. We have football coming in for both the high school and middle school. We have volleyball gearing up. We have basketball teams gearing up. I was here this morning and Garrett had a couple of girls in here shooting. We have had kids in our weight room consistently. We have teachers working with students now. That is what is important, not some of the other pieces. I appreciate every one of you showing up and believe me I have as many emails from those who couldn't be here. Thank you, and I thank you for Brett who doesn't know you yet, and we will move forward. But the 2<sup>nd</sup> part regarding the autonomy, again it is a difficult question and we will work through it and I do have faith that we will get through it.

Jessica Smith: We are now in a temporary recess, we will take a 10 to 15 minute break and then the joint board will resume.

The Joint Board went into recess at 8:00 p.m. and returned at 8:14 p.m.

**ITEM C: Joint Board Discussion**

**MOTION:** Sean Neal moved, seconded by Matt Bofenkamp, to approve the March 2020-2021 version of the cooperative agreement for the 2022-2023 academic year to be replaced by the new agreement once it is agreed upon both boards

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

Justin Honcoop: I feel that this will help dispel the rumors that the boards want to break up the cooperative.

Jessica Smith: Then why can't we just say that.

Andi Edwards: It just feels like there is a sense of urgency. Could we add a reasonable date to have this completed by?

Sean Neal: Without the vote we are still committed to the vote whether we vote or not, but the vote is what people are going to talk about, what people are going to hear about in the community. So it shows that we took immediate action and we are moving forward.

Jessica Smith: This doesn't feel like immediate action. I heard loud and clear what the community wanted; I don't think I need a whole lot of time to think on that one. There was a lot of plain language in this room tonight. I was hoping that we could come out of this tonight and say "hey, we answered question #2, we heard what folks wanted from question #2. That is one piece that we couldn't agree upon in the cooperative agreement. I was hoping that out of this we would have a vote from everyone that said "Jess, this is what the community said and we can write this up and at the next meeting in August we could have that updated cooperative agreement and yeah we may not have it perfect at that point, but that is my thought that we could take what we needed out of this and I am not thrilled that it has taken us this long. Back when Sean and I first talked with the lawyer back in March that we would have this done by June. I understand that everybody has life and work, but I don't think it should take this much to think. Why can't we go forward from here, why do we have to circle back to what we voted on last week, do you guys have to make another point that three out of the five Palouse board members voted otherwise. Do you need to make a point of that again?

Matt Bofenkamp: I think we do need to make a point of that. I think the community needs to know that the ten of us are coming together united. I don't think that the three of those who voted against it does not want the cooperative to end, but the appearance to a community that reads the minutes and hears the rumors is different. Again, the vote is a show to the community to say that we are committed to this, that we are agreeing to stay a cooperative. I don't understand why it is so confusing, maybe I am simplifying it down, but I think that they need to hear as a combined board we are going to agree with what they wanted us to do which is to agree now to move forward with a date and get this solved, and we are going to stay a cooperative.

Heidi Evans: But we said that, again we are just wordsmithing.

Matt Bofenkamp: We are just voting to renew the cooperative agreement for the academic year instead of mulling it over.

Heidi Evans: I am talking about the language in your motion. It undermines the relationship I feel between the two boards. We need to focus on the future, and we issued a public statement that we are committed to renew the cooperative but it has proven to not have accountability and I think the Palouse, and even Garfield, are owed that accountability. I am not of the opinion that we should vote on face value, I am about real change here and putting that time and effort. We spent about an hour on a very similar motion last meeting. Think about the progress we could have made on the new cooperative agreement instead of rehashing this, because again the community is committed to be a coop. We need to fix what is essentially broken in the agreement and I just want to move forward with that. If we want to make a motion if the coop is continuing there is no question in my mind, but I don't want to pigeonhole us as we move forward with the new agreement. As it has been said in previous meetings, we have fundamental differences on what we conceive to be on joint matters. I am at a loss right now that this motion was placed on the table again and it was meant to show who voted no then I will be voting no again on this motion.

Justin Honcoop: What is wrong with that motion to say that we are going to renew the cooperative as written that we are working under and that we are going to work forward to updating this new agreement moving forward and giving a show of good faith to our community that the two boards are coming together and help dispel the rumor mill and show that we are working through our disagreements. I have heard from many people that we are dissolving the cooperative agreement and we just need a motion tonight to show that we are not dissolving the coop.

Sean Neal: I would also argue this, there is nothing that says we can't vote on this motion and let's say that it passes we can just move right into the revisions that the community talked about tonight. What I envision happening is that this motion be made, be seconded, we vote on it, we all say yep we are good with it and now let's dive in and let's start working on the new agreement.

Discussion followed regarding the motion and a set date to have this completed.

**AMENDMENT:** Andi Edwards moved to amend the motion by adding a deadline of the October 2022 board meeting. The motion was seconded by Jessica Twigg-Harris.

**DISCUSSION BY THE BOARD:** None.

**COMMUNITY DISCUSSION:** What happens if you do not reach an agreement at the October agreement, what is the fallout from that. Is the cooperative going to dissolve in the middle of the school year.

Sean Neal: No, this agreement would be for the 2022-23 academic school year as read in the amendment.

John Keen: This vote will squash any question on whether or not you want to dissolve the cooperative.

Tim Coles: I agree with that. You have to tell your two communities what you truly stand for. If stand for the coop then you vote on it and you don't play games, you set your deadline, and you fulfil your responsibilities. Stop arguing about nothing and argue about important things and get the job done.

Aaron Flansburg: There should be no squishiness on what you are operating on, you need to abide by the agreement.

**AMENDED MOTION:** Andi Edwards moved to amend the motion by adding a deadline of the October 2022 board meeting. The motion was seconded by Justin Honcoop. The motion passed by the following roll call votes:

|                      |                           |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Sean Neal – Aye      | Jessica Smith – Aye       |
| Ryan Pfaff – Aye     | Andi Edwards – Aye        |
| Paula Adams – Aye    | Heidi Evans – Aye         |
| Matt Bofenkamp – Aye | Shealyn Holbrook – Aye    |
| Justin Honcoop – Aye | Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye |

**MAIN MOTION:** I move to approve the March 2020-2021 version of the cooperative agreement for the 2022-2023 academic year to be replaced by the new agreement once it is agreed upon both boards to be completed no later than October 27, 2022.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:** Heidi Evans: This does make me feel better with the amendment and it is nice to hear this and I feel more confident.

**PUBLIC DISCUSSION:** Tim Coles: I think this is great.

**The main motion was passed by the following roll call votes:**

|                      |                           |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Sean Neal – Aye      | Jessica Smith – Aye       |
| Ryan Pfaff – Aye     | Andi Edwards – Aye        |
| Paula Adams – Aye    | Heidi Evans – Aye         |
| Matt Bofenkamp – Aye | Shealyn Holbrook – Aye    |
| Justin Honcoop – Aye | Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye |

**MOTION:** Heidi Evans made a motion to pass 5.1 – Cooperative matters must be jointly decided upon by the school boards of both Garfield and Palouse and may not be acted upon independently. This motion was seconded by Andi Edwards.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:** Discussion followed

Matt Bofenkamp: Just wanted to make sure that we are just working on 5.1 only. This was confirmed by Jessica Smith.

Discussion was made regarding the way we want to vote as what was brought up by a community member. This will be brought up later.

**PUBLIC DISCUSSION:**

Shishona Turner: Someone asked about putting this on the website so that they could follow along with what is being addressed.

Jessica Smith: It has not been publicly available but after this vote I don't see that this can be made publicly available.

**The main motion was passed by the following roll call votes:**

|                      |                           |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Sean Neal – Aye      | Jessica Smith – Aye       |
| Ryan Pfaff – Aye     | Andi Edwards – Aye        |
| Paula Adams – Aye    | Heidi Evans – Aye         |
| Matt Bofenkamp – Aye | Shealyn Holbrook – Aye    |
| Justin Honcoop – Aye | Jessie Twigg-Harris – Aye |

**Board Discussion:**

Justin Honcoop would like to open the voting procedure. I just want to open up a discussion if there are other ways to vote on joint matters that affects all our kids. Maybe come together and say that we are a team of ten and not of two fives.

Jessica Smith: I say that we table this as I have read through the original cooperative agreement, and I want to say there is language in there that involved this, and I want to have a chance to go over this.

Matt Bofenkamp: This is a good broad discussion but on the other side of this I do believe the people who did this original document put in lot of work and so we have to be cautious in just brushing aside how the original document was originally worded where in it talked about the majority of both boards, because the intent here could have been to protect an elected board, town or community against a united board with one descending vote.

Jessica Twigg-Harris: I agree with Matt Bofenkamp. I would like to spend time in considering this and where this came from originally before we change it.

Jessica Smith: Any more thoughts, discussions?

Matt Bofenkamp: I know it has been said it multiple times, but an enormous thank you to all who came out tonight and we know how much the cooperative means to everyone!

**ADJOURN:** Ryan Pfaff moved, Heidi Evans seconded to adjourn the meeting. With there being no further business to discuss, the joint board meeting adjourned at 8:50\_p.m.

Board Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Superintendent: \_\_\_\_\_

Board Chairman: \_\_\_\_\_

Superintendent: \_\_\_\_\_